



# COMMUNITY RESILIENCE CATALYST REQUEST FOR SUPPORT SCORING GUIDE

*February 2025*



## INTRODUCTION

The Community Resilience Catalyst (Catalyst) will provide education and technical support to a select number of Gulf Coast communities in their efforts to advance resilience. Requests for technical support will be accepted on a rolling basis and all efforts must be completed by Oct. 31, 2026.

The technical support is **not** a grant program. The request will be for technical support and capacity that can be deployed relatively quickly and flexibly to bring more diversity to the landscape of community resilience. The intention is to overcome barriers that often arise when there is a need for technical work, research, planning, or similar activities, which can be delayed or prevented because such activities require the capacity to manage funds or the timing does not align.

While communities will be selected for technical support on a rolling basis, not all communities in the Gulf region will be eligible. The Center has created eligibility and scoring rubrics to prioritize local government, faith-based organizations, or community-based organizations serving often overlooked areas of the Gulf.

It is also important to note that this effort is currently being supported through multiple funding sources. This effort began in May 2025; and will continue on an ongoing basis. However, there are factors outside of our control that could impact the timeline, scope, or funding available to move forward if funding is paused, delayed, or exhausted. We will continue to keep you informed of any updates or changes.

This document establishes the scoring approach for the requests for technical support. For additional information on eligibility or the overarching Catalyst please visit the website:

<https://thewaterinstitute.org/projects/crc/catalyst>



## SECTION I: SCORING RUBIC

Scoring Criterion	Description	Scoring & Weighting
<b>Adaptive Capacity</b>	<p>This scoring criterion assesses adaptive capacity. Applicants with greater need receive higher scores, meaning they have received less funding relative to organizational resources, have had fewer projects funded, and have less access to partner networks that may be leveraged toward this work.</p> <p>Reviewers will consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The amount of funding received relative to organizational resources;</li> <li>2. The number of projects funded in the past; and</li> <li>3. Depth and diversity of partners.</li> </ol>	<p>5 points, weighted to 10 points</p> <p>10% of total points</p>
<b>Exposure to Hazards</b>	<p>This scoring criterion evaluates the extent to which the target community is exposed to the hazard the project seeks to mitigate. Scoring considers both the situation of people, infrastructure, housing, and other tangible human assets located in hazard-prone areas as well as the increase in frequency of the hazard (projected or recent years). Higher exposure receives higher scores. Reviewers will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hazard the project seeks to address (target hazard);</li> <li>• Geography of the project impact (may be smaller than the community it represents);</li> <li>• Qualitative and/or quantitative descriptions of assets (highlighting houses, critical infrastructure) and population vulnerable to target hazard; and</li> <li>• How exposure has changed from the past.</li> </ul>	<p>5 points, weighted to 10 points</p> <p>10% of total points</p>
<b>Sensitivity to Hazards</b>	<p>This scoring criterion assesses the level to which communities or individuals are impacted by the target hazard. Communities or individuals that have a greater sensitivity to target hazards will receive higher scores. Scoring will consider discrete factors of sensitivities to target hazards and crosscutting factors, that may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Crosscutting</i>: The following factors increase sensitivity across all hazards: low income, disabilities, non-English speaking, age (young and old), lack of access to reliable transportation, lack of access to mental health care/physical health care, mental health problems, substance abuse, singular economy (e.g., fishing or tourism dominated economies), low educational level, single parent households, unemployment, and lack of health insurance.</li> <li>• <i>Flood</i>: lack of clear and accessible flood risk communication, lack of access to funds, lack of flood insurance.</li> <li>• <i>Wind</i>: older structures, lack of diverse and clear wind risk, lack of clearly marked evacuation routes, lack of wind insurance.</li> <li>• <i>Fire</i>: absence of fire suppression policy/practice, higher percentage of housing stock that is mobile, older, and/or composed of renters, high prevalence of respiratory diseases, lack of diverse and clear fire risk communication, lack of fire insurance.</li> </ul>	<p>5 points, weighted to 10 points</p> <p>10% of total points</p>



