

Alachua County Local Mitigation Strategy

Score Guide

Jurisdiction/Agency:

Date of submittal:

Project Contact:

Contact Address:

Telephone:

E-mail:

Is your agency in good standing with the LMS Work Group? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Project Name:

Project Description: (provide a brief project overview):

Project Estimated Cost:

Project Estimated Completion Timeframe:

If project is exempt from the Public Record Act, provide Florida Statute and statement from legal representative documenting exemption. Exempt: Yes/No

This project submitted for:

☐ **LMS Project Ranking List* (score required)**

☐ **LMS Initiative List (score not required)**

*** If project listed on LMS Project Ranking List, the project will also be listed on the LMS Initiative list**

Proposed Project Type:

Please indicate the type of project proposed in accordance to the four tier approach of the LMS Workgroup.

☐ Life Safety

☐ Critical Operations and Infrastructure

☐ Economic Vitality

☐ Preparedness Planning and Studies

When scoring projects, assign a score to the nearest quarter point (0.25) within the Decision Factor score range, unless the Decision Factor requires a whole number score.

1. Jurisdictional Benefits:

This decision factor evaluates the extent of the jurisdictional benefits of the proposed mitigation project. For purposes of scoring projects, the following are considered jurisdictions: County Government, Municipalities, Public Institutions of Higher Education, Special Taxing Districts, Constitutional Offices, Unincorporated Areas, and School Board. For purposes of scoring projects, “directly” is defined as primary recipients of the benefits of the project and does not include indirect benefits of project implementation.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
3	Project will directly benefit all of Alachua County		
2	Project will directly benefit part of more than one jurisdiction but less than the county as a whole		
1	Project will directly benefit a single jurisdiction		
0	Project has indirect benefits but lacks direct benefits		

2. Estimate of Population Benefited:

This decision factor evaluates the benefit to human health and safety derived from the implementation of the project. The beneficial effects of the proposed project may affect more than the population of the sponsoring entity. For purposes of scoring projects, “directly” is defined as primary recipients of the benefits of the project and does not include indirect benefits of project implementation.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
5	This project would directly benefit the health and safety of at least 200,000 people by reducing personal injury and/or risk of illness.		
4	This project would directly benefit the health and safety of between 100,000 to 199,999 people by reducing personal injury and/or risk of illness.		
3	This project would directly benefit the health and safety of 5,001 to 99,999 people by reducing personal injury and/or risk of illness.		
2	This project would directly benefit the health and safety of 2,501 to 5,000 people by reducing personal injury and/or risk of illness.		
1	This project would directly benefit the health and safety of 1 to 2,500 people by reducing personal injury and/or risk of illness.		
0	This project has no direct benefit to the health and safety of the population.		

3. Cost Benefit Adjustment

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
0	This project costs less than \$1,000,000 or this project directly benefits 5,000 or more people		
-1	This project costs \$1,000,000 or more and directly benefits fewer than 5,000 people		

4. Environmental and Public Health Risk Reduction

This decision factor is intended to assess the potential environmental and public health outcomes associated with the implementation of a proposed project. It considers the magnitude, clarity, and evidentiary support of anticipated impacts. Projects that provide strong, credible evidence of significant and measurable benefits receive higher scores, while those with uncertain, minimal, or unsupported impacts score neutrally. Projects that present reasonably foreseeable negative consequences score negatively. The goal is to apply this decision factor in a consistent, objective, and transparent manner, ensuring that environmental and public health considerations are meaningfully incorporated into project prioritization.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
2	Exceptional, Transformative Positive Impact: The project is anticipated to produce extraordinary, transformative improvements in environmental quality and/or public health. Impacts are not only clear and measurable but also broad in scale, long-lasting, and highly significant. This score requires robust quantitative evidence, such as modeling data, third-party evaluations, or regulatory impact assessments, demonstrating that the project's outcomes are well beyond standard expectations for similar initiatives.		
1	Demonstrable Positive Impact: The project is expected to deliver clear, measurable, and significant benefits to environmental or public health outcomes. Supporting evidence must include quantitative data (e.g., reduced emissions, improved water quality metrics) or strong qualitative documentation (e.g., professional assessments, policy alignment).		
0	Minimal, Indirect, or Uncertain Impact: The project may produce limited or secondary environmental or public health benefits that are indirect, incidental, or difficult to measure. This score is also appropriate when insufficient data is provided to justify an expected impact or where the effects are ambiguous or speculative.		
-1	Reasonably Foreseeable Adverse Impact: The project is likely to result in negative environmental or public health outcomes, based on credible analysis or risk assessments. This may include disruption of ecosystems, degradation of natural resources, increased exposure to pollutants, or other documented risks.		

