PIER Project Selection: Methodology & Matrix

PIER Scoring Matrix

The PIER scoring matrix is a tool used to evaluate and compare different PIER applications in a structured and objective way based on the criteria included in each application package. By using a scoring matrix, the PIER Selection Committee can ensure that they consider all relevant factors and make informed decisions based on a consistent set of criteria.

Possible Scores

The scoring matrix for the PIER Selection Committee has four possible scores: **0, 1, 2,** and **3**.

A score of **0** indicates that the application does not apply to the category being evaluated. The selection committee would assign a score of **0** when a particular project aspect or requirement is irrelevant to the category criteria. Scores of **0** will not be included in the section average or overall score as to not count against an application.

A score of **1** indicates that the application fails to meet the criteria being evaluated. The selection committee would assign a score of **1** when the application does not satisfy the requirements specified for a particular criterion.

A score of **2** indicates that the application meets the criteria being evaluated. The selection committee would assign a score of **2** when the application satisfies the requirements specified for a particular criterion.

Finally, a score of **3** means that the application exceeds the criteria being evaluated. The selection committee would assign a score of **3** when the application goes above and beyond the requirements specified for a particular criterion.

Scoring System

To produce a single score for an application, each score assigned by the individual selection committee member will be averaged across the specific criterion. Next, the criterion average scores will be averaged together to produce a section score. Finally, the section scores will be added together to produce an overall score for the application.

Disclaimer

Please note that the scoring matrix provided is intended to be used as an objective tool to evaluate the applications submitted. The scoring matrix is only one of the tools that the selection committee will use in the evaluation process. While the scoring matrix provides a structured and systematic approach to evaluating applications, it does not replace the judgment, expertise, and discretion of the selection committee.

The final decision on which projects to select will be made at the discretion of the selection committee, based on various factors such as the evaluation scores, the alignment of the projects with the program's objectives and priorities, the feasibility and sustainability of the projects, and the available resources and capacity to implement the projects. The selection committee reserves the right to consider other factors not explicitly included in the scoring matrix when making its final decision.

We encourage applicants to provide detailed and compelling information about their projects to help the selection committee make informed and fair decisions. If you have any questions or concerns about the evaluation process or the use of the scoring matrix, please do not hesitate to contact us at <u>pier@jccltrg.org</u>.

PIER Scoring Matrix

Scoring Ma 0 = Does not Apply 1 = Fails to Meet Criteria SECTION 1: Project Summary LTRG SOREDI 1.1 Project purpose, area of benefit, and description 1.2 Project delivery summary 1.3 Anticipated outcomes and proposed performance measures	atrix Scale 2 = Meets Criteria JACKSON COUNTY JACKSON COUNTY	3 = Exceeds Criteria PHOENIX	TOTAL S	SCORE: TOTAL
0 = Does not Apply 1 = Fails to Meet Criteria SECTION 1: Project Summary LTRG SOREDI 1.1 Project purpose, area of benefit, and description 1.2 Project delivery summary 1.3 Anticipated outcomes and proposed performance	2 = Meets Criteria JACKSON COUNTY		TALENT	
1.1 Project purpose, area of benefit, and description 1.2 Project delivery summary 1.3 Anticipated outcomes and proposed performance		PHOENIX		TOTAL
1.1 Project purpose, area of benefit, and description 1.2 Project delivery summary 1.3 Anticipated outcomes and proposed performance				
1.2 Project delivery summary 1.3 Anticipated outcomes and proposed performance	JACKSON COUNTY		TOTAL	
1.3 Anticipated outcomes and proposed performance	JACKSON COUNTY		TOTAL	
	JACKSON COUNTY		TOTAL	
	JACKSON COUNTY	I	TUTAL	
	JACKSON COUNTY			
SECTION 2: Unmet Needs and Alignment with State and Local Priorities LTRG SOREDI		PHOENIX	TALENT	TOTAL
2.1 The unmet need(s) that will be addressed				
2.2 How the activity aligns with other planned federal, state, or local capital improvements and infrastructure development efforts, and/or other investments				
he following subsection evaluates the combined effects on Members of Protected Classes, HUD identified Vulnerabl	e Populations, and Histori	cally Underserved Commu	nities:	
2.3 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Race				
2.4 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Color				
2.5 Effect on Members of Protected Class: National Origin				
2.6 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Religion				
2.7 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Sex				
2.8 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Familial Status				
2.9 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Disability				
SECTION 3: Cost Reasonableness and Justification LTRG SOREDI 3.1 Description of the cost evaluation process and prevention	JACKSON COUNTY	PHOENIX	TALENT	TOTAL
of premature obsolescence of infrastructure 3.2 Method used to determine project funding requirements				
and qualifications of whoever completed construction cost estimate				
		l	TOTAL	
SECTION 4: Resiliency and Long-term Recovery LTRG SOREDI	JACKSON COUNTY	PHOENIX	TALENT	TOTAL
4.1 Mitigation of loss of life or property in the face of current and future natural hazards				
4.2 Description of consultations for risk assessment				
4.3 Description of restoration of infrastructure and related long- term recovery needs within historically underserved communities				
4.4 Project design and construction to withstand chronic stresses and extreme events				
			TOTAL	
SECTION 5: Maintenance and Operations LTRG SOREDI	JACKSON COUNTY	PHOENIX	TALENT	TOTAL
5.1 Future budget structures to fund maintenance and operation so the new asset, target operating reserves, anticipated insurance costs, and any other steps necessary				
anticipated insufance costs, and any other steps necessary to preserve useful function of the asset in case of future disaster				
		l	TOTAL	
SECTION 6: National Obective LTRG SOREDI	JACKSON COUNTY	PHOENIX	TALENT	TOTAL
6.1 Meets the Low and Moderate Income (LMI) National Objective or the Urgent Need National Objective				
6.2 Project or program meets unmet needs which have a particular urgency, including addressing existing conditions that pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community				