Scoring Criterion	Description	Scoring & Weighting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Heat</i>: lack of cooling centers, lack of in-home air conditioning, high prevalence of asthma, COPD, coronary heart disease, diabetes, obesity, poor mental health, high number of outdoor workers, lack of tree canopy, high degree of impervious surface, lack of access to parks or green space.</li> </ul>	
<b>Continuity of Resilience Work</b>	<p>This scoring criterion assesses the level to which the proposed project will continue momentum from past to future resilience efforts. Communities that demonstrate how this project’s efforts will enable the pursuit of concrete next steps for resilience will receive higher scores. Examples of information that demonstrate continuity include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Benefits and outcomes clearly enable next steps after the project.</li> <li>The applicant’s clear commitment to continue the work and identified partnerships that will persist beyond the project.</li> <li>Potential resources and community support can be leveraged for enabling next steps for resilience.</li> <li>Resilience activities can continue after the project despite potential changes in leadership, staff turnover, and/or political/administrative transitions.</li> <li>The project’s alignment with and integration into other public or private investments currently ongoing or planned.</li> </ul>	<p>5 points, weighted to 10 points</p> <p>10% of total points</p>
<b>Impact on Adaptive Capacity, Sensitivity, and/or Exposure</b>	<p><i>Note that the impact criteria are more heavily weighted.</i> This scoring criterion assesses the impact the project will likely have on one or more vulnerability factors: adaptive capacity, sensitivity, and/or exposure. Applicants should emphasize the primary, direct impact of the project and include any secondary impacts. Applicants that demonstrate greater direct impact with additional indirect/co-benefit impacts will receive higher scores. Impact will be assessed for outcomes at project completion and for potential outcomes that are likely to occur through subsequent phases. Reviewers will consider whether projects have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Direct Impact</i>: Immediate, obvious, and often easily measurable effects that result directly from a cause. They are the primary outcomes or consequences.</li> <li><i>Indirect Impact/Co-benefit</i>: Secondary or long-term effects that may be less obvious or immediate, but still significant. They can be caused by ripple effects or chain reactions stemming from the direct impact or from the project activities.</li> <li><i>High Impact</i>: Substantial or noteworthy effect or consequence, implying that the outcome is more than just minor or negligible; it has a noticeable and other meaningful influence on a situation, system, or community. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); lasting (has a long-term effect); important (affects a significant number of people or broader system); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> <li><i>Medium Impact</i>: Beneficial effect that is significant enough to be recognized but doesn’t necessarily represent a major breakthrough or transformation. It is a step in the right direction that is noticeable</li> </ul>	<p>5 points, weighted to 20 points</p> <p>20% of total points</p>



Scoring Criterion	Description	Scoring & Weighting
	<p>and beneficial but may require further efforts to achieve more substantial results. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low Impact:</i> Beneficial effect that is minimal or barely noticeable. It is a level of change that is not significant enough to have a high or medium impact but still represents a small improvement. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Impact on Social Determinants of Health (SDOH)</b></p>	<p><i>Note that the impact criteria are more heavily weighted.</i> This criterion assesses the impact the project will likely have on one or more SDOH: education access and quality, health care and quality, neighborhood and built environment, social and community context, and economic stability. Applicants should emphasize the primary, direct SDOH impact of the project and include any secondary impacts. Applicants that demonstrate greater direct impact with additional indirect/co-benefit impacts will receive higher scores. Also, impact will be assessed for outcomes at project completion and for potential outcomes that are likely to occur through subsequent phases. Reviewers will consider whether projects have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Direct Impact:</i> Immediate, obvious, and often easily measurable effects that result directly from a cause. They are the primary outcomes or consequences.</li> <li>• <i>Indirect Impact/Co-benefit:</i> Secondary or long-term effects that may be less obvious or immediate but still significant. They can be caused by ripple effects or chain reactions stemming from the direct impact or from the project activities.</li> <li>• <i>High Impact:</i> Substantial or noteworthy effect or consequence, implying that the outcome is more than just minor or negligible; it has a noticeable and often meaningful influence on a situation, system, or community. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); lasting (has a long-term effect); important (affects a significant number of people or broader system); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> <li>• <i>Medium Impact:</i> Beneficial effect that is significant enough to be recognized but doesn't necessarily represent a major breakthrough or transformation. It is a step in the right direction that is noticeable and beneficial but may require further efforts to achieve more substantial results. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> <li>• <i>Low Impact:</i> Beneficial effect that is minimal or barely noticeable. It is a level of change that is not significant enough to have a high or medium impact but still represents a small improvement. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> </ul>	<p>5 points, weighted to 20 points</p> <p>20% of total points</p>



Scoring Criterion	Description	Scoring & Weighting
<b>Feasibility</b>	<i>Note that the feasibility criterion is more heavily weighted.</i> This scoring criterion assesses the feasibility of the project within the proposed budget and timeline. Projects receive a higher score with a clearly defined and accomplishable budget and timeline.	5 points, weighted to 20 points  20% of total points