5. Consistency with other Plans and Programs:

This decision factor is used to consider the level of consistency that the mitigation project has with other current plans and programs that have been approved, accepted, or utilized by the community to be affected or benefited by the project. The premise here is that the proposed project should be ranked higher if they are consistent with and further these other plans and programs, rather than if they are inconsistent or in conflict with the goals and objectives of generally accepted guiding principles.

The following types of plans, policies, and programs to be considered under this decision factor are the following:

- The goals and objectives of the Alachua County Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS)
- Entities adopted Comprehensive Plan, or another guiding plan or document.
- Special Area Plans or Conservation Management Plans
- The jurisdiction's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan and or the Alachua County Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP).
- Any applicable land development code or zoning ordinance.
- Any applicable environmental resource preservation or protection plan, policy, or ordinance

- Any other applicable local, state building code, or federal law, regulation, or plan.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
4	The project or activity is incorporated into at least three of the documents listed or judged to be highly consistent with all.		
3	The project or activity is incorporated into at least two of the documents listed.		
2	The project or activity is incorporated into at least one of the documents listed.		
1	The project or activity is consistent with other standards deemed acceptable, however not specifically listed above.		
0	The project is neither consistent nor inconsistent with the documents listed.		
-1	Project or activity is inconsistent with [conflicts with] adopted comprehensive plan or land development code.		
-2	Project or activity is inconsistent with [conflicts with] a Special Area Plan or a Conservation Management Plan.		

6. Community Exposure:

The proposed project mitigates a known hazard identified in the Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS). The scoring factor is based on combinations of high, medium, and low levels of exposure and frequency, as indicated in the LMS.

Exposure is defined as hazards that have had impacts on either the **Population, Property, Environment, or Government Operations**.

- Low Impacting 1 of the above
- Medium Impacting 2-3 of the above
- High Impacting all 4 of the above

Frequency is defined as the number of times the Hazard occurred.

- Low Less than once in the last 10 years
- Medium Once in the last 5 to 10 years
- High Greater than once in the last 5 years

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
5.0	High Exposure and High Frequency		
4.5	High Exposure and Medium Frequency		
4.0	High exposure and Low Frequency		
3.5	Medium Exposure and High Frequency		
3.0	Medium Exposure and Medium Frequency		
2.5	Medium Exposure and Low Frequency		
2.0	Low Exposure and High Frequency		
1.5	Low Exposure and Medium Frequency		
1.0	Low Exposure and Low Frequency		

7. Supports Natural Resources, Critical Infrastructure, Critical Services or Key Resources:

This decision factor evaluates how the project will support public or private critical infrastructure, services, or man-made or natural resources that provide a hazard mitigation function. The critical infrastructure, service, or resource must provide some capacity for or type of hazard mitigation, such as the enhancement of storm water systems [man-made resource] or the restoration of floodplains [natural resource] to attenuate flooding potential.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
4	The project will mitigate hazards to critical infrastructure, critical services, or natural resources with a history of loss or damage within the last 5 years.		
3	The project will mitigate hazards to critical infrastructure, critical services, or natural resources with a history of loss or damage between the last 5-10 years.		
2	The project will mitigate hazards to critical infrastructure, critical services, or natural resources with a history of loss the last within the last 10+ years.		
1	The project will mitigate hazards to critical infrastructure, critical services, or natural resources without a history of loss or damage.		
0	The project's operation would have no impact on critical infrastructure, critical services, or natural resources.		

8. Continuity of Operations/Continuity of Government:

Continuity of Government (COG) refers to a coordinated strategy and set of plans designed to ensure that essential government functions continue without interruption during and after a wide range of emergencies or disasters—such as natural disasters, terrorist attacks, or other catastrophic events.

Continuity of Operations (COOP) is an internal effort within individual departments, agencies, or organizations to ensure that their critical functions continue without interruption when normal operations are disrupted.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
1	The project will provide for continuity of government or continuity of operations of critical infrastructure or services.		
0	The project will not provide for continuity of government or continuity of operations of critical infrastructure or services.		

9. Probability of Receiving Funding for Implementation:

This decision factor considers the likelihood that a project will be adequately funded for its implementation or completion as proposed. The underlying assumption is that one of the fundamental purposes of the Alachua County LMS is to secure funding for meritorious project proposals that otherwise may not be funded in a timely manner. Please list the likely funding sources for the proposed project:

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
4	The only potential funding sources for this project are readily available through mitigation or emergency preparedness funding sources.		
3	The only potential funding sources are other state or federal grants or similar funding sources.		
2	Funding may be accomplished through matching local jurisdiction dollars with funds from budgeting, capital improvement, or a mixture of other funding sources.		
1	Funding may be obtained through available locally controlled budget sources.		

