

Appendix II

Project Prioritization

Planning Projects

Action Items for Safety and Policy

5.1.a. Adoption and enforcement of International Building Codes and/or more stringent hazard-related building code provisions.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	8
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	6
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		24
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.1.b: Develop county policy concerning building materials used in high-risk WUI areas on existing structures and new construction.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	10
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	10
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		30
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.1.c: Develop county policy requiring the installation of dry hydrants in subdivisions with 5 or more dwellings.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	4
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	10
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		24
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.1.e: Develop a policy to enforce "No Burning" restrictions in specified high-risk subdivisions.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	6
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	10
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		26
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.1.f: Review need to inspect and enforce access and water issues in subdivisions and individual homes.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	10
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	7
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		27
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.1.g: Develop county policy concerning access in moderate to high-risk WUI areas where subdivisions are built to insure adequate ingress and egress during wildfire emergencies.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	10
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	10
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		30
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.1.h: Develop a county policy to support grant applications for projects resulting from this plan.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	10
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	10
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		30
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

Action Items for People and Structures

5.2.a: Youth and Adult Wildfire Educational Programs and Professional Development Training.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	10
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	10
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		30
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

Action Items for Resources and Capabilities

5.4.b: Retention of Volunteer Firefighters.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	10
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	10
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		30
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.4.c: Increased training and capabilities of firefighters.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	10
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	10
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		30
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.4.e: Support the construction of the new Fire Station/Clinic/Pharmacy/Community Center in Lockwood.

Project Type: Planning Project		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit/Cost	10
2	Vulnerability of the community or communities	10
3	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
4	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
Total		30
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

Non-Planning Projects

Action Items for Safety and Policy

5.1.d: Begin distributing "New Code of the West" pamphlets with subdivision permit requests.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)

Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	1077:1
2	Population Benefit	3
3	Property Benefit	\$ 140,874,831
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	2
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	1
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	4
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	3
Total		40
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

Action Items for People and Structures

5.2.b: Wildfire risk assessments of homes in identified communities.

5.2.c: Home site WUI Treatments.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)

Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	133:1
2	Population Benefit	5
3	Property Benefit	\$ 416,051,316
4	Economic Benefit	4
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	2
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		42
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.2.d: Community Defensible Zone WUI Treatments (specifically, Clapper Flats, Buffalo Trails, Rehberg Ranch, Alkali Creek, Hills Estates, Cedar Ridge, Pleasant Hollow, Shadow Canyon, White Buffalo, High Trails, Indian Cliffs, and Emerald Hills).

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	262:1
2	Population Benefit	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 140,874,831
4	Economic Benefit	3
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	1
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		50
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.2.e: Maintenance of Home site WUI Treatments.

5.2.f: Re-entry of Home site WUI Treatments.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	239:1
2	Population Benefit	5
3	Property Benefit	\$ 416,051,316
4	Economic Benefit	4
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	2
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		47
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.2.g: Implement proposed home defensible space projects.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		Scores		
Item	Criteria	Rehberg Ranch	Clapper Flats	Alkali Creek
1	Benefit / Cost	197:1	114:1	191:1
2	Population Benefit	10	10	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 16,347,652	\$ 5,658,240	\$ 32,807,504
4	Economic Benefit	5	4	7
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5	5	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3	3	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3	3	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	0	0	0
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5	5	5
Total		40	35	51
Project Ranking Priority Scores		High	Medium	High

5.2.g: Implement proposed home defensible space projects.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		Scores		
Item	Criteria	Hills Estates	Buffalo Trails	Indian Cliffs
1	Benefit / Cost	268:1	138:1	274:1
2	Population Benefit	10	10	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 1,742,546	\$ 17,105,638	\$ 19,202,149
4	Economic Benefit	2	6	6
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5	5	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3	3	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3	3	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	0	0	0
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5	5	5
	Total	38	38	43
Project Ranking Priority Scores		Medium	Medium	High