## SECTION II: SCORING DETAILS AND EXAMPLES

### Adaptive Capacity

Points	5-point scale weighted to 10 points (10%)
Description	<p>This scoring criterion assesses adaptive capacity. Applicants with greater need receive higher scores, meaning they have received less funding relative to organizational resources, have had fewer projects funded, and have less access to partner networks that may be leveraged toward this work. Reviewers will consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The amount of funding received relative to organizational resources;</li> <li>2. The number of projects funded in the past; and</li> <li>3. Depth and diversity of partners.</li> </ol>
Potential Scales/Bins for Point Assignments	<p><b>Maximum Potential for Adaptive Capacity Benefits (5 points):</b> The applicant has very limited access to resources and partnerships to leverage toward this work. This includes having a small organizational budget with very limited or no funding received related to the project topic, few or no projects funded thus far related to the topic, and a small and/or less diverse network of partners.</p> <p><b>High Potential for Adaptive Capacity Benefits (4 points):</b> The applicant has limited access to resources and partnerships to leverage toward this work. This includes having a small organizational budget, limited funding received for projects related to the topic, few projects related to the topic funded thus far, and a small and/or less diverse network of partners.</p> <p><b>Moderate Potential for Adaptive Capacity Benefits (3 points):</b> The applicant has access to some resources and partnerships to leverage toward this work. The organization may have a small or mid-size operational budget, have received some funding but not enough to continue momentum on the activity, and may have a medium or large network that represents a variety of skills and resources but may be missing key traits.</p> <p><b>Slight Potential for Adaptive Capacity Benefits (2 points):</b> The applicant has had access to substantial resources and partnerships to leverage toward this topic, but additional resources are needed to continue momentum. The applicant may have a high operational budget but has not yet received any funding or have a smaller budget and has received some funding. The applicant has some partners, and the partners represent a variety of capacity that may be leveraged toward this work.</p> <p><b>Low to No Potential for Adaptive Capacity Benefits (1 points):</b> The applicant has had access to many resources and partnerships to leverage toward work around this topic and could likely achieve this activity. The organization may have a high operational budget and substantial funding related to the project, but additional work is needed to continue momentum. The organization has a robust network of partners, and the partners represent a variety of capacity that may be leveraged toward this work.</p>
Supporting Data Sources	<p>Applicant provided data including the total value of funded projects to date, number of funded projects to date, description of operational budget and narrative description of partner network.</p> <p>Project team will gather data through a preliminary scan of available online records, i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidestar</li> <li>• Form 990</li> <li>• Return of Organization Exempt from Income Tax (if the applicant is a non-profit)</li> </ul>



Points	5-point scale weighted to 10 points (10%)
Examples of Scoring	<p>Example One: A small service non-profit that has received no funding for projects related to this issue and with multiple partners that are almost all other small service non-profits, and they only have three employees. Because they do not have diversity in partnerships, much funding, or much internal capacity they would receive more points – 4 or 5.</p> <p>Example Two: A small service non-profit that has received no funding for projects related to the issue with many diverse partners including technical partners that have experience in grant writing and the resilience topic of focus. They only have four employees. Because they have some diverse partnerships but not funding or much internal capacity they would receive a medium amount of points – 3.</p> <p>Example Three: A large service non-profit with experience writing and gaining federal dollars on multiple projects, a large and diverse partnership network including technical partners that have experience in grant writing and the resilience topic. They have nine employees. Because they have many partners, received quite a bit of funding, and have higher internal expertise they would receive fewer points – 2 or 1.</p>

### Exposure to Hazards

Points	5-point scale weighted to 10 points (10%)
Description	<p>This scoring criterion evaluates the extent to that the target community is exposed to the hazard the project seeks to mitigate. Scoring considers both the situation of people, infrastructure, housing, production capacities, and other tangible human assets located in hazard-prone areas as well as the increase in frequency of the hazard (projected or recent years). Higher exposure receives higher scores. Reviewers will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hazard the project seeks to address (target hazard);</li> <li>• Geography of the project impact (may be smaller than the community it represents);</li> <li>• Qualitative descriptions of assets (highlighting houses, critical infrastructure) and population vulnerable to target hazard; and</li> <li>• How has it changed from the past.</li> </ul>
Potential Scales/Bins for Point Assignments	<p><b>Maximum Exposure (5 points):</b> The geography of impacts has extreme exposure to the target hazard. If comparative data are available, the exposure of the geography to the target hazard would be in the 90<sup>th</sup>–100<sup>th</sup> percentile.</p> <p><b>High Exposure (4 points):</b> The geography of impact has substantial exposure to the target hazard. If comparative data are available, the exposure of the geography to the target hazard would be in the 80<sup>th</sup>–90<sup>th</sup> percentile.</p> <p><b>Moderate Exposure (3 points):</b> The geography of impact has some exposure to the target hazard. If comparative data are available, the exposure of the geography to the target hazard would be in the 60<sup>th</sup>–80<sup>th</sup> percentile.</p>



Points	5-point scale weighted to 10 points (10%)
	<p><b>Slight Exposure (2 points):</b> The geography of impact has limited exposure to the target hazard. If comparative data are available, the exposure of the geography to the target hazard would be in the lower 60<sup>th</sup> percentile.</p> <p><b>Low to No Exposure (1 points):</b> The geography of impact is among those with the least or no exposure to the target hazard compared to others in the Gulf coast region.</p>
Supporting Data Sources	<p>Publicly available data and The Water Institute’s existing data access potentially include:</p> <p>Flood exposure (population and asset number or percentage in flood hazard extent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastal flooding (Coastal Master Plan)</li> <li>• Fluvial flooding (FEMA, Special Flood Hazard Area, Repetitive loss areas, <a href="https://coast.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/tools/flood-exposure.html">NOAA Flood Exposure Mapper (https://coast.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/tools/flood-exposure.html)</a>)</li> <li>• Stormwater flooding (rely on the applicant qualitative descriptions)</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://hazards.fema.gov/nri/map">NRI (https://hazards.fema.gov/nri/map)</a>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wind: Population, Houses, and other assets in high-risk strong wind census tracts (NRI)</li> <li>• Fire: Population, Houses, farms, and other assets in high-risk wildfire area census tracts (NRI)</li> <li>• Heat: Population in high heat wave census tracts (NRI)</li> <li>• Multiple-hazards: (Yes, no)—use the same resources above to describe exposure to the secondary hazards</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://map.climatevulnerabilityindex.org/map/">Climate vulnerability index (https://map.climatevulnerabilityindex.org/map/ )</a></p> <p>Applicants may also supplement exposure data with a description of hazards that may not be reflected in national databases, particularly for urban flooding/stormwater flooding.</p>
Example scoring cases	<p>Example One: The people that would benefit from the project are at risk to extreme heat and are located in a heat island. A high school science project showed that on the hottest days the neighborhood was on average 6–7 degrees warmer at night than the surrounding city. There are increasing warm nights in the region according to the NCA5. Because many people are directly exposed to this hazard in greater amounts than other areas this would receive more points – 4 or 5.</p> <p>Example Two: The people that would benefit from this project are located in a river community that is protected from rising rivers and coastal surge by levees; however, they are experiencing increased development and extreme rainfall events stressing their stormwater system. This would receive a moderate amount of points because they are experiencing some exposure to hazards; however, they are also already protected from some sources of the hazards – 3.</p>