TOTAL

LTRG: PIER Evaluation Form

	Evaluator's Name:						
			Evaluator's Agency:				
				Project Name			
			Scoring M	latrix Scale			
		0 = Does not Apply	1 = Fails to Meet Criteria	2 = Meets Criteria	3 = Exceeds Criteria		
	CTION 1: Project Summary			Score	Notes		
-	Project purpose, area of benefit, and descri	iption					
-	Project delivery summary						
1.3	Anticipated outcomes and proposed performed	rmance measures					
_							
	CTION 2: Unmet Needs and Alignmer	nt with State and Local Priorities		Score	Notes		
-	The unmet need(s) that will be addressed						
2.2	How the activity aligns with other planned and/or other investments	federal, state, or local capital improvements	and infrastructure development efforts,				
The	following subsection evaluates the combine	ed effects on Members of Protected Classes	s, HUD identified Vulnerable Populations, a	nd Historically Underserved Communities	s:		
2.3	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Rac	ce					
2.4	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Col	lor					
2.5	2.5 Effect on Members of Protected Class: National Origin						
2.6	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Rel	ligion					
2.7	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Sex	x (including gender identity and sexual orient	ation)				
2.8	2.8 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Familial Status						
2.9	2.9 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Disability						
SEC	CTION 3: Cost Reasonableness and J	Justification		Score	Notes		
3.1	Description of the cost evaluation process	and prevention of premature obsolescence of	of infrastructure				
3.2	Method used to determine project funding	requirements and qualifications of whoever	completed construction cost estimate				
SEC	CTION 4: Resiliency and Long-term R	Recovery		Score	Notes		
4.1	Mitigation of loss of life or property in the f	face of current and future natural hazards					
4.2	Description of consultations for risk asses	sment that led to the selection of the project					
4.3	Description of restoration of infrastructure	and related long-term recovery needs within	historically underserved communities				
4.4	Project design and construction to withsta	nd chronic stresses and extreme events					
_							
	CTION 5: Maintenance and Operation			Score	Notes		
5.1		nce and operation so the new asset, target o eserve useful function of the asset in case of					
L	costs, and any other steps necessary to ph	escree aseral randition of the asset III case 0					
SEC	CTION 6: National Obective			Score	Notes		
6.1							
6.2		nich have a particular urgency, including addr	-				

