Project Name	**Cross Bayou Phase 1**
Submitted by:	**Pinellas County Public Works**
Project Cost:	**$5,493,334**
Project Description: (The description should include those threats the project is to address and identify a NEED.)	Watershed project to improve conveyance through Cross Bayou Canal, which has a history of significant and widespread flooding. This project which will help alliveate some of this flooding as well as reduce the duration, in both Cross Bayou and the contributing tributaries. The project scope will include channel dredging, restoration, and bank stabilization to aid in becoming a more disaster resilient community and minimize inland or Riverine flooding losses.
Potential Funding Sources:	Variety

	Parameter	Weighting Factor	Scoring Criteria	Score	Points
Suitability		**30%**	**Rank each project with a score of either a 1 (low), 3 (medium) or 5 (high). Note that in some instances a 5 may be the most desireable score and in some cases it will be the least desireable score.**		
1	Appropriateness of the Project	40%	**5 - High:** Reduces vulnerability and is consistent with Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS) goals and plans for future growth. **3 - Medium:** Needed, but does not tie to identified vulnerability. **1 - Low:** Inconsistent with LMS goals or plans.	**5**	180
2	Community Acceptance	15%	**5 - High:** Accepted by most communities. **3 - Medium:** Accepted by most; may create some burdens. **1 - Low:** Not likely to be accepted by any community ("The not in my backyard" theory).	**5**	67.5
3	Environmental Impact	10%	**5 - Positive effect** on the environment. **3 - No effect -** environmentally neutral. **1 - Adverse effect** on the environment.	**5**	45
4	Consistent with Existing Legislation and/or Policies	10%	**5 - High:** Consistent with existing laws and policies. **3 - Medium:** New legislation or policy changes needed, but no conflicts identified. **1 - Low:** Conflicts with existing laws, regulations and/or policies.	**5**	45
5	Consistent with Existing Plans and Priorities	25%	**5 - High -** Consistent with existing plans and priorities. **3 - Medium -** Somewhat consistant with current plans and priorities. **1 - Low -** Conflicts with existing plans and priorities. Does not fit in with identified initiatives.	**5**	112.5
	Parameter Subtotal	100%	**sum of parameter scores; max =**	450	450
Suitability subtotal			(sum of parameter scores) / (maximum possible score)		100%
Risk Reduction		**45%**			
1	Scope of Benefits	15%	**5 - High:** Benefits the entire municipalitiy and other jurisdictions directly or indirectly. **3- Medium:** Benefits more than half the municipality or other jurisdictions area. **1- Low**: Benefits less than half the municipality.	**5**	101.25

2	Potential to Save or Protect Human Lives	35%	**5 - High:** More than 1,000 lives. **3 - Medium:** Up to 1,000 lives. **1 - Low:** No lifesaving potential.	**5**	236.25
3	Importance of Benefits	15%	**5 - High:** Needed for essential services. **3 - Medium:** Needed for other services. **1 - Low:** No significant implications.	**5**	101.25
4	Level of Inconvenience or "Nuisance Factor" Caused by the Project	10%	**5 - None:** Causes few problems. **3 - Moderate:** Most major problems avoided. **1 - Significant:** Causes much inconvenience (e.g., traffic jams, loss of power, delays).	**5**	67.5
5	Economic Effect or Loss Caused by the Project	10%	**5 - Minimal** economic loss (little effect during project). **3 - Moderate** economic loss (minimum disruption). **1 - Significant** economic loss (businesses closed, jobs affected, etc.).	**5**	67.5
6	Number of People to Benefit from this Project	15%	**5 - High: M**ore than 100,000 people. **3 - Medium:** 10,000 to 100,000 people. **1 - Low: F**ewer than 10,000 people.	**3**	60.75
	Parameter Subtotal	100%	**sum of parameter scores; max =**	675	634.5
Risk Reduction Subtotal			(sum of parameter scores) / (maximum possible score)		94%
Cost		**25%**			
1	Estimated Costs*	20%			22.5
	i. Initial Cost	*75%*	**5 - Low:** $0 to $100,000. **3 - Moderate:** $100,001 to $1 million. **1 - High:** More than $1 million.	**1**	11.25
	ii. Maintenance/Operating Costs	*25%*	**5 - Low** costs **3 - Moderate** costs **1 - High** costs	**3**	11.25
2	Benefit to Cost Ratio	40%	**5 - High:** Ratio is greater than 4 to 1. **3 - Medium:** Ratio is between 1 to 1 and 4 to 1. **1 - Low:** Ratio is less than 1 to 1.	**3**	90
3	Financing availability	10%	**5 - Good:** Readily available through grants or other funding sources. **3 - Moderate:** Limited grant or matching funds available. **1 - Poor:** No funding sources or matching funds are identified.	**5**	37.5
4	Affordability	10%	**5 - Good:** Project is easily affordable. **3 - Moderate:** Project is somewhat affordable. **1 - Poor:** Project is very costly for the jurisdiction.	**3**	22.5
5	Repetitive Damages Corrected (Repetitive Damages and Loss in this case is NOT the same as a Repetitive Loss as in the CRS program)	20%	**5 - High:** Alleviates repetitive loss. Property must have been damaged in the past by a disaster event. **3 - Medium:** Repetitive loss may have occurred but was not documented. **1 - Low:** No effect on repetitive loss.	**5**	75
	Parameter Subtotal	100%	**sum of parameter scores: max =**	375	247.5
Cost Subtotal			(sum of parameter scores) / (maximum possible score)		66%
*Estimated costs are comprised of two secondary parameters: initial and maintenance/operating costs.					
SUITABILITY		**30%**		100%	450
RISK REDUCTION		**45%**		94%	635
COST		**25%**		66%	248
TOTAL		**100%**			**1332**

Cell: E8
Comment: The LMS Goal and accompanying Objective from our LMS plan Appendix 4 will be listed in evaluators comments. If the project doesn't tie to one, best score will be 3.

Cell: E9
Comment: The approach to this question is: "How would another community like this project in their community?"

Cell: E10
Comment: The approach to this question is the environmental impact of the completed project, not during construction.

Cell: E17
Comment: The approach to this is as a countywide initiative. Most projects score 1.

Cell: E18
Comment: For a hardening project, this score reflects the lives potentially saved during the time the hardened facility would be out of service if not hardened. Also, drafting plans and maintaining functioning systems have little potential to save lives.

Cell: E19
Comment: Essential services to the LMS are considered those necessary for response to disaster: police, fire, medical, EOC, emergency communications.

Cell: E20
Comment: This is the inconvenience during construction or implementation.

Cell: E21
Comment: This is the economic effect during construction or implementation.

Cell: E22
Comment: For a hardening project, score a 1 unless you can show that more than 10,000 people would benefit until the services that would be interrupted without the hardening project would be restored.

Cell: E30
Comment: If you don't have a BCR that documents a value greater than 4, this should be a score of 3.

Cell: E31
Comment: If you aren't planning to fund this yourself, the score should be 3 or lower.

Cell: E32
Comment: Normal score is 1 or 3. To rate a 5, you should be planning to fund this yourself.

Cell: E33
Comment: Normal score is 1. For a 3, you should be able to document the storm surge/flooding events that could have caused losses and the losses that occurred elsewhere in the area as proof of the severity of the events. For a 5, you'll need to have documentation of the repetitive losses due to disaster events.