Points	5-point scale weighted to 10 points (10%)
	<p>Example Three:</p> <p>This community has very high exposure to flooding that they describe in great detail; however, their project focuses on addressing increasing heat risk. It is a rural community with large areas of natural surfaces, though there is an increase in the number of warm nights expected. Because this community is addressing a hazard, they do not have a high exposure risk to and because they have large natural surfaces the exposure to changing heat will be lower than other areas this project would receive fewer points – 1 or 2.</p>

### Sensitivity to Hazards

Points	5-point scale weighted to 10 points (10%)
Description	<p>This scoring criterion assesses the level to which communities or individuals are impacted by the target hazard. Communities or individuals that have a greater sensitivity to target hazards will receive higher scores. Scoring will consider the relationships of sensitivities to target hazards and crosscutting sensitivities, that may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Crosscutting</i>: The following factors increase sensitivity across all hazards: low income, disabilities, non-English speaking, age (young and old), lack of access to reliable transportation, lack of access to mental health care/physical health care, mental health problems, substance abuse, singular economy (e.g., fishing or tourism dominated economies), low educational level, single parent households, unemployment, and lack of health insurance.</li> <li>• <i>Flood</i>: lack of clear and accessible flood risk communication, lack of access to funds, lack of flood insurance.</li> <li>• <i>Wind</i>: older structures, lack of diverse and clear wind risk, lack of clearly marked evacuation routes, lack of wind insurance.</li> <li>• <i>Fire</i>: absence of fire suppression policy/practice, higher percentage of housing stock that is mobile, older, and/or composed of renters, high prevalence of respiratory diseases, lack of diverse and clear fire risk communication, lack of fire insurance.</li> <li>• <i>Heat</i>: high prevalence of asthma, COPD, coronary heart disease, diabetes, obesity, poor mental health, high number of outdoor workers, lack of tree canopy, high degree of impervious surface, lack of access to parks or green space.</li> </ul>
Potential Scales/Bins for Point Assignments	<p><b>Maximum Sensitivity (5 points):</b> Given very rarely to those working in an area that has the some of the highest concentration of factors that increase sensitivity. It should include intersection of multiple sensitivities, all of which are in the highest percentiles of risk factors.</p> <p><b>High Sensitivity (4 points):</b> Reflects a community or individuals that have many factors contributing to sensitivity that are high. If comparative data are available, they would be in the upper 80<sup>th</sup> percentile in the state for most of the factors with one or two in the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile.</p> <p><b>Moderate Sensitivity (3 points):</b> Reflects a community or individuals that have some factors contributing to sensitivity that are moderate to high. If comparative data are available, they would be in the upper 60<sup>th</sup> percentile in the state for several of those factors with one or two in the upper 80<sup>th</sup>.</p>



Points	5-point scale weighted to 10 points (10%)
	<p><b>Slight Sensitivity (2 points):</b> Reflects communities and individuals that have a few factors contributing to sensitivity that are mild to moderate. If comparative data are available, they would only have one or two factors that were in the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile or higher.</p> <p><b>Low to No Sensitivity (1 point):</b> Reflects communities and individuals that have very little sensitivity to hazards, meaning they have high income, are early adult to middle aged, highly educated, healthy, and have access to transportation, health care, etc. This should be given very rarely.</p>
Supporting Data Sources	<p>Applicant provided data including a narrative description of their community/individual sensitivity to the relevant hazard(s). Being able to provide experiential data, oral history, municipal or locally collected records, or other non-traditional records will be helpful, particularly where national data viewers are too coarse or incomplete to understand the local challenge.</p> <p>Publicly available data also may be used, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://headwaterseconomics.org/equity/rural-capacity-map/">Rural capacity map (https://headwaterseconomics.org/equity/rural-capacity-map/)</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169204623001160">Fire sensitivity: (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169204623001160)</a></li> <li>• Socioeconomic tools formerly hosted by the federal government: <a href="https://screening-tools.com/epa-ejscreen">https://screening-tools.com/epa-ejscreen</a></li> </ul>
Example scoring cases	<p>Example One: A community-based non-profit that serves residents that have historically been excluded from decision-making processes and have frequently had to pursue legal challenges to prevent harmful development/destruction of remaining wetlands. There is a high prevalence of all sensitivities for heat according to the CDC heat and health tracker. The people they serve live in an area that has a large amount of impervious surfaces. There are also high rates of poverty, renters, and individuals with no vehicles. Public transit consists of buses; however, the service area and frequency and number of routes have continually been scaled back and is not very functional. Most of the census tracts where the residents they serve reside are in the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile and above for the Demographic Index in the state. This would receive more points – 5.</p> <p>Example Two: A very rural, white area with pockets of high income and high poverty. The county/parish residents are fairly disconnected without strong communication pathways to government or each other. There is a direct relationship between income and communication with lower income folks being more disconnected from the county/parish government and neighbors. The pockets of poverty also coincide with high use of mobile homes and high rates of individuals with less than a high school education. Across the county/parish there are high rates of people with disabilities. This would score moderately – 3, possibly 4 if the project directly addresses one of these sensitivities.</p> <p>Example Three:</p>



