

## Osceola County Local Mitigation Strategy Project Submission Form

<b>Project Name:</b>				<b>Submission Date:</b>	
<b>Primary Agency:</b>	<b>Partner Agencies:</b>	<b>Jurisdictions Benefited:</b>	<b>Address:</b>	<b>GPS:</b>	
			<b>Flood Zone:</b>	<b>USNG:</b>	

Primary Contact:	Secondary Contact:	Estimated Project Cost:	Project Timeframe:
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Name:</b>		
		<b>Estimated Annual Maintenance Cost:</b>	
<b>Agency:</b>	<b>Agency:</b>	<b>Benefit Cost Analysis:</b> Project submissions must include a benefit cost analysis. Projects with a BCA less than 1 will not be considered. <a href="https://www.fema.gov/fact-sheet/fema-bca-toolkit-60-installation-instructions">https://www.fema.gov/fact-sheet/fema-bca-toolkit-60-installation-instructions</a>	
<b>Email:</b>	<b>Email:</b>		
<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>		
		<b>BCA:</b>	

### List Potential Funding Sources

<b>Primary Funding Source(s):</b>		
<b>Local Cost-Share(s) (Match) and Maintenance:</b>		

**Primary Community Benefit:**

**Primary LMS Category:**

**\*Primary LMS Goal:**

**\*Primary Community Lifeline:**

# Osceola County Local Mitigation Strategy Project Submission Form

Additional Project Information:	
Population Benefited:	CRS Elements Addressed:
Project Lifespan:	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Mitigates Repetitive Loss: <div> Yes No </div> </div> <p>Attach relevant documentation if applicable</p>
Project Status:	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Benefits Critical Facilities: <div> Yes No </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Benefits Critical infrastructure: <div> Yes No </div> </div>
Social Vulnerability Index: Project submissions will be scored using the social vulnerability index provided with the FEMA national risk index: <a href="https://hazards.fema.gov/nri/map">https://hazards.fema.gov/nri/map</a>	Consistency with Additional Long Range Plans:  Examples: Comprehensive plans, floodplain management plan, etcetera
SVI:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 30px;"></div>
<div style="text-align: center; margin-bottom: 10px;"><b>Primary Hazards Addressed:</b></div> <div style="display: flex; flex-wrap: wrap;"> <div style="width: 50%;"> Tropical Cyclone   Flooding   Tornado   Wildfire   Severe Thunderstorm   Pandemic   Agriculture/Livestock Disease   Geomagnetic Storm Sinkhole   Climate Change </div> <div style="width: 50%;"> Cyber Attack   Terrorism   Nuclear Facility Incident   Civil Unrest   Mass Migration   Transportation Incident   Hazardous Material Release </div> </div>	

## Osceola County Local Mitigation Strategy Project Submission Form

---

Project Description:	
Potential Disruption to Local Community:	Potential Regulatory Compliance Issues:

ENGINEERS ESTIMATE- SIGNAL MITIGATION PROJECTS						
Priority No.	Existing Signal Type	INTERSECTION	Proposed No. of Mast Arms		INSTALL DATE	COST PER INTERSECTION
			Single Arm	Double Arm		
1	MA	CYPRESS PKWY @ DOVERPLUM AVE*	2		8/1/1991	\$ 626,266.72
2	MA	FORTUNE RD @ LAKESIDE DR	3		8/1/2006	\$ 786,222.07
3	SW-Concrete	MICHIGAN AVE @ CARROLL ST	4		2/1/1991	\$ 1,110,278.89
4	SW-Concrete	MICHIGAN AVE @ DONEGAN AVE		2	10/1/1990	\$ 795,811.23
5	SW-Concrete	MICHIGAN AVE @ MILL SLOUGH RD	1	1	12/1/1987	\$ 762,416.52
Total MAs =						
Total SWs =						
			GRAND TOTAL =			\$ 4,080,995.43

## Osceola County Local Mitigation Strategy Project Scoring Worksheet

**Project Title: Osceola County- Traffic Signal Retrofit**

**Agency: Osceola County- Transportation & Transit**

**Date: August 10, 2023**

**Score: 36.24**

The LMS Project Scoring Worksheet was developed by the Project Prioritization Subcommittee using the STAPLEE (Social, Technical, Administrative, Political, Legal, Economic, and Environmental) framework, which has been established as a best practice in hazard mitigation. Following this framework ensures that a thorough evaluation of each project is completed before it is submitted for funding and all potential impacts are taken into consideration. The Project Scoring Worksheet is designed to assist the LMS Working Group with project prioritization by ensuring that projects meet minimum eligibility requirements and by providing a reference score derived from an analysis based on the established criteria. The score is to serve only as a reference for the LMS Working Group when prioritizing projects, and alone does not determine project eligibility or prioritization.

Category	Description	Score
Hazards addressed	2 – Addresses 2 or more hazards 0 – Addresses 1 hazard	2
Benefit to community	4 – Hazard Reduction 3 – Preparedness Against Hazard 2 – Mapping and Regulatory 1 - Public Information	3
Scope of Benefits	1 – Project serves 2 or more jurisdictions 0 – Project does not serve multiple jurisdictions	1
Population benefited	4 – This project could affect over 250,000 people and/or major portions of the county population 3 – This project could affect between 50,000 and 250,000 people 2 – This project could affect between 1,000 and 50,000 people 1 – This project could affect less than 1,000 people	3
Benefit to critical facilities	2 – Project benefits a critical facility 0 – Project does not benefit a critical facility	0
Benefit to critical infrastructure	2 – Project benefits critical infrastructure 0 – Project does not benefit critical infrastructure	2
Social Vulnerability Index of community benefited	This category is scored using the Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) provided with the FEMA National Risk Index. (Score = (SVI/100) *6)	5.24
Disruption to established neighborhoods and/or population groups after completion	4 – No disruption 2 – Minimal disruption 0 – Maximal disruption	4
Project Status	4 - Ready for construction 3 - Preliminary assessment 2 - Design 1 - Study 0 - Conceptual	1
Repetitive Loss Mitigation	4 – Alleviates severe verified repetitive loss. 2 – Loss may have occurred but was not formally documented 0 – No effect on repetitive loss	0
Lifespan of mitigation measure	4 - High - Expected to last/address hazards for 40 or more years 2 - Medium - Expected to last/address hazards for 20-39 years 0 - Low – Expected to last/address hazards for less than 20 years	2
Community Rating System	1 – Project supports CRS elements 0 – Project does not support CRS elements	0

## Osceola County Local Mitigation Strategy Project Scoring Worksheet

Consistency with other guiding documents and plans	<b>2</b> – Project shows consistency with 2 or more plans <b>1</b> – Project shows consistency with 1 other plan <b>0</b> – Project shows consistency with LMS but no additional plans  (Examples: Comprehensive Plan, Floodplain Management Plan, etcetera)	<b>2</b>
Political support/local champion/public support	<b>1</b> – Project demonstrates documentation of support from an organization other than the submitting agency <b>0</b> – Project does not demonstrate support from an organization other than the submitting agency	<b>1</b>
Regulatory Compliance	<b>1</b> – No compliance issues <b>0</b> – Project demonstrates issues with regulatory compliance	<b>1</b>
Benefit Cost Analysis	<b>6</b> – Benefit cost analysis is greater than 1.5 <b>3</b> – Benefit cost analysis is 1.0 – 1.5 <b>0</b> – Benefit cost analysis is less than 1.0	<b>0</b>
Funding Availability / Probability of Funding	<b>6</b> – Funding is secured/budget line item <b>3</b> – Funding sources are available <b>0</b> – No funding sources can be identified	<b>6</b>
Complexity/Technical Feasibility	<b>4</b> - Relatively easy to complete in a short period of time <b>3</b> - Not very complex based on the items listed below <b>2</b> - Somewhat complex due to one of the items listed below <b>1</b> – Complex due to two of the items listed below <b>0</b> – Complex project due to three or more items listed below  Factors for complexity: • Time involved for planning and/or completion • Involves coordination of numerous agencies and/or jurisdictions • Permitting (Type of permitting required or the time period involved) • Difficulty in obtaining funding • Requires a public vote • Requires a public hearing	<b>3</b>
Project benefit to floodway/floodplains	<b>4</b> - Project benefits publicized floodway <b>2</b> - Project benefits mapped floodplains <b>0</b> - No impact on floodplains	<b>0</b>
Total		<b>36.24</b>

This score was determined by a thorough review conducted by the Project Prioritization Subcommittee. All members of the Subcommittee were afforded the opportunity to provide their input, and the score is representative of their consensus.

Project Prioritization Subcommittee Chair or designee: \_\_\_\_\_

*Robin Hinson*

*Signature*