SOREDI: PIER Proposal Form

	Evaluator's Name:						
				Project Name			
			Scoring N	Natrix Scale			
		0 = Does not Apply	1 = Fails to Meet Criteria	2 = Meets Criteria	3 = Exceeds Criteria		
SEC	TION 1: Project Summary			Score	Notes		
1.1	Project purpose, area of benefit, and descri	ption					
1.2	Project delivery summary						
1.3	Anticipated outcomes and proposed perfor	rmance measures					
•							
SEC	TION 2: Unmet Needs and Alignmen	nt with State and Local Priorities		Score	Notes		
2.1	The unmet need(s) that will be addressed						
2.2	2.2 How the activity aligns with other planned federal, state, or local capital improvements and infrastructure development efforts, and/or other investments						
The	following subsection evaluates the combine	ed effects on Members of Protected Classes	s, HUD identified Vulnerable Populations, a	and Historically Underserved Communi	ties:		
2.3	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Rac	e					
2.4	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Col	or					
2.5	2.5 Effect on Members of Protected Class: National Origin						
2.6	2.6 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Religion						
2.7	2.7 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Sex (including gender identity and sexual orientation)						
2.8	2.8 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Familial Status						
2.9	2.9 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Disability						
SEC	SECTION 3: Cost Reasonableness and Justification			Score	Notes		
3.1	Description of the cost evaluation process	and prevention of premature obsolescence of	of infrastructure				
3.2	Method used to determine project funding	requirements and qualifications of whoever	completed construction cost estimate				
SEC	TION 4: Resiliency and Long-term R	ecovery		Score	Notes		
4.1	Mitigation of loss of life or property in the f	ace of current and future natural hazards					
4.2	Description of consultations for risk assess	sment that led to the selection of the project					
4.3	Description of restoration of infrastructure	and related long-term recovery needs within	historically underserved communities				
4.4	Project design and construction to withsta	nd chronic stresses and extreme events					
	TION 5: Maintenance and Operation			Score	Notes		
5.1		nce and operation so the new asset, target o eserve useful function of the asset in case of					
SEC	TION 6: National Obective			Score	Notes		
6.1) National Objective or the Urgent Need Nation					
6.2	6.2 Project or program meets unmet needs which have a particular urgency, including addressing existing conditions that pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community						

Jackson County: PIER Evaluation Form

	Evaluator's Name:						
			Evaluator's Agency:				
				Project Name			
			Scoring M	latrix Scale			
		0 = Does not Apply	1 = Fails to Meet Criteria	2 = Meets Criteria	3 = Exceeds Criteria		
				-			
	TION 1: Project Summary			Score	Notes		
	Project purpose, area of benefit, and descr	ription					
-	Project delivery summary						
1.3	Anticipated outcomes and proposed perfo	ormance measures					
050							
	TION 2: Unmet Needs and Alignmer	nt with State and Local Priorities		Score	Notes		
2.1	The unmet need(s) that will be addressed	Colored and a second	1.6				
2.2 How the activity aligns with other planned federal, state, or local capital improvements and infrastructure development efforts, and/or other investments							
The	following subsection evaluates the combin	ed effects on Members of Protected Classes,	HUD identified Vulnerable Populations, a	nd Historically Underserved Communitie	s:		
	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Rad	ce					
2.4	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Col	lor					
2.5	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Na	tional Origin					
2.6	2.6 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Religion						
2.7 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Sex (including gender identity and sexual orientation)							
2.8 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Familial Status							
2.9 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Disability							
SECTION 3: Cost Reasonableness and Justification				Score	Notes		
3.1	Description of the cost evaluation process	and prevention of premature obsolescence of	infrastructure				
3.2	Method used to determine project funding	requirements and qualifications of whoever c	ompleted construction cost estimate				
SEC	TION 4: Resiliency and Long-term R	Recovery		Score	Notes		
4.1	Mitigation of loss of life or property in the f	face of current and future natural hazards					
-		sment that led to the selection of the project					
		and related long-term recovery needs within h	istorically underserved communities				
4.4	Project design and construction to withsta	and chronic stresses and extreme events					
	TION 5: Maintenance and Operation			Score	Notes		
5.1		nce and operation so the new asset, target op reserve useful function of the asset in case of					
SEC	TION 6: National Obective		Score	Notes			
6.1	6.1 Meets the Low and Moderate Income (LMI) National Objective or the Urgent Need National Objective						
6.2	Project or program meets unmet needs wh serious and immediate threat to the health	nich have a particular urgency, including addres or welfare of the community	ssing existing conditions that pose a				

