

Flagstaff Sustainability Grant

Scoring Rubric

Applications meeting all requirements and receiving the highest scores will receive funding. Questions about this rubric or how your application will be evaluated: SustainabilityGrant@flagstaffaz.gov.

Scoring Criterion	Points Possible
Project Rationale	0–5
Meets the Community Goals	0–7 (+1 bonus)
Alignment with Category-Specific Objectives	0–6
Project Innovation	0–1
Alignment with Carbon Neutrality Plan	0–4
Project Longevity	0–3
Budget / Feasibility / Schedule	0–4

1. Project Rationale — 0–5 points possible

5 points	The applicant provides evidence that the project is needed. The project is likely to have a concrete and substantial positive impact on the lives of people in its target community and/or on the sustainability of the city of Flagstaff. The impact per dollar of grant money used is very high.
3–4 points	Some evidence is provided that the project is needed. The project is likely to provide a fairly concrete and moderate positive impact (direct or indirect) on the lives of people in its target community and/or provide a moderate positive impact on the sustainability of the city of Flagstaff. The impact per dollar of grant money is moderate.
1–2 points	The project will likely provide a small, indirect, positive impact on the lives of people in its target community and/or provide a minor positive impact on the sustainability of the city of Flagstaff.
0 points	There is insufficient evidence that the project is needed. The impact per dollar of grant money is low. No evidence is provided that the project is needed. The project is unlikely to have a positive impact on the lives of people in its target community or provide any benefit to the sustainability of the city of Flagstaff.

2. Meets the Community Goals — 0–7 points possible (+1 bonus)

Goal #1: Meeting the needs and including the voices of individuals or groups who are most often impacted by environmental degradation and climate change — including Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC), people who are LGBTQ+, people with diverse abilities, and people and families with low incomes.

Goal #2: Building community partnerships.

Goal #3: Facilitating volunteer engagement or opportunities.

Projects must meet at least 1 grant goal. 1 bonus point is available to any project that meaningfully involves an underserved community, diverse groups, or vulnerable populations and thoroughly addresses how.

5–6+ points	The project clearly and directly aligns with all three of the overarching grant goals. Applicants specifically state how project activities will aid in achieving these goals.
3–4+ points	The project clearly and directly aligns with two of the three grant goals and may indirectly align with the third. Applicants specifically state how the project activities will aid in achieving two goals.
1–2+ points	The project clearly and directly aligns with one of the three grant goals or may indirectly align with multiple goals. Key information about how project activities are aligned with achieving the goal(s) is missing.
0 points	The project does not directly or indirectly align with any of the overarching grant goals.

3. Alignment with Objectives Specific to this Category — 0–6 points possible

Projects must meet at least 1 objective to receive funding. A complete list of category-specific objectives can be found in the grant guidelines.

5–6 points	The project clearly and directly aligns with all three of the Category Objectives for the chosen category (each category has its own objectives listed in the grant announcement). Applicants specifically state how project activities will aid in achieving these objectives.
3–4 points	The project clearly and directly aligns with two of the three Category Objectives and may indirectly align with the third. Applicants specifically state how the project activities will aid in achieving two goals.
1–2 points	The project clearly and directly aligns with one of the three Category Objectives or may indirectly align with multiple objectives. Key information about how project activities are aligned with achieving the objective(s) is missing.
0 points	The project does not directly or indirectly align with any Category Objectives.

4. Project Innovation — 0–1 point possible

1 point	The project incorporates new (or new-to-this-context) strategies/methods with substantial potential to improve sustainability approaches. It includes well-thought-out innovative components, creativity, and experimentation, which are all clearly described by the applicant.
0 points	The project does not include any new strategies or methods, and it does not have the potential to expand knowledge or teach new ways of approaching sustainability-related problems. Or, new/improved strategies/methods are included, but may not be a practical solution to the community's needs. Or innovation is not clearly described by the applicant.

5. Alignment with Carbon Neutrality Plan — 0–4 points possible

Must score an average of 2 or higher to receive funding.

4 points	The project's activities align with and support the Carbon Neutrality Plan's three main goals. This project will either reduce emissions/is unlikely to create a substantial greenhouse gas emission source (mitigation), and the project strengthens the community (resilience/adaptation), and prioritizes people most impacted by climate change (equity).
2–3 points	This project's activities mostly align with the Carbon Neutrality Plan and/or do not contradict the CNP. When possible, this project uses materials and methods that minimize the amount of greenhouse gases emitted over the course of its life cycle. Alternative materials or methods with a lower climate impact may exist, but these alternatives may be untenable within the budget and scope of the project, and the value of the project still greatly outweighs any emissions incurred. Alternatively, or in addition, this project somewhat strengthens the community and/or prioritizes people most impacted by climate change.
0–1 point	Important aspects of the project contradict Flagstaff's climate goals and applicants are unable to find an alternative. This project uses tools, methods, or materials that do not align with the Carbon Neutrality Plan. Alternatives may exist but are not used. The positive impact of this project may not outweigh its climate impact.

6. Project Longevity — 0–3 points possible

3 points	The project will have direct and concrete effects for long after the term of the grant, potentially for years. The effects of the grant are unlikely to need further grant money to continue or the applicants have clearly stated how future funding will be secured. The impact will continue even if the person who applied for funding leaves the agency or can no longer work on the project.
2 points	The project will have direct or indirect effects for long after the term of the grant, for at least one year. Future funding may be needed to continue the project, and the applicants have a plan in place.
1 point	The project's long-term impacts are limited or will require future funding. There is no plan in place at this time for sustained impact beyond 6 months post-project completion.
0 points	The project will not have any impact beyond the funding cycle; the benefits the project provides will end upon completion of the project itself. Or, applicants fail to discuss longevity in enough detail for the Sustainability Commission to conclude that there are benefits beyond the funding cycle.

7. Budget / Feasibility / Schedule — 0–4 points possible

4 points	All aspects of the project are realistically possible to accomplish within the budget and schedule (12-month timeframe). The budget contains only items that are strictly necessary for the success of the project. Whenever possible, items are ethically and sustainably sourced (e.g., limit single-use plastics, focus on locally sourced items, when possible, etc.).
3 points	There are minor concerns about the feasibility of some aspects of completing the project within the budget and schedule given. However, the overall project still seems realistic and feasible, and/or the budget contains items that may not be strictly necessary for the project's completion.
2 points	There is a substantial risk that the project may not be successfully completed; and/or the budget or schedule is missing important details; and/or the budget contains some items that appear superfluous or wasteful, and/or some items may not align with the Carbon Neutrality Plan.
0–1 points	The project appears unrealistic; and/or the budget or schedule are difficult to understand or missing; and/or the majority of the budget is composed of many items that appear superfluous or wasteful or do not align with the Carbon Neutrality Plan.

Source: Flagstaff Sustainability Grant — Scoring Rubric, City of Flagstaff Sustainability Office. Questions: SustainabilityGrant@flagstaffaz.gov.