

AHSC Round 8 Narrative Rubric Instructions | 01.16.24

AHSC narrative reviewers will use this document to score applications. Applicants may use this document in conjunction with the Narrative Prompts and Required Materials to respond to the outlined prompts. Please see AHSC Round 8 Guidelines page for the Narrative Prompts and other narrative related materials at: <https://sgc.ca.gov/programs/ahsc/resources/guidelines.html>

Reviewers will use this rubric in conjunction with Narrative Prompts and narrative related attachments to score each Project's narrative. It is incumbent on the applicant to ensure the content is correct and consistent throughout all application materials. Inconsistent or demonstrably false statements may result in reviewers issuing a score of zero on any or all portions of the application review process. Reviewers will use differentials of no less than 1.0 to differentiate scores between projects.

This rubric has four sections for each of the scoring subsections. Under each category there is also an equity consideration table. Please follow the respective instructions for that table.

Community Benefits and Engagement – 6 Points Maximum

Table 1. Community Engagement & Leadership (3 points)

| Scoring Considerations | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| In the General Context responses, how much of the requested background information needed to contextualize the project was provided? | All needed information | Most of the needed information | Some of the needed information | None of the needed information |
| What are the developer's or development team's ties to the community? "Development team" can include a co-developer, outside entity with site control, or a Joint Venture partnership, so long as the partnership will result in a meaningful learning experience for the co-developer. | Has Strong Ties to the community immediately around the Affordable Housing Development (AHD). If including a Joint Venture, the "local" developer is from the immediate or surrounding community, with significant ties. | Has Some Ties to the community immediately around the AHD. If including a Joint Venture, the "local" developer is from the broader community, with some ties. | Has Some Ties to the broader community . If including a Joint Venture, the "local" developer is from the same region and has some ties to the community. | Has Limited Ties to the community |
| How involved were community residents and/or local Community Based Organizations (CBOs) in visioning for the AHSC proposal (Pre-AHSC Process)? | There was significant involvement (or leadership) prior to, or from the initial visioning , of the AHSC proposal. | There was some involvement in visioning for the AHSC proposal. | There was limited involvement in visioning for the AHSC proposal. | There was no involvement prior to the AHSC process. |
| <i>If a project has limited or no involvement and has certain contextual factors (i.e. by-right or proposed in communities that may not be supportive of affordable housing or sustainable transportation projects):</i> Did the applicant make, or plan to make, an effort to compensate for a lack of pre-AHSC involvement and/or AHSC process engagement, through a combination of the following? | 2 or more alternative strategies and a clear, detailed plan for how CBOs or stakeholders will be engaged and/or future residents will be supported. | At least 1 alternative strategy and a clear plan for how stakeholders will be engaged and/or future residents will be supported. | 1 alternative strategy OR a clear plan for how stakeholders will be engaged, and future residents will be supported | No alternative strategy OR a minimal plan for how stakeholders will be engaged, and future residents will be supported |
| How involved were local Community Based Organizations (CBOs) during the AHSC process? | They had a strong influence on Project components. | They had some influence on Project components | They had limited influence on Project Components | They had no or minimal influence on Project components |
| Is there a plan for continued/future engagement with CBOs and other stakeholders? | There is a clear, detailed plan for how Collaborators will be engaged and/or involved moving forward; includes a strong "Community Needs" or "Future Engagement" upload. | There is an adequate plan for how Collaborators will be engaged and/or involved, moving forward. | There is a limited plan outlined for how Collaborators will be engaged or involved in future engagement | There is no plan outlined future engagement. |

Table 2. Addressing Community Needs (3 points)

