

California Air Resources Board

Co-benefit Assessment Methodology for Community Engagement

California Climate Investments Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund



July 9, 2018

Table of Contents

Section A. Introduction	1
Community Engagement Co-benefit Description	1
Community Engagement Projects.....	2
Methodology Development	2
Program Assistance.....	3
Section B. Co-benefit Assessment Methods	4
Assessment	7
Section C. Data Requirements and Tools	8
Appendix A. Transformative Climate Communities Program Criteria for Determining Community Engagement.....	13
Appendix B. Example Methods and Data Inputs for Neighborhood-scale Projects	15
Appendix C. Example Methods and Data Inputs for City/Regional-scale Projects	21
Appendix D. Example Methods and Data Inputs for Rural Projects	26
Bibliography	32
Table 1. Community Engagement Questionnaire.....	4
Table 2. Evaluation of Community Engagement in Projects.....	7

Section A. Introduction

The goal of California Climate Investments is to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and further the objectives of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, Assembly Bill (AB) 32. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is responsible for providing guidance on reporting and quantification methods for all State agencies that receive appropriations from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF). Guidance includes developing methodologies for estimating GHG emission reductions and other economic, environmental, and public health benefits of projects, referred to as “co-benefits.”

The Center for Resource Efficient Communities at the University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley), in consultation with CARB staff, developed this Co-benefit Assessment Methodology to estimate community engagement co-benefits for relevant California Climate Investments programs.

Co-benefit Assessment Methodologies are intended for use by administering agencies, project applicants, and/or funding recipients to estimate the outcomes of California Climate Investments. Co-benefit estimates can be used to inform project selection and track results of funded projects. In addition to this methodology, general guidance on assessing California Climate Investment co-benefits is available in CARB’s Funding Guidelines for Agencies Administering California Climate Investments (Funding Guidelines) available at www.arb.ca.gov/cci-fundingguidelines.

Community Engagement Co-benefit Description

Community engagement refers to the process of cultivating active public participation in, or leadership of, affairs of importance to the community. According to the Centers for Disease Control, community engagement is:¹

The process of working collaboratively with and through groups of people affiliated by geographic proximity, special interest, or similar situations to address issues affecting the well-being of those people. It is a powerful vehicle for bringing about environmental and behavioral changes that will improve the health of the community and its members. It often involves partnerships and coalitions that help mobilize resources and influence systems, change relationships among partners, and serve as catalysts for changing policies, programs, and practices.

California Climate Investments that engage with communities can provide positive co-benefits. A positive community engagement co-benefit results when a California Climate Investments project is able to demonstrate that public participation in planning, design, and implementation occurs in ways that foster community access, deliberation, and leadership.

¹ Centers for Disease Control. (2011). https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/communityengagement/pdf/PCE_Report_508_FINAL.pdf

Administering agencies also perform outreach and to engage communities about their California Climate Investments programs. While this methodology is oriented toward the evaluation of project-level community engagement, the tools used to assess the level of engagement can guide agencies in conducting outreach and community engagement.

Community Engagement Projects

This Co-benefit Assessment Methodology may apply to community scale (e.g., beyond the scale of an individual household or business) California Climate Investments² projects that involve:

- Transit infrastructure or operations;
- Affordable housing developments;
- Active transportation;
- Urban tree or vegetation planting;
- Green infrastructure;
- Community-level energy infrastructure;
- Natural land management;
- Climate adaptation measures;
- Land use planning;
- Food waste reduction; and
- Research, monitoring, and community planning.

California Climate Investments that result in community engagement co-benefits create opportunities during planning, design, and implementation for communities to directly engage with the project, provide input that is incorporated into it, and collaborate on its development.

Methodology Development

UC Berkeley developed this Co-benefit Assessment Methodology, consistent with the guiding principles of California Climate Investments. The methodology is developed to:

- Support calculating the applicable co-benefits for individual projects;
- Apply to the project types proposed for funding;
- Provide uniform methods that can be applied statewide and are accessible by all applicants and funding recipients;
- Use existing and proven tools or methods, where available;
- Include the expected period of time for when co-benefits will be achieved; and
- Identify the appropriate data needed to calculate co-benefits.

² This list is based off of project types funded by the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund as of April 2018 and may be modified as California Climate Investments evolve or expand.

UC Berkeley assessed peer-reviewed literature and consulted with experts, as needed, to identify:

- The direction and magnitude of the co-benefit;
- Project types to which the co-benefit is relevant;
- The limitations of existing empirical literature;
- Existing assessment methods and tools; and
- Knowledge gaps and other issues to consider in developing co-benefit assessment methods.

This work is summarized in a literature review on this co-benefit, which can be found at: www.arb.ca.gov/cc-cobenefits. UC Berkeley also considered ease of use, specifically the availability of project-level inputs from users for the applicable California Climate Investments programs.

CARB released the Draft Community Engagement Co-benefit Assessment Methodology for public comment in April 2018. This Final Community Engagement Co-benefit Assessment Methodology has been updated to address public comments, where appropriate. CARB staff periodically review each methodology to evaluate its effectiveness and update methodologies to make them more robust, user-friendly, and appropriate to the projects being quantified.

Program Assistance

For assistance with this Co-benefit Assessment Methodology, send questions to: GGRFProgram@arb.ca.gov. For more information on CARB's efforts to support implementation of California Climate Investments, see: www.arb.ca.gov/auctionproceeds.

Section B. Co-benefit Assessment Methods

This section describes how users estimate community engagement co-benefits. Overall, the methods for estimating the community engagement co-benefits are qualitative, based on tracking the extent and impact of public participation in project planning, design, and implementation. The assessment evaluates the quantity, quality, and equity of community engagement.

To estimate the community engagement co-benefit, users will respond to the five questions in Table 1 below. Based on the responses to the questions in Table 1, the level of community engagement will be evaluated as low, medium, or high.

Guidance for users on how to answer each question is provided in Section C. Examples of how to apply the methods and data inputs needed are provided in Appendices B, C, and D for each type of respondent to question 1 (i.e., a neighborhood-scale, city/regional scale, or rural project).