Phoenix: PIER Evaluation Form

	Evaluator's Name:						
			Evaluator's Agency:				
				Project Name			
			Scoring Matrix Scale				
		0 = Does not Apply	1 = Fails to Meet Criteria	2 = Meets Criteria	3 = Exceeds Criteria		
_							
	TION 1: Project Summary			Score	Notes		
1.1		iption					
-	Project delivery summary						
1.3	Anticipated outcomes and proposed perfo	rmance measures					
SEC	TION 2: Unmet Needs and Alignmer	nt with State and Legal Drighting		Score			
	The unmet need(s) that will be addressed	int with State and Local Phonties		Score	Notes		
		federal, state, or local capital improvements a	and infrastructure development efforts				
2.2	and/or other investments	rederal, state, or local capital improvements a	and innastructure development errorts,				
The	following subsection evaluates the combin	ed effects on Members of Protected Classes	, HUD identified Vulnerable Populations, a	nd Historically Underserved Communities:			
2.3	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Rad	ce					
2.4	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Col	lor					
2.5	.5 Effect on Members of Protected Class: National Origin						
2.6	6 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Religion						
2.7	7 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Sex (including gender identity and sexual orientation)						
2.8		Members of Protected Class: Familial Status					
2.9	Effect on Members of Protected Class: Dis	ability					
	TION 3: Cost Reasonableness and J			Score	Notes		
3.1		and prevention of premature obsolescence of					
3.2	Method used to determine project funding	requirements and qualifications of whoever of	completed construction cost estimate				
OFC	TION 4: Resiliency and Long-term R	Decessory (Score			
4.1				Score	Notes		
4.1		sment that led to the selection of the project					
4.2		and related long-term recovery needs within	historically underserved communities				
4.4		° ,	instonearly underserved communities				
	4.4 Project design and construction to withstand chronic stresses and extreme events						
SEC	TION 5: Maintenance and Operation	IS		Score	Notes		
	Future budget structures to fund maintena	nce and operation so the new asset, target op	perating reserves, anticipated insurance				
	costs, and any other steps necessary to pr	eserve useful function of the asset in case of	future disaster				
	CTION 6: National Obective			Score	Notes		
6.1							
6.2	Project or program meets unmet needs wh serious and immediate threat to the health	nich have a particular urgency, including addre or welfare of the community	essing existing conditions that pose a				

Talent: PIER Evaluation Form

Evaluator's Name:						
		Evaluator's Agency:				
			Project Name			
		Scoring M	latrix Scale			
	0 = Does not Apply	1 = Fails to Meet Criteria	2 = Meets Criteria	3 = Exceeds Criteria		
SECTION 1: Project Summary			Score	Notes		
1.1 Project purpose, area of benefit, and descri	ption					
1.2 Project delivery summary						
1.3 Anticipated outcomes and proposed perfor	rmance measures					
SECTION 2: Unmet Needs and Alignmen	t with State and Local Priorities		Score	Notes		
2.1 The unmet need(s) that will be addressed						
2.2 How the activity aligns with other planned federal, state, or local capital improvements and infrastructure development efforts, and/or other investments						
The following subsection evaluates the combine	ed effects on Members of Protected Classes	s, HUD identified Vulnerable Populations, a	nd Historically Underserved Communities	:		
2.3 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Rac	ce					
2.4 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Col	or					
2.5 Effect on Members of Protected Class: National Origin						
2.6 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Religion						
2.7 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Sex (including gender identity and sexual orientation)						
2.8 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Fan	nilial Status					
2.9 Effect on Members of Protected Class: Disa	ability					
SECTION 3: Cost Reasonableness and Justification			Score	Notes		
	and prevention of premature obsolescence of					
3.2 Method used to determine project funding	requirements and qualifications of whoever	completed construction cost estimate				
SECTION 4: Resiliency and Long-term R			Score	Notes		
4.1 Mitigation of loss of life or property in the f						
4.2 Description of consultations for risk assess						
	and related long-term recovery needs within	historically underserved communities				
4.4 Project design and construction to withstar	nd chronic stresses and extreme events					
SECTION 5: Maintenance and Operation			Score	Notes		
5.1 Future budget structures to fund maintenar costs, and any other steps necessary to pre	nce and operation so the new asset, target op eserve useful function of the asset in case of					
SECTION 6: National Obective			Score	Notes		
6.1 Meets the Low and Moderate Income (LMI)) National Objective or the Urgent Need Natio					
6.2 Project or program meets unmet needs which have a particular urgency, including addressing existing conditions that pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community						