| Scoring Considerations | 3 Points | 2 Points | 1 Point | 0 Points |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| In the General Context responses, how much of the requested background information needed to contextualize the project was provided? | All needed information | Most of the needed information | Some of the needed information | None of the needed information |
| The Community Engagement Tracker includes: | Information that is relevant and clearly tied to the proposed AHSC Project components | Information that is relevant and somewhat tied to the proposed AHSC Project components | Information that is generally relevant and somewhat tied to the proposed AHSC Project components | Information that is not relevant or minimally related to the proposed AHSC Project components |
| Relevant needs expressed in community visioning or planning engagement efforts conducted prior to the AHSC process were: | Integrated into the AHSC visioning process and built upon in the project proposal | Considered in AHSC visioning and partially integrated into the project proposal | Given limited consideration through the AHSC visioning process | Not considered in the AHSC Process |
| Themes and/or needs identified through community engagement are: | Strongly Supported by Community Engagement Tracker | Mostly Supported by Community Engagement Tracker | Generally Supported by Community Engagement Tracker | Not Supported by Community Engagement Tracker |
| Project Area* residents were involved: <i>*Note: If a Project is permitted by-right or proposed in communities that may not be supportive of affordable housing or sustainable transportation project, outreach can be focused on potential residents within the community and near-by low-income communities instead of Project Area residents.</i> | Prior to AHSC Process through a community-driven effort OR from initial visioning of the Project (as evidenced by Community Engagement Tracker) | During the AHSC Process for Project components selection (as evidenced by Community Engagement Tracker) | After AHSC Project components selection (No to Limited evidence found in Tracker) | Minimally (No to Limited evidence found in Tracker) |
| Project addresses the needs identified by the community: | Clearly for ALL housing and transportation and includes needs beyond housing and transportation | Clearly for ALL housing and transportation; minimally beyond those | Clearly for MOST housing and transportation (Nothing beyond) | Clearly for SOME housing and transportation (Nothing beyond) |
| During the AHSC process, applicant and project partners made opportunities for community involvement that: | Demonstrates significant effort and those efforts include area's most vulnerable populations , in addition to approaches that are considerate of community context and culturally appropriate . | Demonstrates sufficient effort and those efforts include approaches that are considerate of community context AND/OR culturally appropriate | Demonstrates limited effort and those efforts include approaches that are somewhat considerate of community context AND/OR culturally appropriate | Demonstrates minimal effort |
| Is there a plan for continued/future engagement and does it include the engagement or support of future residents? | There is a clear, detailed plan , which includes the engagement of potential residents and/or community members AND/OR how they will be supported based on the needs express previously. Also includes a strong "Future Engagement" upload. | There is an adequate plan , which includes the engagement of potential residents and/or community members OR how they will be supported with some connection to the needs express previously | There is a limited plan outlined, which mentions the engagement of potential residents and/or community members OR how they will be supported with limited connection to expressed needs. | There is no plan outlined |

Table 3. Equity Considerations under Community Benefit & Engagement (Outreach & Feedback)

| Equity Considerations | Effort Level: High | Effort Level: Some | Effort Level: Low/None |
|---|--|---|--|
| Outreach extensively considered the access and accessibility considerations for specific population? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Did the applicant conduct targeted outreach to underrepresented community members and incorporated feedback received? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Were AHSC project components originated by the community (residents, longstanding organizations or stakeholders)? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Did the community have a clear and important role in the decision-making processes throughout AHSC visioning or will they have one during implementation? Some examples include: community representation on project advisory team/taskforce/committee; leadership development opportunities made available for vulnerable groups; resident council for future residents | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Did the project make significant efforts to integrate and build upon engagement and feedback from previous efforts? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| <i>If the project was by-right</i> : were there still significant efforts made for outreach and engagement throughout the AHSC visioning process? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| <i>If the project was not by-right</i> : did the community engagement involve community residents and/or local CBOs from the start and throughout the planning process? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| <i>[Other factor unique to project, insert here]</i> | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| For reviewers: select demonstrated effort level for this section's equity considerations | High level of effort: Above & Beyond for 2 or more options | Some level of effort: Meets Expectations for at least 2 options OR Above & Beyond for at least 1 option | Low or no effort: Does Not Meet Expectations OR Meets Expectations for only 1 option |

Climate Adaptation & Community Resiliency – 5 Points Maximum

Table 1. Climate Adaptation & Climate Resilience (5 points)

| Scoring Considerations | 5 Points | 4 Points | 3 Points | 2 Points | 1 Point | 0 Points |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| In the General Context responses, how much of the requested background information needed to contextualize the project was provided? | All needed information | Nearly all needed information | Most needed information | Some of the needed information | Little of the needed information | None of the needed information |
| Applicants display a level of understanding of the vulnerabilities from climate impacts AND how well do they describe the adaptive/mitigation measures? | Displays a sufficient understanding & fully describes how adaptation measures work together to address multiple climate risk categories | Displays a sufficient understanding & mostly describes how adaptation measures work together to address multiple climate risk categories | Displays a sufficient understanding & generally describes how adaptation measures work together to address multiple climate risk categories | Displays a limited understanding & partially describes how adaptation measures work together to address multiple climate risk categories | Displays a limited understanding & minimally describes how adaptation measures work together to address multiple climate risk categories | Does not describe either |
| Technical aspects of adaptive measures in the Adaptive Measures table in the Climate Matrix are described in: | Comprehensive detail | Significant detail | Sufficient detail | Some detail | Minimal detail | No detail |
| Selected adaptive measures will mitigate the respective vulnerabilities in the near (mid-term) future to what degree? | Substantially mitigate | Mostly mitigate | Generally mitigate | Moderately mitigate | Minimally mitigate | Does not mitigate |
| Selected adaptive measures will mitigate the respective vulnerabilities in the long term, beyond the near future to what degree? | Substantially mitigate | Mostly mitigate | Generally mitigate | Should mitigate some | Might mitigate | Will not mitigate |
| Beyond the most pressing vulnerability, how many other vulnerabilities does the project address? | All noted vulnerabilities | Multiple vulnerabilities | More than one other vulnerability | One other vulnerability | Only addresses the most pressing vulnerability | Did not address the most pressing vulnerability |
| In the narrative response to the "Mitigation Measures and Community Resiliency" prompt, applicants provide which type of explanation for why the adaptive measures were chosen for each applicable hazard? | Comprehensive explanation | A clear, detailed explanation | A sufficient explanation | A limited explanation | An inadequate explanation | No explanation |
| In the "Improving Health Outcomes" prompt response, the Applicant describes how climate and air pollution-related measures will improve health outcomes for future residents and/or the community: | In comprehensive detail (including components, project design, and outreach and education on the impacts of air pollution) | In significant detail (including most components, project design, and outreach and education on the impacts of air pollution) | In sufficient detail | In some detail | In minimal detail | no detail provided |

Table 2. Equity Considerations under Climate Adaptation & Climate Resilience (CACR)

| Equity Considerations | Effort Level: High | Effort Level: Some | Effort Level: Low/None |
|---|--|---|--|
| Do the adaptive measures benefit surrounding project area residents, in addition to residents of the Affordable Housing Development? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Were the adaptive measures selected based on community (i.e. Project Area specific, if by-right can be broader) input? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Were climate adaptation and community resiliency measures supplemented by programming and outreach to the disadvantaged population(s)? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Was or will education, empowerment, safety, and preparedness prioritized to increase resiliency? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Did the applicant communicate how potential clean energy or greening benefits (financial or otherwise) will be shared or passed along to future AHD residents or vulnerable community members? (For example, reduced energy costs resulting in lower utility bills for AHD residents) | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Does the project incorporate mitigation measures that go beyond AHSC expectations? <i>For example, addressing unspecified climate or environmental hazards or substantial consideration and planning for long term impacts</i> | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| <i>[Other factor unique to project, insert here]</i> | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| For reviewers: select demonstrated effort level for this section's equity considerations | High level of effort: Above & Beyond for 2 or more options | Some level of effort: Meets Expectations for at least 2 options OR Above & Beyond for at least 1 option | Low or no effort: Does Not Meet Expectations OR Meets Expectations for only 1 option |

Collaboration & Planning – 4 points maximum

Table 1. Housing and Transportation Collaboration (3 points)