Table 1. Community Engagement Questionnaire
1. Is the project a neighborhood-scale, city/regional-scale, or rural project?
2. With regard to public events held by the project proponent to discuss this project proposal with the community: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What was the approximate total attendance at those events? b. Briefly describe the events held. (Please respond in fewer than 100 words)
3. With regard to other opportunities provided by the project proponent for community members to comment or provide input on the project (e.g., internet- or telephone-based input opportunities) or separate meetings with specific stakeholders, community leaders, and organizations, beyond those included above: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What is the approximate total number of people who provided commentary or input on the project through these opportunities? b. Briefly describe the opportunities provided. (Please respond in fewer than 100 words)

Table 1. Community Engagement Questionnaire (cont.)

4. Which of the following took place as part of the events and other opportunities identified in questions 2 and 3?
(Check all that apply):
- a. Informed the community about various aspects of the project, including the process by which major decisions about the project would be made.
 - b. Solicited and recorded written or spoken input from the community about specific aspects of the project or potential project alternatives before decisions on those aspects and alternatives were finalized.
 - c. Incorporated proposals or ideas from the community into project alternatives or components.
 - d. Reported back to the community on how the input in 4(b) and 4(c) was incorporated.
 - e. Developed project features or project alternatives collaboratively with the community by one or more of the following means:
(Check all that apply):
 - i. One or more workshops or other meetings in which the community developed a project alternative or specific component to address unmet community needs, which was subsequently included in the project's application for funding or final design.
 - ii. Formal cooperation with a community-based organization (i.e., via a memorandum of understanding, community benefits agreement, steering committee, labor agreement, etc.) to acquire or distribute funding, identify project alternatives or project components, or otherwise enhance community engagement in project design, planning and implementation.
 - iii. Delegation of authority to choose between project alternatives or components to the community through a steering committee, organized voting process, representative community-based organization, or other means.
 - iv. A community-based organization, community-driven steering committee, or similar entity designed, planned, and implemented the project in whole or in significant part.

Table 1. Community Engagement Questionnaire (cont.)

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 5. Considering all of the events and input opportunities as a whole, which of the following statements are true (check all that apply): | |
| a. The participants comprised a broadly representative sample of the population potentially benefiting from, or affected by, the project. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Project proponents identified key community leaders and organizations and engaged them directly. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. The events and input opportunities were hosted at varied and accessible times and locations throughout the area potentially affected by the project, and included both in person and online forms of engagement. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Events and written materials were offered in languages other than English. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. The participation process was conducted or assisted by a professional facilitator or public participation expert. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. The project proponents, or those acting on their behalf, prepared and followed a community engagement plan that meets the minimum criteria originally established by the Transformative Climate Communities Program (option is available for all project types). | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Assessment

To determine the overall Community Engagement Co-benefit, users will assess the responses to the quantity, quality, and equity-oriented questions in Table 1 as low, medium, or high. These levels are defined and scored as described in Table 2.

For the quantity category, which measures the number of people giving input on the project, the scoring is different for projects of different scales and contexts — neighborhood-scale, city/regional-scale, and rural — as defined in the guidance for question 1 above. These scoring thresholds reflect considerations of total population size and population density in the area potentially affected by the project.

Scores related to quantity, quality, and equity of community engagement are then aggregated to provide a total project community engagement score.

Table 2. Evaluation of Community Engagement in Projects			
	Low	Medium	High
Quantity: Total event attendance + number of people commenting through other opportunities			
For neighborhood-scale projects:	0 – 24	25 – 59	60 or more
For city/regional-scale projects:	0 – 49	50 – 99	100 or more
For rural projects:	0 – 14	15 – 29	30 or more
Quality: Boxes checked in response to Table 1, Question 4	4a or 4b	4c or 4d	Any box in 4e
Equity: Number of boxes checked in response to Table 1, Question 5	None or 1	2 or 3	4 or more

The total community engagement level will then be evaluated based on the quantity, quality, and equity of community engagement as follows:

- If two or more of these categories are low, the overall engagement level is **low**
- If two or more of these categories are medium, the overall engagement level is **medium**
- If two or more of these categories are high, the overall engagement level is **high**
- If each category is in a separate rank (one low, one medium, and one high), the overall engagement level is **medium**

Section C. Data Requirements and Tools

This section provides guidance for users on how to answer questions in Table 1 and identifies the tools for the Community Engagement Co-benefit Assessment Methodology. Knowledge and records of a project's community engagement is the primary data requirement in the methods above.

Guidance on answering questions in Table 1.

1. Is the project a neighborhood-scale, city/regional-scale, or rural project?

The geographic scale/location of the project will determine the standards for evaluating the quantity of engagement. Respond in accordance with the following definitions:

Neighborhood-scale projects are smaller-scale projects that will primarily affect a community living or working within a half-mile of the project.³ Examples of neighborhood-scale projects include bike lanes or transit projects of less than a half-mile in length, affordable housing developments, and green infrastructure projects.

City/regional-scale projects are larger-scale projects that affect a community over more than a half-mile area, up to or beyond an entire city or region. Examples include intercity bus or rail extensions, walking or biking improvements or transit projects of more than a half-mile in length, and energy infrastructure.

Rural projects are any projects that occur outside a municipality, that is, on unincorporated land. Potential examples include forestry projects and dairy digester clusters.

2. With regard to public events held by the project proponent to discuss this project proposal with the community:

- a. What was the approximate total attendance at those events?

Users should respond with the total number of attendees at all events that were held to inform and/or solicit input from the community. If it is known how many people attended multiple events, count each individual once; if unknown, count attendance at each event rather than attempting to count individuals.

- b. Briefly describe the events held.

Include event type (e.g., public meeting or webinar) dates, locations, estimated attendance, stakeholder categories represented (e.g., residents, local business owners, or local officials), and types of materials shared (e.g., PowerPoints, printed materials, maps, or videos) for each event.

³ Half-mile project radius based on the radius defining transit priority projects in SB 375 implementation, code 21155: https://california.public.law/codes/ca_pub_res_code_section_21155

3. With regard to other opportunities provided by the project proponent for community members to comment or provide input on the project (e.g., internet- or telephone-based input opportunities) or separate meetings with specific stakeholders, community leaders, and organizations, beyond those included above:
 - a. What is the approximate total number of people who provided commentary or input on the project through these opportunities?

Users should respond with the approximate number of people who, through these other opportunities described above, gave input about the project that was recorded.
 - b. Briefly describe the opportunities provided.

Describe the methods used to solicit input (e.g., online, in print, telephone in person surveys, a website describing the project that invites comments and provides a method to collect them, or meetings with interested stakeholders such as transit advocacy groups, neighborhood associations, and others particularly likely to be affected by the project). For separate meetings, provide the individual or organization name(s) and meeting dates.

