

A. Mitigation Initiatives: Criteria for Scoring and Prioritizing

The prioritization of mitigation initiative process begins with the sponsor(s) of each initiative then goes to the Local Mitigation Strategy Working Group.

The first step consists of the sponsoring governments, agencies, and departments developing their initiatives and then scoring each project using the matrix developed by the LMS Working Groups.

The sponsor's prioritized initiatives are then presented to the LMS Working Group via the Collier County Emergency Management Division who will put the initiative on the LMS meeting agenda. The Working Group then reviews, discusses, revises and votes on each of the initiatives, assigning each a score and a ranking using the scoring matrix. The LMS Chair will brief the Collier County Citizen Corps about new mitigation projects and activities LMS Working Group since the Citizen Corps last meeting.

In grouping the initiatives, in addition to using the scores derived from the matrix as a guide, considerations such as useful life of the initiative, cost-effectiveness, funding capability, and time required to implement and complete the project were factored.

- B. Special Grant Funding Opportunities & other exigent circumstances: Should an eligible entity have an opportunity to apply for a mitigation grant for a project not previously listed on the Project Priority Listing (Annex E) and not be able to apply for the grant because the next announced LMSWG meeting would preclude timely application, this procedure applies. The applicant will complete a project score sheet, below, and submit it to the Emergency Management Division. Emergency Management will transmit the score sheet to the LMS Chair. The LMS Chair will electronically transmit the score sheet to the voting members of the LMSWG along with an explanation of the exigent circumstances. The LMSWG voting members have **two** business-days to vote on the project acceptability to the project priority listing. At the conclusion of the two business-days a majority vote, with at least three votes agreeing, determines the initiative's status. A transcript of this exception will be entered in the minutes at the next scheduled meeting.

C. Mitigation Initiatives Scoring Matrix

The following table represents the scoring matrix used for the submission of initiatives for consideration for inclusion in the Collier County LMS. Submit the completed "Mitigation Initiative Evaluation Score Sheet" to Emergency Management Div. in MS Word format. (NOTE: See Section 4, para. 4.1.4 for situations which deal with initiatives that cannot be scored.)

Mitigation Initiatives Evaluation Score Sheet

Instructions: Applicant completes this score sheet for EACH Project. Information required in each of the **SHADED AREAS**. Submit this score sheet in **MS Word format** to the Emergency Management Office electronically: Richard.Zyvoloski@Colliercountyfl.gov . Questions, call: 252-3603

If a submitter does not agree with the final determination, he or she shall have the right to meet with the scoring committee to present compelling information to change the score.

PART I

Project Title:							
Project Location:							
<i>TYPE PROJECT ("X" appropriate box, or explain)</i>							
Acquisition	Elevation	Relocation	Reconstruction	Essential Facility Retrofit	Non-Residential Retrofit	New Construction	Special Considerations or Impact Statement, if any:
What Goal or Objective does this address (See Sec. 3.0, LMS)?							
What hazard(s) does this project or initiative correct/mitigate?							
Who (what community) benefits from this project or initiative?							
Does this project or initiative address mitigation on NEW infrastructure or buildings?							
Does this project or initiative address mitigation on EXISTING infrastructure or buildings?							
Project or Initiative Description:							
Applicant and Responsible Agency:							
<i>Agency Contact Information</i>							
NAME			E-Mail			PHONE	
Potential Funding Source(s) (See Annex J, LMS)					Estimated Cost		

Suitability			Score	For LMS WG only
1	Appropriateness of the Measure	5- High: Reduces vulnerability and is consistent with Local Mitigation goals and plans for future growth. 3- Medium: Needed but isn't tied to an identified vulnerability. 1- Low: Inconsistent with LMS goal or plans.		
2	Community Acceptance	5- High: Endorsed by most communities. 3- Medium: Endorsed by most; may create burdens. 1- Low: Not likely to be endorsed by the communities.		
3	Environmental Impact	5- Positive effect on the environment. 3- No effect 1- Adverse effect on the environment.		
4	Legislation	5- High: Consistent with the existing laws and regulations. 3- Medium: New legislation or policy change. 1- Low: Conflicts with existing laws and regulations.		
5	Consistent with Existing Plans and Priorities.	5- High: Consistent with existing plans. 3- Medium: Somewhat consistent. 1- Low: Conflicts with existing plans and policies.		

Risk			Score	For LMS WG only
1	Scope of Benefits	<p>5- High: Benefits all municipalities and unincorporated area directly or indirectly</p> <p>3- Medium: Benefits half or more, but not all the municipalities and/or the unincorporated areas.</p> <p>1-Low: Benefits less than half of the municipalities and/or the unincorporated area.</p>		
2	Potential to protect human lives	<p>5- High: More than 1,000 lives</p> <p>3- Medium: Up to 1,000 lives</p> <p>0- Low: No lifesaving potential.</p>		
3	Importance of Benefits	<p>5- High: Need for essential services.</p> <p>3- Medium: Need for other services.</p> <p>1- Low: No significant implications.</p>		
4	Inconvenience of Problem Correction	<p>5- None: Causes no problems.</p> <p>3- Moderate: Causes few problems.</p> <p>1- Significant: Causes much inconvenience (i.e. traffic jams, loss of power, delays).</p>		
5	Economic Loss (Effect of implementing the project on local economy)	<p>5- Minimal: Economic loss has little effect during the project.</p> <p>3- Moderate: Economic loss (minimal disruption).</p> <p>1- Significant: Economic loss (businesses closed; jobs affected).</p>		
6	Number of People to directly Benefit	<p>5- High: More than 20,000</p> <p>3- Medium: 4,000 –20,000</p> <p>1- Lower: Fewer than 4,000</p>		

Cost			Score	For LMS WG only
1	Initial Cost	<p>5- Low: \$0 to \$250,000</p> <p>3- Moderate: \$251,000 to \$1 million</p> <p>1- High: More than \$1 million</p>		
2	Maintenance /Operating Costs	<p>5- Lower costs: Less than 5% per annum of the initial cost.</p> <p>3- Moderate: 5%-10% per annum of the initial cost.</p> <p>1- High: More than 10% per annum of the initial cost.</p>		
3	Environmental Cost Impact	<p>5- Positive effect on the environment.</p> <p>3- No effect</p> <p>1- Adverse effect on the environment.</p>		
4	Financing Availability	<p>5- Good: Readily available with grants and/or matching funds</p> <p>3- Moderate: Limited matching funds available</p> <p>1- Poor: No funding sources or matching funds identified</p>		
5	Repetitive <u>FLOOD</u> damages corrected (applies ONLY to NFIP-insured structure(s) w/two paid flood losses).	<p>5- High: Corrects repetitive loss/severe repetitive loss</p> <p>3- Medium: Possible repetitive loss mitigation, but not documented.</p> <p>1- Low: Improves NFIP flood insured.</p> <p>0- Not a NFIP insured structure.</p>		

PART II

Benefit Cost Analysis – QUICK WORKSHEET

This worksheet to be filled out by the applicant, is designed only for the Local Mitigation Strategy Working Group use only. This gives the group a flavor for the potential benefits that the project may yield. Here's your chance to quantitatively make the case for your project as COST EFFECTIVE. This BCA is not the same one as the FEMA BCA. The FEMA BCA requires a lot more detail and supporting documentation, but this one will help you to further develop the "official FEMA BCA" should your project go forward as a FEMA grant request. (Please note the asterisked "*" items below for the appropriate help.)

ESTIMATED PROJECT COST:

How many people directly are affected by this project?

ESTIMATED POTENTIAL DAMAGE AND LOSS COSTS:

Some possible costs are:

- * Real Property Losses based on hazard mitigated: _____
- ** Furnishing/Equipment Losses: _____
- ** Alternate facility costs: _____
- ** Contract/rental costs: _____
- ** Other associated costs (list): _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Total Cost for Future Damages & Associated Expenses: (NOTE:

This figure should be detailed above.)

Statement to support above costs/losses:

DAMAGE & LOSS COSTS, divided by PROJECT COST = QUICK BCA RATIO

DAMAGE COSTS:
divided by _____ = BCA
MITIGATION PROJECT \$: