Community Tree Planting Grants Scoring Guide (rev. 9/1/2024)   Applicant:_____   Reviewer:_____

<u>Instructions</u>

There are 5 categories that will be used to evaluate applications. Within each category, there are several sub-criteria; these repeat on a spectrum of 0-5 points within the category. Check the boxes most applicable to the application, using no more than 4 checks per category, then multiply the checks by the "points" column to get a total score. For example, "Project area has <20% canopy cover" earns 5 points, but "20-25 trees planted" earns only 3 points.

Points	5	4	3	2	1
Project Metrics (20 points possible)	☐ Over 75 trees planted	☐ 50-75 trees planted	☐ 25-50 trees planted	☐ 10-25 trees planted	☐ Fewer than 10 trees planted
	☐ Project area has <20% canopy cover	☐ Project area has 20-40% canopy cover	☐ Project area has 40-60% canopy cover	☐ Project area has 60-80% canopy cover	☐ Project area has >80% canopy cover, or canopy coverage is not mapped
	☐ Census tract has 5 or more flags on VT Social Vulnerability Index	☐ Census tract has 4 flags on VT Social Vulnerability Index	☐ Census tract has 2-3 flags on VT Social Vulnerability Index	☐ Census tract has 1 flag on VT Social Vulnerability Index	☐ Census tract has 0 flags on VT Social Vulnerability Index
	☐ Project increases community tree diversity using exclusively native species	☐ Project increases community tree diversity using mostly native species and appropriately-selected non-native species	☐ Project increases community tree diversity but mostly uses non-native species	☐ Project has no net effect on community tree diversity and/or uses exclusively non-native species	☐ Project decreases tree diversity and/or uses non-native invasive species
Planning Goals (15 points possible)	☐ Project has clear and specific objectives and strategies to reach overall goals	☐ Project has clear but non-specific objectives / strategies to reach overall goals	☐ Project identifies clear goals but no objectives and strategies to reach them	☐ Project goals are vague with no objectives or strategies	☐ Project does not set goals.
	☐ Project has express support from multiple entities, including community members or a non-legislative municipal body; or project references specific goals / actions in the municipal plan and/or shade tree plan.	☐ Project has express support from the municipal legislative body and at least one impacted group.	☐ Project has general written support from municipality, but no other community groups or documents.	☐ No clear support from municipal bodies beyond necessary signatures and forms.	☐ There is opposition to the project from community or affected entities
	☐ Project is located in a state-designated Downtown, Village, or New Town Center **AND** Growth Center	☐ Project is located in a Downtown, Village, or New Town Center but not a Growth Center	☐ Project is located in a Neighborhood Development Area	☐ Project is located in an urban area, but not in a state-designated center	☐ Project is located outside an urban area
Likelihood of Success (15 points possible)	☐ Trees will require minimal watering (fall planting) and pruning.	☐ Qualified professionals are committed to maintenance (watering / pruning) of trees.	☐ Applicant is committed to maintenance but does not have qualified professionals.	☐ No clear commitment to tree maintenance but trees are likely to survive.	☐ No clear commitment to tree maintenance; tree survival is questionable.
	☐ Includes full list of species to be planted that are correctly matched with each site	☐ Includes a full list of sites and criteria that will be used to select appropriate species	☐ Identifies planting sites but not a method by which to select appropriate species.	☐ Planting sites identified, but proposed species are inappropriate	☐ No planting sites identified
	☐ Applicant demonstrates, through soil testing or knowledge of existing soils and landscaping design plans, that existing subsurface conditions are ideal and require no improvement for trees to thrive.	☐ Root growth is enabled through cost-effective subsurface improvements (structural soil, silva cells, suspended pavement Stockholm method, etc.); infrastructure is protected from roots	☐ Root growth is enabled through subsurface improvements, but at high cost.	☐ Below OR above ground space is restricted	☐ Below AND above ground space is restricted
Co-Benefits (20 points possible)	☐ Removes pavement, adds trees, and provides infiltration that controls both stormwater flow and quality (phosphorus)	☐ Removes pavement, adds trees, and controls stormwater flow but not quality (phosphorus)	☐ Removes pavement, adds trees, but has no net effect on stormwater management	☐ No removal of pavement; planting site is currently a lawn	☐ No removal of pavement; trees planted in forest, forest edge, or meadow
	☐ Establishes new recreational assets for all community members	☐ Enhances existing recreational assets for all community members	☐ Enhances existing recreational assets for some community members	☐ Has no impact on recreational assets	☐ Reduces recreational assets.
	☐ Provides deep shade, cooling, or shelter in a heavily trafficked area	☐ Provides deep shade, cooling, or shelter in a moderately trafficked area	☐ Provides some shade, cooling, and shelter benefits to some people	☐ Does not provide useful shade, cooling, or shelter	☐ Negatively impacts nearby buildings, sidewalks, or other infrastructure
	☐ Provides food, cultural or aesthetic value equitably to all community members	☐ Provides food, cultural or aesthetic value to most community members	☐ Provides food, cultural or aesthetic value to some community members	☐ Project has no impact on cultural or aesthetic resources	☐ Project will negatively impact cultural or aesthetic resources
Equity (15 points possible)	☐ Underserved communities empowered to authentically lead project planning, implementation, or maintenance	☐ Project planned, implemented, or maintained collaboratively with an underserved community	☐ Applicant involved affected community and compensated them as part of project planning.	☐ Applicant consulted with affected communities (i.e., provided avenue for input).	☐ No effort to inform or consult with affected community / assumptions made about affected community.
	☐ Maximizes the co-benefit of each tree to disadvantaged communities by mitigating dust, noise, heat, traffic.	☐ Maximizes the co-benefit of some trees to disadvantaged communities.	☐ Project considers equitable access to trees but does not specifically benefits disadvantaged communities.	☐ Application doesn't reference tree equity; disadvantaged communities unintentionally excluded from tree benefits.	☐ Project reduces tree equity; disadvantaged communities intentionally excluded from tree benefits.
	☐ Applicant hasn't interacted with VT UCF, does not have an arborist on staff, and would benefit from technical assistance	☐ Applicant has interacted with VT UCF, but hasn't received technical or financial assistance	☐ Applicant has received VT UCF technical OR financial assistance, but still demonstrates need	☐ Applicant has received VT UCF technical AND financial assistance, but still demonstrates need	☐ Applicant has no need of technical or financial assistance.