HAZARD MITIGATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA WORKSHEET

This worksheet is used, as a consistent approach, to assign a numeric value to each project. It allows the Sarasota County Local Mitigation Strategy Work Group to prioritize projects relative to one another based on several factors outlined below.

Project Information

Project Priority *	
Project Score	
Name of Project	
Brief Description of Project	
1	
Hazard Mitigated*	
Hazard Mitigation Strategy*	
Hazard Mitigation Goals Achieved *	
Funding Source	
Jurisdiction Project Benefit (List all	
applicable jurisdictions)*	
Jurisdiction	
Jurisdiction Project #	
Agency Responsible for	
Implementation	
Estimated Cost	
Timeframe for Project Completion	
Mitigate New or Existing	

^{*} Refer to The Sarasota County Local Mitigation Strategy Project List notes for assistance.

Project Scoring

Cost or Cost Impact: This would refer to the actual cost of the project over the life of the project and/or the cost impact that would occur because of the project.

Score	Points	Description
	4	No quantifiable Cost or Cost Impact, or the Cost/Cost Impact is less than 50,000
	3	Cost/Cost Impact is between \$50,000 and \$250,000
	2	Cost/Cost Impact is between \$250,001 and \$1,000,000
	1	Cost/Cost Impact is between \$1,000,001 and \$5,000,000
	0	Cost/Cost Impact exceeds \$5,000,000

Probability of Funding: How likely is it that this project could get funded?

Score	Points	Description
	4	Funding is available through local short-term budgeting (less than two years) or a
		grant for this type of project is available and the likelihood of success is high.
	3	Funding is available through local long-term budgeting (more than two years) or
		grants
		for this type of project are available, but the likelihood of success is moderate.
	2	Funding could only be accomplished through matching local dollars with funds from
		other sources; or would require a blend of funding sources.
	1	Funding could only be accomplished through post-disaster funding options.
	0	No funding sources can be identified.

Probability of Community Acceptance:

Score	Points	Description
	4	This type of project would likely be endorsed by the entire community.
	3	This type of project would benefit only those directly affected and would not
		adversely affect the rest of the community.
	2	This type of project could place some burden of cost on the community, but would
		likely be endorsed as an acceptable cost for the benefit received.
	1	This type of project would place a burden of cost on the community that might not
		win endorsement y residents and/or businesses.
	0	This type of project is not likely to be endorsed by the community.

Estimated Ration of Benefit vs. Cost: The individual or entity proposing this project should have completed a "Consequence Analysis" to support the ration of benefit vs. cost.

Score	Points	Description	
	4	Both quantitative and qualitative benefits make this a high priority project.	
	3	The benefit of this project is 2 to 4, or more, times the cost and/or the qualitative	
		benefits make the project one that should be given a relatively high priority.	
	2	The benefit of this project is over 1, but less than 2 times the cost and/or the	
		qualitative benefits make the project one that should be strongly considered.	

	1	The benefit of this project is equal to or less than the cost and/or the benefits are difficult to quantify due to their qualitative nature.
	0	The ratio of benefits vs. cost cannot be quantified.

Complexity of Implementation: The following list shows examples of various items that can make a project more complex;

- Time involved for planning and/or completion.
- Involves numerous agencies and/or jurisdictions
- Permitting (Either the type of permitting required or the time period involved, or both)
- Difficulty in obtaining funding
- Requires a public vote
- Requires a public hearing

Score	Points	Description
	4	This project will be relatively easy to put in place in a short period of time.
	3	This project should not be very complex based on the items listed.
	2	This project will be somewhat complex due to one of the items listed.
	1	This is a complex project because it involves at least two of the items listed.
	0	This is a complex project because it involves three or more of the items listed.

Addressed in Plans, Programs, and Policies: The following list shows examples of various guiding principles that may affect, or be affected by, the project;

- Goals & Objectives of Sarasota LMS
- Comprehensive Growth Management Plans
- Comprehensive Emergency Management Plans
- Land Development Codes, Zoning Ordinances, or Building Codes
- Environmental, Conservation, Preservation and/or Reclamation plans, programs or policies.
- Statutes, Public Laws, other local laws, and/or other plans, programs, or policies.

Score	Points	Description
	4	This project is addressed in at least three of the items listed.
	3	This project is addressed in at least two of the items listed.
	2	This project is addressed in at least one of the items listed.
	1	Where this project is addressed in any plans, programs or policies is not clear.
	0	This project may not fall within the purview of Sarasota LMS.

Health and Safety:

Score	Points	Description
	4	This project could affect the Health & Safety of several jurisdictions (totaling over
		250,000 people) and/or major portions of the county population.
	3	This project could affect the Health & Safety of between 50,000 and 250,000
		people
	2	This project could affect the Health & Safety of between 1,000 and 50,000 people
	1	This project could affect the Health & Safety of less than 1,000 people.
	0	This project has no Health & Safety implications.

Compilation of Scores		
Scores	Issues	
	Cost or Cost Impact	
	Probability of Funding	
	Probability of Community Acceptance	
	Ration of Benefit vs. Cost	
	Complexity of Implementation	
	Consistency with other Plans, Programs, and Policies	
	Health and Safety Considerations	
	Total Score	

Date Completed:	
Scoring performed by:	Local Mitigation Strategy Committee
	_Other (Describe):
Chair, Co-Chair, or Authorized Committee Member acknowledgement:	