5.2.g: Implement proposed home defensible space projects.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		Scores		
Item	Criteria	Pleasant Hollow	Cedar Ridge	White Buffalo
1	Benefit / Cost	122:1	119:1	96:1
2	Population Benefit	10	10	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 9,416,085	\$ 3,921,391	\$ 1,056,852
4	Economic Benefit	5	4	3
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5	5	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3	3	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3	3	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	0	0	0
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5	5	5
	Total	36	35	33
Project Ranking Priority Scores		Medium	Medium	Medium

5.2.g: Implement proposed home defensible space projects.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		Scores		
Item	Criteria	Shadow Canyon	High Trails	Emerald Hills
1	Benefit / Cost	100:1	262:1	139:1
2	Population Benefit	10	10	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 996,257	\$ 3,277,614	\$ 29,342,713
4	Economic Benefit	3	3	7
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5	5	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3	3	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3	3	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	0	0	0
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5	5	5
	Total	33	39	49
Project Ranking Priority Scores		Medium	Medium	High

Action Items for Infrastructure Enhancement Projects

5.3.a: Post "Emergency Evacuation Route" signs along the identified primary and secondary access routes in the county.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	123274:1
2	Population Benefit	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 9,245,585
4	Economic Benefit	6
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	5
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		51
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.3.b: Access improvements of bridges, cattle guards, and limiting road surfaces.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	180:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 184,911,696
4	Economic Benefit	8
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	2
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	4
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		48
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.3.c: Improve communications throughout the County by installing additional repeater towers and obtaining portable repeaters for emergency response personnel.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	2845:1
2	Population Benefit	8
3	Property Benefit	\$ 739,646,784
4	Economic Benefit	6
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		52
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.3.d: Erect a repeater tower on the site donated by the Conover Ranch near Broadview.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	716:1
2	Population Benefit	3
3	Property Benefit	\$ 14,327,461
4	Economic Benefit	3
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		36
Project Ranking Priority Score		Medium

5.3.e: Fuels mitigation of the "Emergency Evacuation Routes" in the County to insure these routes can be maintained in the case of an emergency.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	92:1
2	Population Benefit	8
3	Property Benefit	\$ 277,367,544
4	Economic Benefit	7
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	2
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	2
Total		42
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.3.f: Erect a repeater tower system to support the Shepherd Volunteer Fire Department and Shepherd community.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	2659:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 159,554,607
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	3
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	4
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	4
Total		41
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.3.g: Access improvements through roadside fuels management.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		Scores		
Item	Criteria	Rehberg Ranch	Clapper Flats	Alkali Creek
1	Benefit / Cost	2063:1	783:1	3705:1
2	Population Benefit	10	10	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 16,347,652	\$ 5,658,240	\$ 32,807,504
4	Economic Benefit	5	4	7
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4	4	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3	3	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3	3	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3	3	0
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5	5	5
	Total	44	42	52
Project Ranking Priority Scores		High	High	High

5.3.g: Access improvements through roadside fuels management.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		Scores		
Item	Criteria	Hills Estates	Buffalo Trails	Indian Cliffs
1	Benefit / Cost	456:1	643:1	3383:1
2	Population Benefit	10	10	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 1,742,546	\$ 17,105,638	\$ 19,202,149
4	Economic Benefit	2	6	6
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4	4	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3	3	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3	3	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	0	0	0
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5	5	5
	Total	37	42	42
Project Ranking Priority Scores		Medium	High	High

5.3.g: Access improvements through roadside fuels management.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		Scores		
Item	Criteria	Pleasant Hollow	Cedar Ridge	White Buffalo
1	Benefit / Cost	469:1	573:1	187:1
2	Population Benefit	10	10	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 9,416,085	\$ 3,921,391	\$ 1,056,852
4	Economic Benefit	5	4	3
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4	4	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3	3	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3	3	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	0	0	0
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5	5	5
	Total	40	39	36
Project Ranking Priority Scores		High	Medium	Medium

5.3.g: Access improvements through roadside fuels management.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)				
Item	Criteria	Scores		
		Shadow Canyon	High Trails	Emerald Hills
1	Benefit / Cost	89:1	588:1	1746:1
2	Population Benefit	10	10	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 996,257	\$ 3,277,614	\$ 29,342,713
4	Economic Benefit	3	3	7
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4	4	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3	3	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3	3	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	0	0	0
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5	5	5
	Total	32	38	52
Project Ranking Priority Scores		Medium	Medium	High

Action Items for Resources and Capabilities

5.4.a: Enhance radio availability in each department, link into existing dispatch, improve range within the region, and conversion to consistent standard of radio types.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	370:1
2	Population Benefit	10
3	Property Benefit	\$ 92,455,848
4	Economic Benefit	6
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	5
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
	Total	59
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.4.d: Obtain a Type 6 wildland fire truck, a ProPAC foam kit, a floater pump, and additional personal protective equipment for the Broadview Fire District #3.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	179:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 14,327,461
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	2
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	3
	Total	27
Project Ranking Priority Score		Medium

5.4.f. Obtain a Type 6 engine, two 1,000 gallon pumper trucks, and a heated truck storage facility for the Worden Volunteer Fire Department.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	346:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 148,815,924
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	2
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	3
Total		39
Project Ranking Priority Score		Medium

5.4.g. Obtain a 4x4 pumper truck and a 1,500-2,000 gallon water tender for the Laurel Fire Department.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	52:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 14,500,006
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	2
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	3
Total		22
Project Ranking Priority Score		Low

5.4.h. Construction of a Shepherd Volunteer Fire Department satellite station in the Hidden Lake area.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	1596:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 159,554,607
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	4
Total		41
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.4.i: Additional heated equipment storage facility for the Broadview Fire Department #3.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	179:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 14,327,461
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	2
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	2
Total		26
Project Ranking Priority Score		Medium

5.4.j: Establish onsite water sources such as dry hydrants or underground storage tanks for rural housing developments.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	4623:1
2	Population Benefit	4
3	Property Benefit	\$ 924,558,480
4	Economic Benefit	3
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	2
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		46
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.4.k: Establish a site and install a higher capacity municipal well and pump and a 100,000 gallon storage tank for the town of Broadview.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	57:1
2	Population Benefit	3
3	Property Benefit	\$ 14,327,461
4	Economic Benefit	3
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	3
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		28
Project Ranking Priority Score		Medium

5.4.l: Establish a non-potable water well and storage system to supply fire hydrants, dry hydrants, and fire suppression systems in public buildings in the town of Broadview.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	72:1
2	Population Benefit	3
3	Property Benefit	\$ 14,327,461
4	Economic Benefit	3
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	3
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	4
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		28
Project Ranking Priority Score		Medium

5.4.m: Obtain a Type 3 WUI pumper truck for the Laurel Urban Fire Service Area.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	418:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 62,739,255
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	2
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	3
Total		40
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.4.n: Obtain funding to add structural fire responsibilities to Broadview Fire District #3, which would include personnel incentives, additional rolling stock equipped with structural firefighting capabilities, structural turnout gear, and a larger equipment storage facility.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	40:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 14,327,461
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	4
Total		23
Project Ranking Priority Score		Low

5.4.o: Obtain a Type 6 structural engine and a wood chipper for Lockwood Fire District #8.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	2839:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 204,422,546
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	3
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	2
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	3
Total		38
Project Ranking Priority Score		Medium

5.4.p: Acquire sites and install dry hydrants on Pine Hills Road, High Trails Road, Coburn Hill Road, Yellowstone Trail Road, and Box Canyon Spring Road.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	2405:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 204,422,546
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	3
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	4
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	4
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	4
Total		43
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

5.4. q: Obtain one structural engine, 3 Type 3 engines (to replace old 6x6's), and one Type 2 water tender for the Shepherd Volunteer Fire Department.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	202:1
2	Population Benefit	2
3	Property Benefit	\$ 159,554,607
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	2
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	3
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	3
Total		37
Project Ranking Priority Score		Medium

5.4.r: Secure funding for a full time Laurel Volunteer Fire Department Chief.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	5327:1
2	Population Benefit	4
3	Property Benefit	\$ 346,236,721
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	4
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	2
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	2
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	2
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	3
Total		39
Project Ranking Priority Score		Medium

5.4.s: Equip Laurel Emergency Operations Center with radios and phone lines.