10. Feasibility of Implementation:

This decision factor considers the feasibility of implementation of the project from an administrative or managerial perspective. At a minimum, the following external factors are to be evaluated for each proposed project:

- The time involved to complete a project, including planning and engineering studies, environmental assessments, and ecological surveys
- The type, number, and time needed to secure permits and approvals
- If the project proposal would require a referendum vote by the general public
- If the project proposal would require a public hearing and/or specific commission/council approval

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
4	The project would be relatively easy to complete or implement within one year.		
3	The project is not anticipated to be difficult to implement; no external factors affect the proposed project or would only have a minimal influence on the implementation process.		
2	The project may be somewhat difficult to implement because one identified external factor will impede the implementation process.		
1	The project may be fairly difficult to implement because two external factors will impede the implementation process.		
0	The project may be difficult to implement because three or more external factors will impede the implementation process.		

11. Community Rating System:

This decision factor takes into account a proposed project's positive effect upon Community Rating System (CRS) flood-related activities. These activities would enhance public safety, reduce damages to property and public infrastructure, avoid economic disruption and losses, reduce human suffering and protect the environment.

- Project supports public information activities such as Elevation Certificates, Map information services, Outreach projects, Hazard disclosure, Flood Protection Information, Flood Protection Assistance, and Flood Insurance Promotion
- Project supports mapping (i.e. GIS) and regulations such as Floodplain mapping, open space preservation, higher regulatory standards, flood data maintenance, and stormwater management
- Project supports flood damage reduction activities such as floodplain management planning, acquisition and relocation, flood protection, and drainage system maintenance
- Project supports flood preparedness activities such as flood warning and response, levees, and dams

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
4	The project supports all four elements of CRS flood-related activities.		
3	The project supports three elements of CRS flood-related activities.		
2	The project supports two elements of CRS flood-related activities.		
1	The project supports one element of CRS flood-related activities.		
0	The project has no component applicable to the CRS.		

12. Repetitive Loss Mitigation:

This decision factor rates how the project would mitigate Severe Repetitive Loss (RL) properties which are structures flooded two or more times in a ten-year period.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
4	Project protects 50% or more of RL structures within Alachua County		
2	Project protects less than 50% of RL structures within Alachua County		
0	Project does not protect any RL structures		

13. Non-Residential Repetitive Loss Mitigation

This decision factor rates how the project would mitigate government structures and other non-residential structures or property that have been impacted two or more times in a ten-year period. These occurrences must be documented with suitable and substantial proof.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
4	A total of 4 flood insurance claims or more per 10-year period		
3	A total of 3 flood insurance claims in a 10-year period		
2	A total of 2 flood insurance claims per 10-year period		
0	Less than 2 flood insurance claims per 10-year period		

14. Age of Issue

This decision factor provides additional points for projects identified as long-standing issues within a community. This must be backed up by documentation demonstrating the longevity of the issues the project is addressing.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
4	Issue has existed 10 years or more		
3	Issue has existed more than 7 but less than 10 years		
2	Issue has existed more than 5 but less than 7 years		
1	Issue has existed more than 2 but less than 5 years		
0	Issue has existed less than 2 years		

15. Benefit to Community Lifelines

This decision factor credits the project for benefits relating to one or more of the seven community lifelines. Projects will be attributed per community lifeline that is directly benefited by the project. A project will benefit a community lifeline if it increases the resiliency of one or more contributing functions of that lifeline. A project will receive points for having at least one or more element of each lifeline. The scoring for this section is cumulative. Projects will not be attributed points for community lifelines that are indirectly benefited.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
0.5	Safety and Security - Law Enforcement/Security, Fire Service, Search and Rescue, Government Service, Community Safety		

0.5	Food, Hydration, Shelter - Food, Hydration, Shelter, Agriculture		
0.5	Communications - Infrastructure, Responder Communications, Alerts Warnings and Messages, Finance, 911, and Dispatch		
0.5	Transportation - Highway/Roadway/Motor Vehicle, Mass Transit, Railway, Aviation, Maritime		
0.5	Hazardous Material: Facilities, HAZMAT, Pollutants, Contaminants		
0.5	Water Systems - Potable Water Infrastructure, Wastewater Management		
0.5	Health and Medical - Medical Care, Public Health, Patient Movement, Medical Supply Chain, Fatality Management		
0.5	Energy: Power Grid, Fuel		

16. Benefit to Vulnerable Populations

This decision factor credits the project for benefiting identified vulnerable populations. Projects will be attributed points according to the vulnerability of the areas they **directly** benefit as identified in the Centers for Disease Control's Social Vulnerability Index map. Projects will be scored based on the percentage of each vulnerability zone they benefit.

Score	Description of the Decision Factor	Percentage of Area	Applicant Score	Committee Validation
5	Project benefits an area with a high level of vulnerability			
3	Project benefits an area with a moderate to high level of vulnerability			
1	Project benefits an area with a low to moderate level of vulnerability			
0	Project affects resilience in an area with a low level of vulnerability			

Alachua County Local Mitigation Strategy Workgroup

Project Description Form

Jurisdiction/Agency:

Proposed Project Name (brief description)

Please present a brief description of your project that includes:

- A. Justification of self-evaluation scores of the Decision Factors.
- B. Components of your project that warrant special attention.
- C. Any other pertinent information that can be used in ranking the proposed project.

Provide an overall description of your proposed project, including your goals to be accomplished by the project and the objectives to be completed as intermediate steps towards the goal(s).

1. Provide information on the jurisdiction's population that will potentially benefit from your project, such as demographics and an estimated number of people. Indicate if the project would provide multi-jurisdictional benefits.
2. Describe how the project will directly influence the health and safety of the population of Alachua County or a portion thereof.
3. Explain the cost-benefit adjustment of the project. This is the process of reviewing and possibly modifying a project's evaluation score based on how well the expected benefits justify the cost of the project. If a project is expensive but delivers very little value or a low-cost project provides significant benefits. This adjustment helps make sure that limited funding is spent on projects that give the most value for money.
4. Explain how the project will directly affect the environment and public health risk reduction. Include possible risks or adverse effects that may be associated with the implementation or completion of the proposed project.
5. Provide documentation explaining the consistency of your project with the plans and programs of the applicable jurisdiction, including an explanation of consistency with the adopted Alachua County Comprehensive Plans, Special Area Plans, Conservation Management Plans, or other applicable plans, policies, and/or guiding principles.
6. Assess the relative exposure to an identified hazard of your community and the frequency with which this hazard occurs.
7. Illustrate how your project will affect essential or non-essential services or infrastructure necessary to support life (power, water, sewer, gas, medical care); provide for safety and security (law enforcement, fire, telecommunications); minimize adverse impacts to the economy(fueling facility, food retail outlet); protect cultural resources (artifacts, historical buildings); protect natural resources and/or their functions (floodplains, flood attenuation, water quality); or promote educational programs.
8. Describe if the project will enhance Continuity of Government or Continuity of Operations

9. Present the likelihood that your project proposal would receive funding for implementation from HMGP or another funding source. Indicate if the project is eligible for short-term, long-term, or capital improvement grants.
10. Present an explanation of the feasibility of implementing your project, including, but not limited to supplying information on the complexity of implementation and a timeframe for completion
11. Describe how your project is complementary to one or more of the components or activities of the Community Rating System (CRS).
12. Describe how your project would mitigate Repetitive Loss properties identified by FEMA or known to a jurisdiction.
13. Provide substantial documentation showing impacts and their date(s) of occurrence that this project would mitigate.
14. Provide documentation showing the original submission date of the project.
15. Illustrate how the project will benefit each of the community lifelines by identifying the benefited contributing functions and providing a supporting narrative.
16. Provide a graphic depicting the benefited area of the project and how it corresponds with the Center for Disease Control's Social Vulnerability Index map located at: <https://svi.cdc.gov/map.html>. Explain the impacts to resilience in the area. Provide a breakdown by percentages for projects that benefit several zones.

Alachua County Local Mitigation Strategy Work Group
Validation Worksheet

Sponsor/Agency Contact: _____

Project Proposal Name (or brief description) _____

Date Scoring validated by LMS Committee: _____ **Project Confidential: Y / N**

Applicant Scores	Determining Factors	Committee Validation
	1. Jurisdictional Benefits	
	2. Estimate of Population Benefited	
	3. Cost-Benefit Adjustment	
	4. Environmental and Public Health Risk Reduction	
	5. Consistency with other Plans and Programs	
	6. Community Exposure	
	7. Supports Natural Resources, Critical Infrastructure, Critical Services, or Key Resources	
	8. Continuity of Operations/Continuity of Government	
	9. Probability of Receiving Funding for Implementation	
	10. Feasibility of Implementation	
	11. Community Rating System	
	12. Repetitive Loss Mitigation	
	13. Non-Residential Repetitive Loss Mitigation	
	14. Age of Issue	
	15. Benefits to Community Lifelines	
	16. Benefit to Vulnerable Populations	
Total Applicant Score		Total Validation Score

Authorized LMS Official:

(1) _____
Ranking TF Chair Signature

(2) _____
LMS Work Group Chair Signature