Points	5-point scale weighted to 10 points (10%)
	<p>A community that is a suburb of other industrial and economic hubs in the state indicating a relatively well-paid, educated population. It is primarily white, with a slightly aging population that almost exclusively speaks English. In the EJ Screen none of the census tracts are above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile on the Demographic Index in the state. Because this community has low socioeconomic vulnerabilities and other occurrences that increase sensitivity this would receive few points – 1.</p>

### Continuity of Resilience Work

Points	5-point scale weighted to 10 points (10%)
Description	<p>This scoring criterion is to assess the level to which the proposed project will continue momentum from past to future resilience efforts. Communities that demonstrate how this project’s efforts will enable the pursuit of concrete next steps for resilience will receive higher scores. Examples of information that demonstrate continuity include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits and outcomes clearly enable next steps after the project;</li> <li>• The applicant’s clear commitment to continue the work and partnerships beyond the project;</li> <li>• Potential resources and community support to be leveraged for enabling next steps for resilience;</li> <li>• Resilience activities that can continue after the project despite potential changes in leadership, staff turnovers, and/or political/administrative transitions; or</li> <li>• The project’s alignment with and integration into other public or private investments currently ongoing or planned.</li> </ul>
Potential Scales/Bins for Point Assignments	<p><b>Maximum Potential for Continuity (5 points):</b> Indicates very high potential for continuing resilience work beyond this project, including many concrete examples of how this project enables next steps and a high likelihood the project will enable next steps.</p> <p><b>High Potential for Continuity (4 points):</b> Indicates substantial potential for continuing resilience work beyond this project, including some concrete examples of how this project enables next steps and indication that the project is likely to generate next steps.</p> <p><b>Moderate Potential for Continuity (3 points):</b> Indicates some potential for continuing resilience work beyond this project, including a moderate level of detail on how this project enables next steps and that the project has some likelihood of enabling the next steps.</p> <p><b>Slight Potential for Continuity (2 points):</b> Indicates the potential for continuing resilience work is limited or unlikely, with very few details on how this project would enable next steps and a lack of sufficient detail that the project will likely generate the next steps.</p>



<b>Points</b>	<b>5-point scale weighted to 10 points (10%)</b>
	<b>Low to No Continuity Potential (1 point):</b> Indicates the potential for continuing resilience work is minimal or very unlikely beyond this project, or the project description does not provide enough information to assess continuity.
<b>Supporting Data Sources</b>	Applicants provided data including: community-data; documentation of potential funding source for next steps; documentation of partners to support next steps.
<b>Example scoring cases</b>	<p>Example One: A local non-federal tribe seeking funding to get conceptual designs and cost estimates to enable more robust applications for implementation. They are specifically looking to submit to a recently announced, but not-yet-released funding opportunity that will come out in about three months and to BRIC which closes in 7 months. This is for specific funding opportunities, with enough time to conduct the work before the proposals are due. This is a strong example of continuity and would be awarded a greater number of points – 4 or 5</p> <p>Example Two: A moderately large city that is alongside a state transportation corridor would like to plan for economic development that also reduces emissions—specifically focusing on where best to install electric vehicle charging stations proximate to existing and potential locally-owned businesses and how to advertise them. They are hopeful that the Economic Development Administration would have a grant that would make sense to apply to and that they could then shop around the proposal to other businesses/investors. This is a good idea and the city is clearly committed to pursuing funding; however, there is not a clear line to funding/next step. This would score moderately – 3.</p> <p>Example Three: A neighborhood organization is frustrated by the continued flooding in their neighborhood. They would like modeling and planning conducted to then give to the city for them to use in capital improvement planning. This is a good idea, but without the city involved and committing funding and no other clear funding sources this seems to have a minimal opportunity for continuity to future actions. This would receive fewer points – 2.</p>