| Scoring Considerations | 3 Points | 2 Points | 1 Points | 0 Points |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| In the General Context responses, how much of the requested background information needed to contextualize the project was Provides? | All needed information | Most of the needed information | Some of the needed information | None of the needed information |
| To what degree does the Applicant provide descriptions of <i>Housing and Transportation</i> partners involvement in prompt response and in "Table 2. Organizational Engagement" of the Narrative Prompts document. Response demonstrates what level of collaboration between <i>Housing and Transportation</i> partners? | Provides detailed descriptions of partners' involvement and demonstrates extensive and meaningful collaboration. | Provides sufficient descriptions of partners' involvement and demonstrates significant collaboration. | Provides limited descriptions of partners' involvement and demonstrates limited collaboration. | Provides no descriptions of partners' involvement and does not demonstrate collaboration. |
| The AHSC proposal accounts for collaboration related to local needs and priorities in its visioning process, in a way that is: | Extensive and meaningful | Significant | Some Limited | Limited or None Does not |
| The AHSC proposal accounts for collaboration related to specific site needs in it's visioning process in a way that is: | Extensive and meaningful | Significant | Some Limited | Limited or None Does not |
| To what degree does the Applicant provide descriptions of <i>Programs, Workforce, and Anti-Displacement Activity</i> partners involvement in prompt response and in "Table 2. Organizational Engagement" of the Narrative Prompts document? Responses demonstrates what level of collaboration between the <i>Programs and Anti-Displacement Activity</i> partners? | Provides detailed descriptions of partners' involvement and demonstrates extensive and meaningful collaboration. | Provides sufficient descriptions of partners' involvement and demonstrates significant collaboration. | Provides limited descriptions of partners' involvement and demonstrates limited collaboration. | Provides no descriptions of partners' involvement and insufficient demonstrate collaboration. |
| Overall the proposed STI/TRA components are a [point descriptor] that will increase accessibility, connectivity, or mobility and backed by [[point descriptor]] credible sources or noted planning priorities. <i>Consider how proposed STI/TRA improvements connect future residents of the AHD and nearby low-income households to an improved transit line, job dense areas, areas with greater opportunity, or substantially improve connectivity and safety for active transportation.</i> | Significant improvement and backed by credible sources or noted planning priorities | Significant improvement minimally backed by credible sources or noted planning priorities | Notable Improvement | Are an inappropriate improvement |
| If applicable, information in "Table 2. Organizational Engagement" of the Narrative Prompts document captures the roles of other notable partners, the level of their input, and when they were involved by providing: | Detailed descriptions of their involvement | Sufficient descriptions of their involvement | Limited descriptions of their involvement | No description |

Table 2. Local Plans (1 points)

| Scoring Considerations | 1 Point | 0 Points |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| Information included in the Local Plans table is: | Relevant, clear, and organized | Irrelevant and dis-organized |
| "Local Plans" upload contains: | Only relevant and well-organized content | Irrelevant and dis-organized content |
| The local plans referenced in "Table 1. Description of Local Plans" of the Narrative Prompts document, support: | Information found under General Context and supports claims that specific project components are based on local plans | Does not support applicant claims |

Table 3: Equity Considerations under Collaboration and Planning (Project Partners)

| Equity Considerations | Effort Level: High | Effort Level: Some | Effort Level: Low/None |
|---|--|---|--|
| Did the project help facilitate tangible connections or coordination that will result in related efforts to provide concrete agreements, improvements, or systems to support or benefit identified populations, or the community broadly? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Is there documentation of the project's role in implementing the public partner's vision, in a local plan specific to an area within the Project Area? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Were there capacity building efforts for project partners or inclusion of community serving organizations, businesses, or stakeholders in a way that will increase their ability to serve the community moving forward? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Did the applicant note Project partners - beyond local government or agencies - with a strong connection to the project community (e.g. reflective of the identified populations, from the community, or organizations focused on community-relevant issues)? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Do the Project partners - beyond local government or agencies - for Anti-displacement, Programs, and/or Workforce strategies have a long history (e.g. 5 or more years) working with the identified populations or within project community? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| <i>Greater weight if the work was focused on the neighborhood in the Project Area</i> | | | |
| Were there notable roles for Project Partners with strong connections to or significant history with the identified populations or within project community? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Did the project make significant efforts to coordinate and embed outreach/engagement in ongoing planning efforts to increase reach? Or, did the project make significant efforts to integrate and build upon engagement and feedback from previous efforts? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| For reviewers: select demonstrated effort level for this section's equity considerations | High level of effort: Above & Beyond for 2 or more options | Some level of effort: Meets Expectations for at least 2 options OR Above & Beyond for at least 1 option | Low or no effort: Does Not Meet Expectations OR Meets Expectations for only 1 option |

Equity and Transformation – 3 points maximum

Table 1. Equity Considerations under Improving Health Outcomes

| Equity Considerations | Effort Level: High | Effort Level: Some | Effort Level: Low/None |
|---|---|--|--|
| Does the applicant display a level of understanding of health concerns, hazards, or impacts faced by the community in the Project Area and future residents AND how well do they describe the ways the project will lead to positive health outcomes/improvements? | Has at least a sufficient understanding & Fully Describes: how climate/air pollution measures, and other project aspects will work together to improve health outcomes for AHD residents and low income communities; OR How the selected project aspects positively impact health concerns related to multiple Community Condition categories | Has at least a sufficient understanding & Partially Describes: How climate/air pollution measures, and other project aspects will work together to improve health outcomes for AHD residents and low income communities; OR How the selected project aspects positively impact health concerns related to multiple Community Condition categories | Does not display an Understanding or Insufficiently describes either |
| Does the applicant: 1) identify known sources of air pollution in Project Area; 2) describe how appropriate mitigation strategies are utilized; 3) propose adaptive measures that exceed local & state requirements, and Program expectations? | Yes to 1, 2, & 3--Above & beyond | Yes to 1, 2--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Does the project include physical and programmatic components designed to improve health, or support to AHD residents including those with physical, sensory, intellectual/developmental, and other types of disabilities? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Does the project include programs to improve the health of community members in the Project Area? | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| Does the applicant note any related efforts (not funded through AHSC) that the project leveraged or spurred, that will impact resident health? <i>For example: prior remediation, access to healthy foods, health services/facilities, or park access and development, Safe Routes to School, direct connection to a major active transportation investment.</i> | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| <i>[Other factor unique to project, insert here]</i> | Yes--Above & beyond | Yes--Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| For reviewers: select demonstrated effort level for this section's equity considerations | High level of effort: Above & Beyond for 2 or more options | Some level of effort: Meets Expectations for at least 2 options OR Above & Beyond for at least 1 option | Low or no effort: Does Not Meet Expectations OR Meets Expectations for only 1 option |

Instructions for Table 2:

First review the Equity Considerations tables in this document: 1) Community Benefits and Engagement (Outreach & Feedback), 2) Climate Adaptation and Community Resiliency (CACR), 3) Collaboration and Planning (Project Partners), 4) Improving Health Outcomes (IHO). Then select the most appropriate responses for each row.

Table 2. Equity (2 points)

| Scoring Considerations | 2 Points | 1 Point | 0 Points |
|--|--|--|--|
| In the General Context responses, how much of the requested background information needed to contextualize the project was provided? | All needed information | Most of the needed information | None of the needed information |
| Does the applicant display a level of understanding of racial, economic, disability, and/or health equity AND how well do they describe the ways the project aspects will lead to equitable outcomes for the community/future residents? | Has at least a sufficient understanding & Fully Summarizes or Describes: How the proposed components and program costs work together to address equity OR how the selected components and program costs address multiple equity related concerns | Has at least a sufficient understanding & Partially Summarizes or Describes: How the proposed components and program costs work together to address equity OR how the selected components and program costs address multiple equity related concerns | Does not display an Understanding or Insufficiently describes either |
| Based on the selected scores above and the level of effort selected under each of the four equity consideration tables, select the appropriate total score: | Demonstrated "High level of effort" under at least 3 of the 4 equity consideration tables. | Demonstrates at least "High level of effort" under at least 1 of the 4 equity consideration tables and have at least "Meets Expectations" for the remaining equity consideration tables. | Does not meet the requirements of the other point categories |

Instructions for Table 3:

Select effort level for each of the transformation considerations. After making selections, determine a score:

1 point - Goes above and beyond in at least 1 project aspect OR given its context, meets expectations across a range of project aspects to the extent that, taken together, could be considered transformative.

0 points - Does not exceed expectation

Table 3. Transformation (1 point)

| Transformation Considerations | Effort Level: Above & Beyond | Effort Level: Meets Expectations | Insufficient Information | No effort |
|---|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Does the project bring together unlikely partners? | <i>Above & beyond</i> | <i>Meets Expectations</i> | <i>Prefer Not to Evaluate</i> | <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i> |
| Does the project leverage an underutilized community resource? | <i>Above & beyond</i> | <i>Meets Expectations</i> | <i>Prefer Not to Evaluate</i> | <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i> |
| Does the project incorporate innovative preventative health measures? | <i>Above & beyond</i> | <i>Meets Expectations</i> | <i>Prefer Not to Evaluate</i> | <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i> |
| Does the project build wealth or capacity of the broader Project Area? | <i>Above & beyond</i> | <i>Meets Expectations</i> | <i>Prefer Not to Evaluate</i> | <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i> |
| Is the project piloting a new approach to housing or transportation given the local context (e.g. first in the region)? | <i>Above & beyond</i> | <i>Meets Expectations</i> | <i>Prefer Not to Evaluate</i> | <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i> |
| Does the project address long standing harm in a systemic way? | <i>Above & beyond</i> | <i>Meets Expectations</i> | <i>Prefer Not to Evaluate</i> | <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i> |
| [Other factor unique to project, insert here] | <i>Above & beyond</i> | <i>Meets Expectations</i> | <i>Prefer Not to Evaluate</i> | <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i> |