4. Which of the following took place as part of the events and other opportunities identified in questions 2 and 3? (check all that apply):
 - b. Informed the community about various aspects of the project, including the process by which major decisions about the project would be made.

Check this box if the events provided the community with basic information about what the project proposal, who it may benefit and affect, how and when decisions about it will be made, and how public input will be used in making those decisions.
 - c. Solicited and recorded written or spoken input from the community about specific aspects of the project or potential project alternatives, before decisions on those aspects and alternatives are finalized.

Check this box if input received was recorded and reviewed before final decisions were made about project components and potential alternatives.
 - d. Incorporated proposals or ideas from the community into project alternatives or components.

Check this box if the project's design and planning process accommodated changes in components, plans, designs, or alternatives to incorporate specific requests or feedback.⁴ For example, in response to community input, a development makes units available at deeper discounts below market rate, leases space only to neighborhood-serving retail, adds public open space, provides secure bike parking, or changes the design so as not to shade an adjacent school.

⁴ The alternatives here may not necessarily be those referred to in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines; public participation can include discussion of alternatives beyond those required by CEQA.

- e. Reported back to the community on how the input in 4(b) and 4(c) was incorporated.

Check this box if the project was changed in response to community input, and this change was then reported back to the community. For example, if in response to community comments and requests, a project adds an alternative design, the change is announced in subsequent project outreach, and the new alternative is presented at public and stakeholder meetings, in emails, or on the project's website.

- f. Developed project features or project alternatives collaboratively with the community by one or more of the following means (check all that apply):

- i. One or more workshops or other meetings in which the community developed a project alternative or specific component to address unmet community needs, which was subsequently included in the project's application for funding or final design.

Check this box if the following steps occurred during the project's design and planning process: the community was given the opportunity to state unmet needs, potentially prioritize those needs, create a project component or alternative to address those needs, and that became part of the project's application for funding or final design. For example, for a transit expansion project, the community identifies the need for safer walking conditions around bus stops, and the ultimate project includes new stoplights, improved crossings, and wider sidewalks along with the expanded bus service.

- ii. Formal cooperation with a community-based organization (i.e., via a memorandum of understanding, community benefits agreement, steering committee, labor agreement, etc.) to acquire or distribute funding, identify project alternatives or project components, or otherwise enhance community engagement in project design, planning and implementation.

Check this box if the project used any such formal tools to collaborate with a community-based organization and so get the community more closely involved in project components, design, planning, funding, and/or implementation. For example, a community-based organization has a memorandum of understanding to do outreach around a project, holding events and providing translation as needed, attending existing local events, and gathering input from which to recommend components and alternatives; the organization then collaborates on a funding application to build a project shaped by the community.

- iii. Delegation of authority to choose between project alternatives or components to the community through a steering committee, organized voting process, representative community-based organization, or other means.

Check this box if, through a formal process, the community itself was given the authority to make the decisions on project components, design,

planning, funding, and/or implementation. For example, the residents of a given street are asked to vote on traffic calming measures on their block, which would then only be implemented if the majority voted for them.

- iv. A community-based organization, community-driven steering committee or similar entity designed, planned, and implemented the project in whole or in significant part.

Check this box if the project was largely conceived and led by the community. For example, community members learn that a publicly owned parking lot is for sale and create a plan to make it into a public park for the neighborhood; though public agencies must do much of the planning, funding, and implementation, the project is community-led.

- 5. Considering all of the events and input opportunities as a whole, which of the following statements are true (check all that apply):

- a. The participants comprised a broadly representative sample of the population potentially benefiting from, or affected by, the project.

Check this box if people from the communities most affected by the project have attended events and/or given input. For example, a project proposes to install a bike path near a school ensures that families at that school are involved in its design and planning, and also that nearby residents and people who ride bikes in the area are informed and engaged. The process should also result in inclusion of all major interest, demographic, and socioeconomic groups in the affected community.⁵ For example, engagement should occur with a variety of interested/affected parties such as local officials, residents, business owners, community organizations, etc. If a project is being built in a community with a large Vietnamese-American population, participants should include Vietnamese-American residents. (Note: Involving community-based organizations and providing translation in languages other than English, as addressed in later questions, can help broaden representation.)

- b. Project proponents identified key community leaders and organizations and engaged them directly.

Check this box if the project proponent seeks out and works with leading individuals and organizations in the community to solicit their input on the project. For example, project proponents for a public transit project meet with leaders at organizations representing large groups of people in the community, such as transit riders, local low-income housing residents, homeowners' associations, etc.

⁵ There are multiple approaches for determining the demographics of community that a project proponent may employ including reference to data sources such as the U.S. Census (https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml) or CalEnviroScreen (<https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/maps-data/download-data>).

- c. The events and input opportunities were hosted at varied and accessible times and locations throughout the area potentially affected by the project, and included both in person and online forms of engagement.

Check this box if engagement opportunities were conducted both in person and online and events were scheduled to accommodate participants with differing schedules and mobility (e.g., accessible by public transit). For example, a project proponent holds one event in the evening to accommodate people who work in the daytime, another on a weekend day to accommodate families, and also sends a representative to existing community events, such as farmers' markets or neighborhood meetings, to accommodate people who are unlikely to attend a project-specific event, but are still affected by it.

- d. Events and written materials were offered in languages other than English.

Check this box if include events and written materials are presented in languages other than English. This should also include the ability to record and translate input provided into these languages. For example, an urban forestry project proposes to plant trees in communities of primarily Filipino and Spanish speakers and project proponents print flyers in these languages and offers translation into these languages at events, enabling non-English speakers to help shape the project.

- e. The participation process was conducted or assisted by a professional facilitator or public participation expert.

Check this box if one or more events used a professional facilitator or if the participation process, or its components, were planned by a public participation expert. For example, a project proponent uses a survey expert to design a survey that will involve a representative sample of the community to provide meaningful feedback on the project.

- f. The project proponents, or those acting on their behalf, prepared and followed a community engagement plan that meets the minimum criteria originally established by the Transformative Climate Communities Program (option is available for all project types).

Check this box if the project, regardless of program or project type, creates a clear community engagement plan that meets the Transformative Climate Communities Program minimum criteria (see Appendix A). The plan should include identification of the needs of residents in the project area and other key stakeholders; involvement of residents and stakeholders, as reflected by certain indicators; a detailed timeline of community engagement activities for proposal development and project implementation; and at least nine of the activities recommended for informing stakeholders, soliciting input, engaging stakeholders in proposal development, and engaging them in implementation. This methodology utilizes this program's existing criteria for all program and project types since the Transformative Climate Communities Program developed criteria for prioritizing community engagement and funded projects that cross multiple sectors and California Climate Investments project types.

Appendix A. Transformative Climate Communities Program Criteria for Determining Community Engagement

Below are excerpts from the Transformative Climate Communities Program Guidelines⁶ related to community engagement to assist users in answering question 5(f) in the Community Engagement Questionnaire.

Minimum requirements for a Community Engagement Plan:

Ensure Community Engagement. Applicants must involve residents from the Project Area and key stakeholders in all phases of TCC Proposal development and implementation. TCC Proposals should be designed to meet needs that have been and will be further identified by Project Area residents through a documented outreach and engagement process. Additionally, Applicants must establish multi-stakeholder partnerships organized into a Collaborative Stakeholder Structure that will oversee TCC Proposal development and implementation. Applicants are required to address the following:

- a. TCC Proposals must include a Community Engagement Plan that describes methods that will be used to engage residents and key stakeholders during TCC Proposal development and implementation. Priority will be given to proposals that include a robust combination of activities to engage community stakeholders. The Community Engagement Plan should include, at a minimum:
 - i. Description of key stakeholders and residents, including any existing neighborhood organizations or advisory councils serving the Project Area;
 - ii. Description of recent history of resident engagement in neighborhood issues of the proposed Project Area, including involvement in any planning or community development activities administered by the local government or other administrative entities;
 - iii. Description and timeline of proposed community engagement activities (see Table 4 for list of recommended activities to ensure meaningful community engagement);
 - iv. The process to be used to identify the needs of residents and other stakeholders during the TCC Proposal development phase and, if applicable, the relationship of this process to any pending planning activities or public improvements for the Project Area within the time frame of implementation;
 - v. How the public will be informed of implementation progress, including updates on project performance and other Indicators being tracked, as well as implementation progress on the Displacement Avoidance and Community Engagement Plans; and
 - vi. Justification for the community engagement activities as a budget line item.

⁶ <http://www.sgc.ca.gov/programs/tcc/resources/>

Scoring criteria for a Community Engagement Plan:

Criteria: Community Engagement Plan (CEP)	10 Points		
1. CEP presents clear plan used to identify needs of residents and key stakeholders from Project Area.			
2. Residents and key stakeholders were involved in the development and selection of Projects included in the Proposal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Indicators included: number of residents, key stakeholders, and small business owners that attended meetings; number of community meetings held; establishment of advisory body or steering committee; number of residents and key stakeholders involved in Collaborative Stakeholder Structure; number of residents/key stakeholders; number of community-based organizations engaged in process; number and description of community engagement strategies used to reduce barriers to participation; description of decision-making processes/bodies that include community representation; and number of residents, businesses, and non-profit/community leaders with clear role in decision making processes. 			
3. Provide detailed description and timeline of community engagement activities used for proposal development and proposed for projects implementation.			
4. Applicants utilized at least three (3) of the recommended activities to inform community stakeholders about the TCC proposal development process and to solicit community stakeholder input: <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Public workshops/meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Door-to-door canvassing <input type="checkbox"/> House meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Established website and/or social media </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Distributed flyers or other printed materials <input type="checkbox"/> Outreach to existing community groups <input type="checkbox"/> Surveys <input type="checkbox"/> Focus groups </td> </tr> </table>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Public workshops/meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Door-to-door canvassing <input type="checkbox"/> House meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Established website and/or social media 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Distributed flyers or other printed materials <input type="checkbox"/> Outreach to existing community groups <input type="checkbox"/> Surveys <input type="checkbox"/> Focus groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Public workshops/meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Door-to-door canvassing <input type="checkbox"/> House meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Established website and/or social media 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Distributed flyers or other printed materials <input type="checkbox"/> Outreach to existing community groups <input type="checkbox"/> Surveys <input type="checkbox"/> Focus groups 		
5. Applicants utilized at least two (2) of the following activities to actively engage community stakeholders in proposal development: <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Design charrettes <input type="checkbox"/> Community-based participatory research <input type="checkbox"/> Participatory budgeting <input type="checkbox"/> Convened advisory body or shared decision-making body </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Established website and/or social media <input type="checkbox"/> Community benefits agreements <input type="checkbox"/> Additional activities to provide community stakeholders an opportunity to influence the TCC Proposal development </td> </tr> </table>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Design charrettes <input type="checkbox"/> Community-based participatory research <input type="checkbox"/> Participatory budgeting <input type="checkbox"/> Convened advisory body or shared decision-making body 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Established website and/or social media <input type="checkbox"/> Community benefits agreements <input type="checkbox"/> Additional activities to provide community stakeholders an opportunity to influence the TCC Proposal development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Design charrettes <input type="checkbox"/> Community-based participatory research <input type="checkbox"/> Participatory budgeting <input type="checkbox"/> Convened advisory body or shared decision-making body 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Established website and/or social media <input type="checkbox"/> Community benefits agreements <input type="checkbox"/> Additional activities to provide community stakeholders an opportunity to influence the TCC Proposal development 		
6. Applicants propose to utilize at least four (4) of the following activities to actively engagement community stakeholders during implementation of TCC Plan: <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Public workshops/meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Door-to-door canvassing <input type="checkbox"/> House meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Established website and/or social media <input type="checkbox"/> Conduct surveys <input type="checkbox"/> Conduct focus groups <input type="checkbox"/> Sub-contract with community-based organizations to conduct outreach </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Allocate staff positions focused on community engagement <input type="checkbox"/> Advisory body or shared decision-making body <input type="checkbox"/> Additional activities to provide community stakeholders an opportunity to influence the TCC Proposal development <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain community engagement throughout the TCC Implementation Plan </td> </tr> </table>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Public workshops/meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Door-to-door canvassing <input type="checkbox"/> House meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Established website and/or social media <input type="checkbox"/> Conduct surveys <input type="checkbox"/> Conduct focus groups <input type="checkbox"/> Sub-contract with community-based organizations to conduct outreach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Allocate staff positions focused on community engagement <input type="checkbox"/> Advisory body or shared decision-making body <input type="checkbox"/> Additional activities to provide community stakeholders an opportunity to influence the TCC Proposal development <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain community engagement throughout the TCC Implementation Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Public workshops/meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Door-to-door canvassing <input type="checkbox"/> House meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Established website and/or social media <input type="checkbox"/> Conduct surveys <input type="checkbox"/> Conduct focus groups <input type="checkbox"/> Sub-contract with community-based organizations to conduct outreach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Allocate staff positions focused on community engagement <input type="checkbox"/> Advisory body or shared decision-making body <input type="checkbox"/> Additional activities to provide community stakeholders an opportunity to influence the TCC Proposal development <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain community engagement throughout the TCC Implementation Plan 		

Appendix B. Example Methods and Data Inputs for Neighborhood-scale Projects

The following is a hypothetical project⁷ to demonstrate how the Community Engagement Co-benefit Assessment Methodology would be applied to a neighborhood-scale project in the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program. This example does not include the supporting documentation that may be required of actual project proponents.