*Impact on Adaptive Capacity, Sensitivity, and/or Exposure*

<b>Points</b>	<b>5-point scale weighted to 20 points (20%)</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p><i>Note that the impact criteria are more heavily weighted.</i> This scoring criterion assesses the impact the project will likely have on one or more vulnerability factors: adaptive capacity, sensitivity, and/or exposure. Applicants should emphasize the primary vulnerability impact of the project and include any secondary impacts. Applicants that demonstrate greater direct impact with additional indirect/co-benefit impact will receive higher scores. Also, impact will be assessed for outcomes at project completion and for potential outcomes that are likely to occur through subsequent phases. Reviewers will consider whether projects have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Direct Impact:</i> Immediate, obvious, and often easily measurable effects that result directly from a cause. They are the primary outcomes or consequences.</li> </ul>



<b>Points</b>	<b>5-point scale weighted to 20 points (20%)</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Indirect Impact/Co-benefit</i>: Secondary or long-term effects that may be less obvious or immediate, but still significant. They can be caused by ripple effects or chain reactions stemming from the direct impact or from the project activities.</li> <li>• <i>High Impact</i>: Substantial or noteworthy effect or consequence, implying that the outcome is more than just minor or negligible; it has a noticeable and often meaningful influence on a situation, system, or community. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); lasting (has a long-term effect); important (affects a significant number of people or broader system); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> <li>• <i>Medium Impact</i>: Beneficial effect that is significant enough to be recognized but doesn't necessarily represent a major breakthrough or transformation. It is a step in the right direction that is noticeable and beneficial but may require further efforts to achieve more substantial results. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> <li>• <i>Low Impact</i>: Beneficial effect that is minimal or barely noticeable. It is a level of change that is not significant enough to have a high or medium impact but still represents a small improvement. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> </ul>
<b>Potential Scales/Bins for Point Assignments</b>	<p><b>Maximum Impact (5 points)</b>: Projects have a high direct impact for the primary vulnerability factor with multiple co-benefits. This can be immediately or from subsequent phases. There also must be multiple additional impacts, including indirect/co-benefits, or direct impacts for other aspects of vulnerability.</p> <p><b>High Impact (4 points)</b>: Projects have a direct and high impact for the primary vulnerability factor either immediately or from subsequent phases without any clear co-benefits. This could also be projects that have a medium impact for the primary vulnerability factor either immediately or from subsequent phases with multiple indirect/co-benefits, or direct impacts for other aspects of vulnerability.</p> <p><b>Moderate Impact (3 points)</b>: Projects have a medium impact for the primary vulnerability factor either immediately or from subsequent phases without any clear co-benefits. This could also be projects that have a low impact for the primary vulnerability factor either immediately or from subsequent phases with multiple indirect/co-benefits, or direct impacts for other aspects of vulnerability.</p> <p><b>Slight Impact (2 points)</b>: These are projects that have a low impact for the primary vulnerability factor either immediately or from subsequent phases without any clear co-benefits.</p> <p><b>Low or No Impact (1 point)</b>: These are projects that have minimal direct impact for the primary vulnerability factor either immediately or from subsequent phases without any clear co-benefits.</p>
<b>Supporting Data Sources</b>	Applicant provided data through a narrative describing project impact on one or more of the vulnerability factors, with detailed explanation of the primary impact the project is



Points	5-point scale weighted to 20 points (20%)
	<p>expected to have, both immediately and into the future, as well as any secondary, indirect impacts/co-benefits.</p>
<p><b>Example scoring cases</b></p>	<p>Example One:            A local non-profit wants to establish a community land trust (CLT) with residents and other stakeholders in a frequently overlooked community to increase the prevalence of affordable resilient housing and minimize gentrification and loss of community cohesion. They have already received some preliminary funding to engage the community to assess interest. It was found to be favorable. This will address a major gap that remains after a major hurricane almost twenty years ago. They would like support in developing a plan for how to move forward with continuing to establish the CLT and to explicitly consider issues related to wind and flood resilient construction and alternative approaches to insurance to further keep housing affordable. This project and successful implementation of the CLT would provide a high direct impact on reducing exposure and sensitivity to hazards. Because of this it would receive many points – 5.</p> <p>Example Two:            A municipality wants to improve the resilience of their stormwater system and is asking for a compound flood modeling study to be done so that they can prioritize their capital improvement investments and pursuit of external dollars. This plan and the subsequent implementation of the CI dollars would have a clear impact on reducing exposure to flood risk. It does not have any other benefits to other hazard impacts so it would score moderate to many points – 4</p> <p>Example Three:            A local church in a historically marginalized community wants help designing a proposal that can be submitted for implementation funding to establish a goat farm on land they already own that can be used for a three-fold purpose: 1) an educational program with at-risk youth from the neighborhood to learn husbandry and various aspects of successfully running a business; 2) collaborate with local land holders to provide an alternative to fire or harmful pesticides to maintain conservation and other types of land; and 3) provide food security to residents in the neighborhood who are struggling. This project does not have a clear hazard but has indirect benefits on environmental health that can increase environmental resilience. Because of this it would receive few points – 1.</p>
<p><b>Notes</b></p>	<p>Applicants will be provided with guidance to ensure they understand how their responses will be assessed and scored, including the above and that the reviewers will consider whether the project uses a known approach that has had demonstrated success in reducing vulnerability, or is novel but is uniquely positioned to positively impact the community.</p> <p>Reviewers will use the applicant’s descriptive narrative that incorporates their local expert knowledge and the reviewers’ expert judgement to assess the likelihood of impact as described. Effort will be expended to attempt to align reviewers with some familiarity of the lived experiences of applicants.</p>