Project Type: Implementation Project (Non-Planning)		
Item	Criteria	Score
1	Benefit / Cost	4616:1
2	Population Benefit	4
3	Property Benefit	\$ 346,236,721
4	Economic Benefit	2
5	Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)	5
6	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency	5
7	Potential for repetitive loss reduction	3
8	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development	5
9	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability	5
Total		49
Project Ranking Priority Score		High

Data Tables Used to Calculate Prioritization

Average Structure Value and Cost To Inspect and Treat per Project Area

Treatment Area	Acres	Parcels with Structures	Total Structure Value	Average Structure Value	Cost To Inspect and Treat
Clapper Flats Project Area	3463	55	\$5,658,240	\$102,877	\$49,500
Buffalo Trails Project Area	7715	138	\$17,105,638	\$123,954	\$124,200
Indian Cliffs Project Area	228	100	\$19,202,149	\$192,021	\$70,000
Rehberg Ranch Project Area	1110	92	\$16,347,652	\$177,692	\$82,800
Alkali Creek Project Area	449	245	\$32,807,504	\$133,908	\$171,500
Emerald Hills Project Area	1710	234	\$29,342,713	\$125,396	\$210,600
High Trail Project Area	765	25	\$3,277,614	\$131,105	\$12,500
Hill Estates Project Area	553	13	\$1,742,546	\$134,042	\$6,500
Pleasant Hollow Project Area	2072	86	\$9,416,085	\$109,489	\$77,400
Shadow Canyon Project Area	681	20	\$996,257	\$49,813	\$10,000
White Buffalo Project Area	319	22	\$1,056,852	\$48,039	\$11,000
Cedar Ridge Project Area	2932	47	\$3,921,391	\$83,434	\$32,900
Treatment Area Summary	21996	1077	\$140,874,641	\$130,803	\$969,300
Structures Outside High Density Urban Area	***	7740	\$924,559,341	\$119,452	\$6,966,000

Average Value of Structures per Fire Department

Name	Number of Structures	Total Value	Average Value
Billings FSA	3189	\$ 423,860,078	\$ 132,913
Blue Ck FSA Lakewood	274	\$ 33,021,122	\$ 120,515
Broadview FD 3	194	\$ 14,327,461	\$ 73,853
City of Billings	32517	\$4,501,259,310	\$ 138,428
City of Laurel	2158	\$ 169,621,596	\$ 78,601
Huntley FSA	1364	\$ 135,498,014	\$ 99,339
Laurel FD 5	133	\$ 14,511,116	\$ 109,106
Laurel FD 7	848	\$ 99,364,754	\$ 117,175
Laurel FSA	528	\$ 62,739,255	\$ 118,824
Lockwood FD 8	2118	\$ 204,422,546	\$ 96,517
Shepherd FSA	1685	\$ 159,554,607	\$ 94,691
Worden FD 4	145	\$ 13,317,910	\$ 91,848
Wildland Protection	1306	\$ 131,785,180	\$ 100,907

Roadside Fuels Treatments Within or Near Project Areas

Roadside Fuels Treatment Area	Total Miles	Total Acres	Cost
Clapper Flats Project Area	3.14	76.0	\$ 7,221.83
Buffalo Trails Project Area	11.55	280.0	\$ 26,603.49
Indian Cliffs Project Area	2.46	59.8	\$ 5,676.45
Rehberg Ranch Project Area	3.44	83.4	\$ 7,923.21
Alkali Creek Project Area	3.84	93.2	\$ 8,854.89
Emerald Hills Project Area	7.30	176.9	\$ 16,808.20
High Trail Project Area	2.42	58.7	\$ 5,577.87
Hill Estates Project Area	1.66	40.2	\$ 3,823.12
Pleasant Hollow Project Area	8.71	211.1	\$ 20,058.61
Shadow Canyon Project Area	4.86	117.8	\$ 11,192.81
White Buffalo Project Area	2.46	59.6	\$ 5,665.11
Cedar Ridge Project Area	2.97	72.0	\$ 6,837.99
Total	54.82	1328.9	\$126,243.57