Overview of the Proposed Project

This section provides a background narrative on the example project; it is not expected that users provide such an overview.

The proposed project is a collaborative transit oriented development project between a housing developer and a transit agency, proposing the following components:

- Mixed-use development with affordable housing
- New bus service

The proposed project is located in San Diego County with the following project features:

- First year of development operation: 2019.
- 4-story rental development with 80 units; 75% are affordable.
- New hydrogen-powered bus service to begin operation in 2019, with a ridership of 500 passengers per day on a daily service schedule
- The distance to the nearest Central Business District (CBD) is 0.1 miles.
- The surrounding communities, Logan Heights and Barrio Logan, are predominantly Latino and are home to many non-English-speaking Spanish speakers, as are many workers in the nearby Central Business District.

The public participation process at the time of application submission has included:

- Collaboration with a community-based organization:
 - The proposed project's design and public participation process were conducted in partnership with a community-based organization that has been active in planning and land use in the area for several years.
- Three community meetings:
 - One meeting was held before the design phase, one during the design phase, and one in the planning phase. The meetings were led by the community-based organization, in both Spanish and English; two were on weekends and one on a weekday evening.
 - Meeting announcements in both English and Spanish were:
 - Emailed to the community group's list and neighborhood groups.
 - Printed and posted around the proposed development, including the nearby business district and along the proposed bus route.

⁷ The hypothetical project has not undergone verification of any program requirements; all assumptions about location type and features are for demonstration purposes only.

- Emailed to people on the city's affordable housing waiting list.
 - The first meeting before the design phase included a broad discussion of community needs, with a process to prioritize them and translate them into goals and design criteria for this project. There were 14 attendees.
 - The second meeting, during the design phase, included exercises to choose certain design features and weigh trade-offs. It also included an opportunity to comment on and potentially change bus stop locations. There were 24 attendees.
 - The third meeting, held during the planning phase, provided information about the project, how it had changed in response to community input, its proposed timing, and how to get on the affordable housing waiting list. There were 30 attendees.
 - A total of 68 people attended the meetings.
- Engagement of key community leaders and organizations:
 - The partner organization is a community-based organization that has been active in planning and land use in the area for several years. Through this organization, two community leaders and three organizations were identified and project representatives met with them to seek their input. The leaders were from the surrounding neighborhood and the business district, and the organizations were a local community group and affordable housing and sustainable transportation advocacy groups.
- Additional opportunities for input:
 - A website about the project included a short survey in either Spanish or English asking respondents to prioritize community needs; the site also invited open-ended comments. The site and survey/comment field were sent to the lists that received the meeting announcements. A total of 16 people took the survey and 10 people commented. Online survey responders and commenters later received an email about the design and what had been changed, based on community input like theirs.
 - The project sponsors staffed a table at two community events and received a total of 20 survey responses and 12 comments.
- Representation of affected communities:
 - Attendees were asked about their race/ethnicity at the three workshop events, and 75% identified as Chicano/Latino, 10% as Caucasian, and 15% did not respond. The online survey did not ask for race/ethnicity; one-quarter of the comments were in Spanish. At the community events, 80% of the people who responded to the survey and made comments in person said they identified as Chicano or Latino.
 - Of participants, 70% said they currently ride the bus; 60% said they would ride the new bus line.
- Incorporation of input:
 - The project's design was modified based on the community's input on needs: building height was increased to enable the project to go from 50% to 75% affordable units. In addition, 10 units were offered at deeper levels of affordability.

Methods to Apply

To estimate community engagement level, the applicant completed the public participation questionnaire as displayed below.

EXAMPLE Community Engagement Questionnaire
<p>1. Is the project a neighborhood-scale, city/regional-scale, or rural project? <i>Neighborhood-scale</i></p>
<p>2. With regard to public events held by the project proponent to discuss this project proposal with the community:</p> <p>a. What was the approximate total attendance at those events? <i>68</i></p> <p>b. Briefly describe the events held. (Please respond in fewer than 100 words)</p> <p><i>Three community meetings:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Initial scoping meeting: Community Space #1, 3/1/2017 (evening), 14 attendees (non-profit housing organization representatives, transit users, housing developers, local residents), PowerPoint presentation</i> - <i>Design phase meeting: Community Space #2, 6/11/2017 (weekend day), 24 attendees (local business owners, transit users, non-profit housing organization representatives, housing developers, local residents), PowerPoint presentation and maps</i> - <i>Planning phase meeting: Community Space #1, 1/13/2018 (weekend day), 30 attendees (non-profit housing organization representatives, transit users, housing developers, local residents), PowerPoint presentation, maps, and printed materials</i>
<p>3. With regard to other opportunities provided by the project proponent for community members to comment or provide input on the project (e.g., internet- or telephone-based input opportunities) or separate meetings with specific stakeholders, community leaders, and organizations, beyond those included above:</p> <p>a. What is the approximate total number of people who provided commentary or input on the project through these opportunities? <i>58</i></p> <p>b. Briefly describe the opportunities provided. (Please respond in fewer than 100 words)</p> <p><i>Circulated online survey and website with open comments field. Went to two community events and gathered survey responses and comments.</i></p> <p><i>Five stakeholder meetings were held:</i></p> <p><i>1. Community Leader #1, representing the neighborhood, Date</i></p>