### Impact on Social Determinants of Health

Points	5-point scale weighted to 20 points (20%)
Description	<p><i>Note that the impact criteria are more heavily weighted.</i> This criterion assesses the impact the project will likely have on one or more SDOH: education access and quality, health care and quality, neighborhood and built environment, social and community context, and economic stability. Applicants should emphasize the primary SDOH impact of the project and include any secondary impacts. Applicants that demonstrate greater direct impact with additional indirect with additional indirect/co-benefit impact will receive higher scores. Also, impact will be assessed for outcomes at project completion and for potential outcomes that are likely to occur through subsequent phases. Reviewers will consider whether projects have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Direct Impact:</i> Immediate, obvious, and often easily measurable effects that result directly from a cause. They are the primary outcomes or consequences.</li> <li>• <i>Indirect Impact/Co-benefit:</i> Secondary or long-term effects that may be less obvious or immediate, but still significant. They can be caused by ripple effects or chain reactions stemming from the direct impact or from the project activities.</li> <li>• <i>High Impact:</i> Substantial or noteworthy effect or consequence, implying that the outcome is more than just minor or negligible; it has a noticeable and often meaningful influence on a situation, system, or community. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); lasting (has a long-term effect); important (affects a significant number of people or broader system); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> <li>• <i>Medium Impact:</i> Beneficial effect that is significant enough to be recognized but doesn't necessarily represent a major breakthrough or transformation. It is a step in the right direction that is noticeable and beneficial but may require further efforts to achieve more substantial results. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> <li>• <i>Low Impact:</i> Beneficial effect that is minimal or barely noticeable. It is a level of change that is not significant enough to have a high or medium impact but still represents a small improvement. It also is: measurable (can be quantified or observed); and beneficial (is considered valuable or desirable).</li> </ul>
Potential Scales/Bins for Point Assignments	<p><b>Maximum Impact (5 points):</b> Projects have a high direct impact for the primary SDOH factor with multiple co-benefits, immediately or from subsequent phases. There also must be multiple additional impacts, including indirect/co-benefits, or direct impacts for other aspects of SDOH.</p> <p><b>High Impact (4 points):</b> Projects have a direct and high impact for the primary SDOH factor either immediately or from subsequent phases without any clear co-benefits. This could also be projects that have a medium impact for the primary SDOH factor either immediately or from subsequent phases with multiple indirect/co-benefits, or direct impacts for other aspects of SDOH.</p> <p><b>Moderate Impact (3 points):</b> Projects have a medium impact for the primary SDOH factor either immediately or from subsequent phases without any clear co-benefits. This could also be projects that have a low impact for the primary SDOH factor either</p>



<b>Points</b>	<b>5-point scale weighted to 20 points (20%)</b>
	<p>immediately or from subsequent phases with multiple indirect/co-benefits, or direct impacts for other aspects of SDOH.</p> <p><b>Slight Impact (2 points):</b> These are projects that have a low impact for the primary SDOH factor either immediately or from subsequent phases without any clear co-benefits.</p> <p><b>Low or No Impact (1 point):</b> These are projects that have minimal direct impact for the primary SDOH factor either immediately or from subsequent phases without any clear co-benefits.</p>
<b>Supporting Data Sources</b>	<p>Applicant provided data to describe the project’s impact on one or more SDOH factors. In doing so, applicants should explain the primary impact the project is expected to have, both immediately and into the future, as well as any secondary, indirect impacts/co-benefits.</p>
<b>Example scoring cases</b>	<p>Example One: A local non-profit wants to establish a community land trust (CLT) with residents and other stakeholders in a historically marginalized community to increase the prevalence of affordable resilient housing and minimize gentrification and loss of community cohesion. They have already received some preliminary funding to engage the community to assess interest. It was found to be favorable. This will address a major gap that remains after a major hurricane almost twenty years ago. They would like support in developing a plan for how to move forward with continuing to establish the CLT and to explicitly consider issues related to wind and flood resilient construction and alternative approaches to insurance to further keep housing affordable. This project and successful implementation of the CLT would provide improvement to the built environment and have additional benefits to community cohesion. It would score maximum number of points – 5.</p> <p>Example Two: A municipality wants to improve the resilience of their stormwater system and is asking for a compound flood modeling study to be done so that they can prioritize their capital improvement investments and pursuit of external dollars. This plan and the subsequent implementation of the CI dollars would have a clear impact on reducing exposure to flood risk. The community did not provide any information about how flooding has or will impact their community—it a middle-class suburb that is predominately white, with high rates of education and falls below the average rates of poverty. While this does have a positive impact on built infrastructure, it is not clear by how much or if there is already a problem. It would receive a few number of points – 2 or 1.</p> <p>Example Three: A local church in a historically marginalized community wants help designing a proposal that can be submitted for implementation funding to establish a goat farm on land they already own that can be used for a three-fold purpose: 1) an educational program with at-risk youth from the neighborhood to learn husbandry and various aspects of successfully running a business; 2) collaborate with local land holders to provide an alternative to fire or harmful pesticides to maintain conservation and other types of land; and 3) provide food security to residents in the neighborhood who are struggling. This project is clearly tackling issues related to economic stability and will have a moderate impact by teaching at-risk</p>



Points	5-point scale weighted to 20 points (20%)
	youth and has some lesser impact on community cohesion. This would score a moderate number of points – 3.
Notes	<p>Applicants will be provided with guidance to ensure they understand how their responses will be assessed and scored, including the above and that reviewers will consider whether the project uses a known approach that has demonstrated success in addressing an SDOH, or is novel but is uniquely positioned to positively impact the community.</p> <p>Reviewers will use the applicant’s descriptive narrative that incorporates their local expert knowledge and the reviewers’ expert judgement to assess the likelihood of impact as described. Effort will be expended to attempt to align reviewers with some familiarity of the lived experiences of applicants.</p>

### Feasibility

Points	5-point scale weighted to 20 points (20%)
Description	This scoring criterion assesses the feasibility of the project within the proposed budget and timeline. Projects receive a higher score with a clearly defined and accomplishable budget and timeline.
Potential Scales/Bins for Point Assignments	<p><b>Maximum Feasibility (5 points):</b> The project is definitely accomplishable within the budget and time proposed; the project is clearly defined.</p> <p><b>High Feasibility (4 points):</b> The project is accomplishable within the budget and time proposed with minor questions/concerns; the project description provides enough information to assess feasibility.</p> <p><b>Moderate Feasibility (3 points):</b> The project is likely accomplishable within the budget and time proposed with some questions/concerns; the project description provides enough information to assess feasibility.</p> <p><b>Slight Feasibility (2 points):</b> The project may be accomplishable within the budget and time proposed but has substantial questions/concerns; the timeline and the project description is limited but provides enough information to assess feasibility.</p> <p><b>Low or No Feasibility (1 point):</b> The project is very unlikely to be accomplished within the budget and time and/or the project description does not provide enough information to assess feasibility.</p>
Supporting Data Sources	Project application (scope, partners, milestone, budget)
Example scoring cases	<p>Example One:</p> <p>A community organization has teamed up with their city to model their stormwater system to capture the urban flooding that they have been experiencing. The city already has digitized all of their above and below ground storm water systems. Our internal team has determined it will take about 6 months to ingest and model the system, this will allow two months for time for stakeholder review and validation of the model and development of potential activities to reduce urban flooding in different neighborhoods. Then two months</p>



to rerun the models with the potential solutions and then two months to select priority projects with the city to add to the capital improvement plan. The modeling is anticipated to cost around \$120,000 and the stakeholder engagement and facilitation to be around \$80,000. This project is feasible in timeline and costs well below the cost cap. This would score a higher number of points – 4 or 5.

**Example Two:**

A small coastal municipality wants to update their mean high tide line so that they can be eligible for additional federal dollars for beach renourishment. Analyses will need to be conducted to determine where the high tide line should be, that will take about three months followed by public meetings. Allowing three months for the public meetings (one month for meeting scheduling plus 60-day comment period), this leaves 6 months for the permit to be submitted and processed. The cost would be around \$100,000. This is a feasible cost, but the timeline on the permit has some uncertainty as these processes can drag on for many months to years. This would score moderate number of points – 3.

**Example Three:**

A coastal county/parish wants to have a real-time forecasting model of compound flooding across the county/parish. They do not have any existing stormwater, riverine, or coastal flooding models to leverage. This would take multiple years and over \$500,000 which is not feasible in timing or cost available in this opportunity. This would score the minimum number of points – 1



## SECTION III: HELPFUL DEFINITIONS

**ADAPTIVE CAPACITY.** Adaptive capacity refers to the ability to withstand, avoid, or adjust to acute hazards and chronic stressors.

**COMMUNITY.** Community can refer to a wide array of scales. Community can include parishes and counties, incorporated cities and towns, census-designated places, neighborhoods, and individuals that identify as a community, such as members of a marginalized group.

**EXPOSURE.** Exposure is the presence of people, assets, and ecosystems where they can be adversely affected by acute hazards, such as floods, oil spills, and extreme heat events, and chronic stressors, such as air, water, and noise pollution and rising sea levels.

**MARGINALIZED.** Groups of people that have been excluded from political processes and decision-making processes.

**RESILIENCE.** Resilience is an ongoing process to reduce vulnerability.

**SENSITIVITY.** Sensitivity is the degree to which an individual or a community is impacted by an acute hazard or chronic stressor.

**TECHNICAL SUPPORT.** Technical work, research, planning, facilitation, engagement, or similar activities to advance efforts in Gulf Coast communities.

**UNDERSERVED.** Groups of people that have currently or historically received inadequate or disproportionately low levels of service and resources.

**VULNERABILITY.** Vulnerability is the intersection of exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity.