Osceola County Local Mitigation Strategy
Project Scoring Worksheet

Project Title:		
Agency:	**Date:**	**Score:**

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	
Benefit to community	**4 –** Hazard Reduction **3 –** Preparedness Against Hazard **2 –** Mapping and Regulatory **1 -** Public Information	
Scope of Benefits	**1 –** Project serves 2 or more jurisdictions **0 –** Project does not serve multiple jurisdictions	
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	
Benefit to critical facilities	**2 –** Project benefits a critical facility **0 –** Project does not benefit a critical facility	
Benefit to critical infrastructure	**2 –** Project benefits critical infrastructure **0 –** Project does not benefit critical infrastructure	
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)**	
Disruption to established neighborhoods and/or population groups after completion	**4 –** No disruption **2 –** Minimal disruption **0 –** Maximal disruption	
Project Status	**4 -** Ready for construction **3 -** ~~Preliminary assessment~~ Design **2 –** ~~Design~~ Study **1 –** ~~Study~~ Preliminary assessment **0 -** Conceptual	
~~Repetitive Loss~~ Mitigation against recurring loss	**4 –** ~~Alleviates~~ Mitigates ~~severe~~ verified ~~repetitive~~ recurring loss **2 –** Loss may have occurred but was not formally documented **0 –** No effect on ~~repetitive~~ recurring loss	
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	
Community Rating System: Project benefit to floodway/floodplains	**4 -** Project benefits publicized floodway **2 -** Project benefits mapped floodplains; supports a CRS element **0 -** No impact on floodplains; does not support a CRS element	

Osceola County Local Mitigation Strategy
Project Scoring Worksheet

Consistency with other guiding documents and plans, including those at the agency, local, regional, and/or state levels	**2 –** Project shows consistency with 2 or more plans **1 –** Project shows consistency with 1 other plan **0 –** Project shows consistency with LMS but no additional plans (Examples: Comprehensive Plan, Floodplain Management Plan, etcetera)	
~~Political support/local champion/public~~ Community support	~~**1**~~ **3 –** Project demonstrates documentation of support from an organization other than the submitting agency **0 –** Project does not demonstrate support from an organization other than the submitting agency	
Regulatory Compliance	**1 –** No compliance issues **0 –** Project demonstrates issues with regulatory compliance	
Benefit Cost Analysis	**6 –** Benefit cost analysis is greater than 1.5 **3 –** Benefit cost analysis is 1.0 – 1.5 **0 –** Benefit cost analysis is less than 1.0	
Funding Availability / Probability of Funding	**6 –** Funding is secured/budget line item **3 –** Funding sources are available **0 –** No funding sources can be identified	
Complexity/Technical Feasibility	**4** - Relatively easy to complete in a short period of time **3** - Not very complex based on the items listed below **2** - Somewhat complex due to one of the items listed below **1 –** Complex due to two of the items listed below **0 –** 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	
~~Project benefit to floodway/floodplains~~	~~**4 – Project benefits publicized floodway**~~ ~~**2 – Project benefits mapped floodplains**~~ ~~**0 – No impact on floodplains**~~	
Total		

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: _____

Signature