<p>2. <i>Community Leader #2, representing the business district, Date</i> 3. <i>Community Group #1, Representative Name, Date</i> 4. <i>Community Group #2, Representative Name, Date</i> 5. <i>Community Group #3, Representative Name, Date</i></p>	
<p>4. Which of the following took place as part of the events and other opportunities identified in questions 2 and 3? (check all that apply):</p> <p>a. Informed the community about various aspects of the project, including the process by which major decisions about the project would be made.</p> <p>b. Solicited and recorded written or spoken input from the community about specific aspects of the project or potential project alternatives before decisions on those aspects and alternatives were finalized.</p> <p>c. Incorporated proposals or ideas from the community into project alternatives or components.</p> <p>d. Reported back to the community on how the input in 4(b) and 4(c) was incorporated.</p> <p>e. Developed project features or project alternatives collaboratively with the community by one or more of the following means: (Check all that apply):</p> <p>i. One or more workshops or other meetings in which the community developed a project alternative or specific component to address unmet community needs, which was subsequently included in the project's application for funding or final design.</p> <p>ii. Formal cooperation with a community-based organization (i.e., via a memorandum of understanding, community benefits agreement, steering committee, labor agreement, etc.) to acquire or distribute funding, identify project alternatives or project components, or otherwise enhance community engagement in project design, planning and implementation.</p> <p>iii. Delegation of authority to choose between project alternatives or components to the community through a steering committee, organized voting process, representative community-based organization, or other means.</p> <p>iv. A community-based organization, community-driven steering committee, or similar entity designed, planned, and implemented the project in whole or in significant part.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p>5. Considering all of the events and input opportunities as a whole, which of the following statements are true (check all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The participants comprised a broadly representative sample of the population potentially benefiting from, or affected by, the project. b. Project proponents identified key community leaders and organizations and engaged them directly. c. The events and input opportunities were hosted at varied and accessible times and locations throughout the area potentially affected by the project, and not solely conducted through digital means. d. Events and written materials were offered in languages other than English. e. The participation process was conducted or assisted by a professional facilitator or public participation expert. f. The project proponents, or those acting on their behalf, prepared and followed a community engagement plan that meets the minimum criteria originally established by the Transformative Climate Communities Program (option is available for all project types). 	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
--	---

Based on the responses to these questions, each component of community engagement — the quantity, quality, and equity — can then be evaluated as low, medium, or high, defined as follows:

EXAMPLE Evaluation of Community Engagement for Neighborhood-scale Projects			
	Low	Medium	High
Quantity: Total event attendance + number of people commenting through other opportunities	0 – 24	25 – 59	60 or more
Quality: Boxes checked in response to Table 1, Question 4	4a or 4b	4c or 4d	Any box in 4e
Equity: Number of boxes checked in response to Table 1, Question 5	None or 1	2 or 3	4 or more

For this example:

Quantity category: $68 + 58 = 126 = \text{high}$

Quality category: boxes 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e checked = high

Equity category: 4 boxes checked in response to question 5 = high

In this example, all three of the quantity, quality, and equity categories are high. Therefore, the overall community engagement level for this example project is **high**.

Appendix C. Example Methods and Data Inputs for City/Regional-scale Projects

The following is a hypothetical project⁸ to demonstrate how the Community Engagement Co-benefit Assessment Methodology would be applied to a city/regional-scale project in the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP). This example does not include the supporting documentation that may be required of actual project proponents.

Overview of the Proposed Project

This section provides a background narrative on the example project; it is not expected that users provide such an overview.

The project is proposing to expand capacity of the regional transit (RT) orange and purple line by purchasing ten (10) railcars and extending the existing daily light rail service.

The proposed project is located in Sacramento County with the following features:

- Railcars will be operational in 2020 and have an estimated useful life of 25 years.
- Daily ridership will increase by 350 unlinked trips.
- Length of the average auto trip will be reduced to 5.66 miles.
- Daily light rail service will be extended by 35.5 miles.
- Sacramento County is home to many people who speak languages other than English at home; a significant percentage of the county's population is non-English speaking.

The public participation process thus far has included:

- Three community meetings:
 - One meeting was held in the design phase and two in the planning phase.
 - One meeting was held on a weekday during the day (6 attendees), one during the evening (10 attendees), and one on a Saturday (18 attendees). Translations were provided in Spanish at all meetings. Agency representatives presented the plan in a spoken presentation and made maps available of the proposed extensions. Cards were available for the public to make comments; these were collected and recorded.
 - Meeting announcements (in Spanish and English) were printed and posted on some parts of the potential line extension, and at major transfer points.
 - Attendees at these three meetings totaled 34.
- Engagement of key community leaders and organizations:
 - The project applicants met with three organizations to inform them about the project and seek their input. The organizations included two groups

⁸ The hypothetical project has not undergone verification of any program requirements; all assumptions about location type and features are for demonstration purposes only.

working with local Latino and Asian communities respectively, and a neighborhood association.

- Additional opportunities for input:
 - A web page on the transit agency website provided information about the project (in English and Spanish). It included an email address where comments could be submitted; 7 were submitted and recorded.
- Representation of affected communities:
 - Event attendees and commenters were not asked explicitly about their demographics; they were asked about their transit ridership; 90% of attendees and commenters said they were transit riders.
- Incorporation of input:
 - Based on public input at meetings and with community groups, the locations of some stops were changed. The community groups were informed and this was announced at the third meeting and on the project website.

Methods to Apply

To estimate community engagement level, the applicant completed the public participation questionnaire as displayed below.

EXAMPLE Table 1. Community Engagement Questionnaire
<p>1. Is the project a neighborhood-scale, city/regional-scale, or rural project?</p> <p><i>City/regional-scale</i></p>
<p>2. With regard to public events held by the project proponent to discuss this project proposal with the community:</p> <p>a. What was the approximate total attendance at those events?</p> <p><i>34</i></p> <p>b. Briefly describe the events held. (Please respond in fewer than 100 words)</p> <p><i>Three public meetings:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Design phase meeting, Transit Agency Space #1, Date (weekday), 6 attendees (local government and transit representatives), PowerPoint presentation</i> - <i>Planning phase meeting, Transit Agency Space #1, Date (weeknight), 10 attendees (local government, transit, and non-profit representatives), PowerPoint presentation and maps</i> - <i>Planning phase meeting, Community Space #1, Date (weekend), 18 attendees, (transit and non-profit representatives, transit riders), PowerPoint presentation and maps</i>

<p>3. With regard to other opportunities provided by the project proponent for community members to comment or provide input on the project (e.g., internet- or telephone-based input opportunities) or separate meetings with specific stakeholders, community leaders, and organizations, beyond those included above:</p> <p>a. What is the approximate total number of people who provided commentary or input on the project through these opportunities? 7</p> <p>b. Briefly describe the opportunities provided. (Please respond in fewer than 100 words)</p> <p><i>Webpage with project description online; the public could send comments by email.</i></p> <p><i>Three stakeholder meetings were held:</i></p> <p><i>1. Community Group #1, Representative Name, Date</i></p> <p><i>2. Community Group #2, Representative Name, Date</i></p> <p><i>3. Community Group #3, Representative Name, Date</i></p>	
<p>4. Which of the following took place as part of the events and other opportunities identified in questions 2 and 3? (check all that apply):</p> <p>a. Informed the community about various aspects of the project, including the process by which major decisions about the project would be made. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b. Solicited and recorded written or spoken input from the community about specific aspects of the project or potential project alternatives before decisions on those aspects and alternatives were finalized. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. Incorporated proposals or ideas from the community into project alternatives or components. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. Reported back to the community on how the input in 4(b) and 4(c) was incorporated. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>e. Developed project features or project alternatives collaboratively with the community by one or more of the following means: (Check all that apply):</p> <p>i. One or more workshops or other meetings in which the community developed a project alternative or specific component to address unmet community needs, which was subsequently included in the project's application for funding or final design. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>ii. Formal cooperation with a community-based organization (i.e., via a memorandum of understanding, community benefits agreement, steering committee, labor agreement, <input type="checkbox"/></p>	

<p>etc.) to acquire or distribute funding, identify project alternatives or project components, or otherwise enhance community engagement in project design, planning and implementation.</p> <p>iii. Delegation of authority to choose between project alternatives or components to the community through a steering committee, organized voting process, representative community-based organization, or other means.</p> <p>iv. A community-based organization, community-driven steering committee, or similar entity designed, planned, and implemented the project in whole or in significant part.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>5. Considering all of the events and input opportunities as a whole, which of the following statements are true (check all that apply):</p> <p>a. The participants comprised a broadly representative sample of the population potentially benefiting from, or affected by, the project.</p> <p>b. Project proponents identified key community leaders and organizations and engaged them directly.</p> <p>c. The events and input opportunities were hosted at varied and accessible times and locations throughout the area potentially affected by the project, and not solely conducted through digital means.</p> <p>d. Events and written materials were offered in languages other than English.</p> <p>e. The participation process was conducted or assisted by a professional facilitator or public participation expert.</p> <p>f. The project proponents, or those acting on their behalf, prepared and followed a community engagement plan that meets the minimum criteria originally established by the Transformative Climate Communities Program (option is available for all project types).</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

Based on the responses to these questions, each component of community engagement — the quantity, quality, and equity — can then be evaluated as low, medium, or high, defined as follows:

EXAMPLE Evaluation of Community Engagement for City/Regional-scale Projects			
	Low	Medium	High
Quantity: Total event attendance + number of people commenting through other opportunities	0 – 49	50 – 99	100 or more
Quality: Boxes checked in response to Table 1, Question 4	4a or 4b	4c or 4d	Any box in 4e
Equity: Number of boxes checked in response to Table 1, Question 5	None or 1	2 or 3	4 or more

For this example:

Quantity category: $34 + 7 = 41 = \text{low}$

Quality category: boxes 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d checked = medium

Equity category: Four boxes checked in response to Table 1, Question 5 = high

In this example, the quantity category is low, the quality area is category, and the equity area is category. Therefore, the overall community engagement level for this example project is **medium**.

Appendix D. Example Methods and Data Inputs for Rural Projects

The following is a hypothetical project⁹ to demonstrate how the Community Engagement Co-benefit Methodology would be applied to a rural project in the Dairy Digester Research and Development Program (DDRDP). This example does not include the supporting documentation that may be required of actual project proponents.

Overview of the Proposed Project

This section provides a background narrative on the example project; it is not expected that users provide such an overview.

The proposed project would install a dairy digester that will be part of a cluster. This dairy digester will primarily utilize recovered biogas for renewable natural gas transportation fuel (via pipeline injection) as part of a cluster. The dairy digester will be operational one year before the renewable natural gas pipeline injection is operational, so biogas will be combusted in a lean-burn internal combustion (IC) engine for electricity generation for the first year of the ten-year project.

The proposed project is located in Kern County with the following characteristics:

- Covered lagoon dairy digester design;
- Primary biogas end use will be upgrading to renewable natural gas transportation fuel via pipeline injection (90%); secondary biogas destruction device is a lean-burn IC engine generating electricity (10%).
- Solid separation via stationary screen in both baseline and project scenario;
 - Separated solids are stacked and stored outdoors, and periodically applied to land or used as bedding (solid storage);
- Uncovered effluent pond;
- Previous year average of 2,000 freestall lactating dairy cows, 1,300 dry cows, and 500 heifers with average milk production of 55 lbs/cow/day;
- All manure sent to anaerobic lagoon in the baseline and to the dairy digester in the project case, except for separated solids and what is deposited on land in areas where it is not collected;
- 500 gallons of diesel fuel used for manure management support equipment in baseline and project scenarios (support equipment emissions unchanged);
- 300 MWh electricity consumption in baseline scenario and 1,000 MWh estimated for project scenario (increase associated primarily with electricity use in upgrading biogas to pipeline-quality renewable natural gas as well as by stirrers in digester and other dairy digester support equipment);
- Propane pilot light of IC-engine identified as new combustion source, estimated 30 gallons/yr.

⁹ The hypothetical project has not undergone verification of any program requirements; all assumptions about location type and features are for demonstration purposes only.

