

# 2021 Homeland Security Grant Project # \_\_\_\_\_

## Project Scoring Sheet

Criteria	Description	Scoring	Wgt.	Total Score Poss.	Proj. Score	Wgt. Project Score
<b>Risk Scenario Linkage</b>	Project is applied to one of the risk scenarios identified within the UASI THIRA or the NCR Regional Risk Assessment.	Scale = 1-15 Subjective Evaluation	<b>1.0</b>	<b>15</b>		
<b>Alignment with Regional Strategy</b>	Evaluate the project's alignment with the Regional Strategy and Committee Work Plans. Provide a narrative description of this linkage and how the project supports Committee work plan goals.	Scale = 0-5 Subjective Evaluation	<b>2.0</b>	<b>10</b>		
<b>Improvement Planning Alignment</b>	Evaluate how this project addresses an improvement area(s) identified in the Regional AAR/Lessons Learned Rolling Summary Report.	Scale = 0-5 Subjective Evaluation	<b>5.0</b>	<b>25</b>		
<b>Matching Funds</b>	Matching Funds ( <b>only for projects &gt;\$50k</b> ) 1-10%      1 Additional Point 10.1-20%   2 Additional Points 20.1% <   3 Additional Points	Scale = 0-3 Objective Evaluation	<b>10.0</b>	<b>30</b>		
<b>Core Capability Impact</b>	How does this project improve the selected core capability? Does the proposed project address gaps identified in the Regional capability assessment? Is project implementation viable and supported through a Regional committee?	Scale = 0-5 Subjective Evaluation	<b>7.0</b>	<b>35</b>		
<b>Core Capability Alignment</b>	Alignment can be either with the overall core capability score OR an individual capability measure score.:  Core Capability Score of 0.1-2.0 = 5 points Core Capability Score of 2.1-4.0 = 4 points Core Capability Score of 4.1-6.0 = 3 points Core Capability Score of 6.1-8.0 = 2 point Core Capability Score of 8.1-10.0 = 1 point	Scale = 0-5 Objective Evaluation	<b>5.0</b>	<b>25</b>		
<b>Multi-Jurisdictional Collaboration</b>	Evaluates the level of multi-jurisdictional and/or multi-agency collaboration exhibited in the project.	Scale = 1-5 Subjective Evaluation	<b>4.0</b>	<b>20</b>		
<b>Regional Committee Prioritization</b>	Project score based on the Regional Committee's priority evaluation/ranking received from each committee or sub-committee. Ranked 1st- 8 points Ranked 2nd - 6 points Ranked 3rd through 5th - 4 points Ranked 6th through 10th - 2 points Remaining Projects if linked to Workplan - 1 point Project Not supported by Committee- 0 Points	Scale = 0-8 Subjective Evaluation by Regional Committees	<b>5.0</b>	<b>40</b>		
<b>Totals</b>				<b>200</b>		

## 2021 Regional Grant Scoring Anchors

### Risk Scenario Linkage

Scale

0	Question left blank.
1	Question was answered, but answer is not specifically linked to a NCR or UASI THIRA Risk Scenario.
2	Question was answered and <b>is</b> specifically linked to a NCR or UASI THIRA Risk Scenario.
3/4	Answer <b>is</b> specifically linked to a NCR/UASI THIRA Risk Scenario <b>and</b> explains how projects mitigates scenario risk.
5	Answer <b>is</b> specifically linked to a NCR/UASI THIRA Risk Scenario <b>and</b> provides detailed scenario risk mitigation explanation.

### Alignment with the Regional Homeland Security Strategy

Scale

0	Question left blank
1	Question was answered, but answer is <b>not</b> linked to any Goals or Measures from the Regional Strategy
2	Question was answered and <b>is</b> linked to either a Goal <b>or</b> a Capability Measure from the Regional Strategy
3	Question was answered and is linked to a Goal <b>and</b> a Measure from the Regional Strategy
4/5	Question was answered and <b>is</b> linked to a Goal <b>and</b> Measure from the Regional Strategy <b>and</b> provides a detailed explanation of how the proposed project supports the goal and objective

### Alignment with Improvement Planning Regional Rolling Summary Report

Scale

0	Question left blank
1	Question was answered but answer is <b>not</b> specifically linked to an improvement area identified within the Regional AAR/Lessons Learned Rolling Summary Report.
2	Question was answered and <b>is</b> specifically linked to an improvement area identified within the Regional AAR/Lessons Learned Rolling Summary Report.
3/4	Question was answered and <b>is</b> specifically linked to an improvement area identified within the Regional AAR/Lessons Learned Rolling Summary Report <b>and</b> provides a broad explanation of how the proposed project supports the referenced improvement area.
5	Question was answered and <b>is</b> specifically linked to an improvement area identified within the Regional AAR/Lessons Learned Rolling Summary Report <b>and</b> provides a detailed explanation of how the proposed project supports the referenced improvement area

### Capability Impact

Scale

0	Question left blank
1	Project provides an impact to a <b>single agency or jurisdictional</b> capability
2	Project provides a <b>minimal</b> impact to a <b>regional</b> capability
3	Project provides a <b>moderate</b> impact to a <b>regional</b> capability
4	Project provides a <b>significant</b> impact to a <b>regional</b> capability within a sub-regional area
5	Project provides a <b>significant</b> impact to a <b>regional</b> capability

### Multi-Jurisdictional Collaboration

Scale

1	<b>Agency</b> Specific Project
2	<b>Municipality</b> Specific Project
3	<b>County-wide</b> Project (State Recognized Counties)
4	<b>Sub-Regional</b> Project
5	<b>Region-wide</b> Project

### Committee Prioritization

Scale

0	Project <b>not submitted through Regional Committee</b> or Project <b>not linked to Committee workplan</b> in Regional Strategy or Project <b>not supported by Regional Committee</b>
1	Project <b>submitted through Committee and linked to Committee workplan.</b>
2	Project <b>ranked 6th through 10th</b> in Committee priority.
4	Project <b>ranked 3rd through 5th</b> in Committee priority.
6	Project <b>ranked 2nd</b> in Committee priority.
8	Project <b>ranked 1st</b> in Committee priority.