The public participation process thus far has included:

- Two public information meetings:
 - Both meetings were held in the design phase.
 - One meeting was held on a weekday during the day (6 attendees), one on a weekday in the evening (9 attendees). Translations were provided in Spanish at both. Agency representatives presented the plan in a spoken presentation, addressing both benefits of reducing methane and potential adverse impacts, such as construction noise and traffic, any potential air and water pollution, and mitigations for these. They also discussed employment potential. The presenters invited questions, and had a discussion period.
 - Meeting announcements (in Spanish and English) were posted on Facebook, in local newspapers, and around the project area.
 - Attendees at these two meetings totaled 15.
- Engagement of key community leaders and organizations:
 - The project applicants met with three organizations to inform them about the project and seek their input. These included the local farm bureau, a regional group organized around air quality, and a statewide environmental justice group with a local office.
- Additional opportunities for input:
 - The project applicants created a web page with information about the project (in English and Spanish), using a “forum” format where comments could be made; 3 were made.
 - The project applicants went door to door in the surrounding community to talk with people at neighboring farms and other properties about the project. The spoken information and printed materials included the same information presented at the public meetings. They visited 12 neighboring properties, and talked with 16 people who were residents or workers at these locations.
 - Three letters of support came from neighbors, supporting the project in the belief that it will reduce air pollution and odor.
 - The project applicants also went to a County Board of Supervisors’ meeting, to give a brief update on the plan and stay for questions and comments, and pass out printed materials. There were 3 commenters.
- Representation of affected communities:
 - Event attendees, neighbors, and commenters were not asked explicitly about their demographics; all lived or worked near the project. Project applicants estimated that, based on the names of people they talked with, about 50% were Latino; about 20% of commenters spoke Spanish.
- Incorporation of input:
 - Based on public input at meetings and from local groups, the timing of the construction was changed, mitigations were increased for the year before the pipeline would become operational, and water quality protections were strengthened. The community groups were informed and these changes were announced on the project website.

Methods to Apply

To estimate community engagement level, the applicant completed the public participation questionnaire as displayed below.

EXAMPLE Community Engagement Questionnaire
<p>1. Is the project a neighborhood-scale, city/regional-scale, or rural project? <i>Rural</i></p>
<p>2. With regard to public events held by the project proponent to discuss this project proposal with the community:</p> <p>a. What was the approximate total attendance at those events? <i>15</i></p> <p>b. Briefly describe the events held. (Please respond in fewer than 100 words) <i>Two public information meetings:</i> <i>1. County Space, Date (weekday), 6 attendees (community based organization representatives, local business owners, residents), PowerPoint</i> <i>2. Farm Group Space, Date (weeknight), 9 attendees (community based organization representatives, local business owners, residents), Powerpoint</i></p>
<p>3. With regard to other opportunities provided by the project proponent for community members to comment or provide input on the project (e.g., internet- or telephone-based input opportunities) or separate meetings with specific stakeholders, community leaders, and organizations, beyond those included above:</p> <p>a. What is the approximate total number of people who provided commentary or input on the project through these opportunities? <i>22 (3 online, 3 at stakeholder mtgs, 16 neighbors, 3 at Supervisors meeting)</i></p> <p>b. Briefly describe the opportunities provided. (Please respond in fewer than 100 words) <i>Web page with project description online with forum for comments.</i> <i>3 stakeholder meetings:</i> <i>- Air Quality Group, Representative Name, Date</i> <i>- Environmental Justice Group, Representative Name, Date</i> <i>- Farm Group, Representative Name, Date</i></p> <p><i>Door to door outreach: talked with 16 people at 12 neighboring locations, Dates</i></p> <p><i>Spoke at Kern County Supervisors meeting, Date</i></p>

<p>4. Which of the following took place as part of the events and other opportunities identified in questions 2 and 3? (Check all that apply):</p> <p>a. Informed the community about various aspects of the project, including the process by which major decisions about the project would be made.</p> <p>b. Solicited and recorded written or spoken input from the community about specific aspects of the project or potential project alternatives before decisions on those aspects and alternatives were finalized.</p> <p>c. Incorporated proposals or ideas from the community into project alternatives or components.</p> <p>d. Reported back to the community on how the input in 4(b) and 4(c) was incorporated.</p> <p>e. Developed project features or project alternatives collaboratively with the community by one or more of the following means: (Check all that apply):</p> <p>i. One or more workshops or other meetings in which the community developed a project alternative or specific component to address unmet community needs, which was subsequently included in the project's application for funding or final design.</p> <p>ii. Formal cooperation with a community-based organization (i.e., via a memorandum of understanding, community benefits agreement, steering committee, labor agreement, etc.) to acquire or distribute funding, identify project alternatives or project components, or otherwise enhance community engagement in project design, planning and implementation.</p> <p>iii. Delegation of authority to choose between project alternatives or components to the community through a steering committee, organized voting process, representative community-based organization, or other means.</p> <p>iv. A community-based organization, community-driven steering committee, or similar entity designed, planned, and implemented the project in whole or in significant part.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
--	---

<p>5. Considering all of the events and input opportunities as a whole, which of the following statements are true (check all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The participants comprised a broadly representative sample of the population potentially benefiting from, or affected by, the project. b. Project proponents identified key community leaders and organizations and engaged them directly. c. The events and input opportunities were hosted at varied and accessible times and locations throughout the area potentially affected by the project, and not solely conducted through digital means. d. Events and written materials were offered in languages other than English. e. The participation process was conducted or assisted by a professional facilitator or public participation expert. f. The project proponents, or those acting on their behalf, prepared and followed a community engagement plan that meets the minimum criteria originally established by the Transformative Climate Communities Program (option is available for all project types). 	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
--	---

Based on the responses to these questions, each component of community engagement — the quantity, quality, and equity — can then be evaluated as low, medium, or high, defined as follows:

EXAMPLE Evaluation of Community Engagement for Rural Projects			
	Low	Medium	High
Quantity: Total event attendance + number of people commenting through other opportunities	0 – 14	15 – 29	30 or more
Quality: Boxes checked in response to Table 1, Question 4	4a or 4b	4c or 4d	Any box in 4e
Equity: Number of boxes checked in response to Table 1, Question 5	None or 1	2 or 3	4 or more

For this example:

Quantity category: $15 + 22 = 37 = \text{high}$

Quality category: boxes 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d checked = medium

Equity category: Four boxes checked in response to Table 1, Question 5 = high

In this example, the quantity category is high, the quality category is medium, and the equity category is high. Therefore, the overall community engagement level for this example project is **high**.

Bibliography

California Public Resource Code, Division 13, Chapter 4.2, Implementation of the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Available at:

https://california.public.law/codes/ca_pub_res_code_section_21155.

California Strategic Growth Council. (2018). Transformative Climate Communities Program Guidelines. Available at: <http://www.sgc.ca.gov/programs/tcc/resources/>.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). Principles of Community Engagement. Available at:

https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/communityengagement/pdf/PCE_Report_508_FINAL.pdf.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). American Fact Finder, Community Facts. Available at: https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). (2018).

CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Data. Available at: <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/maps-data/download-data>.