

4 MITIGATION STRATEGY

4	MITIGATION STRATEGY	4.1
4.1	<i>Goals.....</i>	4.1
4.2	<i>Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions.....</i>	4.2
4.3	<i>Implementation of Mitigation Actions</i>	4.6

44 CFR Requirement §201.6(c)(3): The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction’s blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.

This section presents the mitigation strategy updated by the Mitigation Planning Committee (MPC) based on the [updated] risk assessment. The mitigation strategy was developed through a collaborative group process. The process included review of [updated] general goal statements to guide the jurisdictions in lessening disaster impacts as well as specific mitigation actions to directly reduce vulnerability to hazards and losses. The following definitions are taken from FEMA’s *Local Hazard Mitigation Review Guide (October 1, 2012)*.

- **Mitigation Goals** are general guidelines that explain what you want to achieve. Goals are long-term policy statements and global visions that support the mitigation strategy. The goals address the risk of hazards identified in the plan.
- **Mitigation Actions** are specific actions, projects, activities, or processes taken to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property from hazards and their impacts. Implementing mitigation actions helps achieve the plan’s mission and goals.

4.1 Goals

44 CFR Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy shall include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.

This planning effort is an update to an existing hazard mitigation plan. Therefore, the goals from the *2011 Stoddard County Hazard Mitigation Plan* were reviewed to determine if they are still valid. The MPC participated in a facilitated discussion during their second meeting to review and update the plan goals. To ensure that the goals are comprehensive and support State goals, the *2018 Missouri State Hazard Mitigation Plan* goals were reviewed as well. The MPC also reviewed common categories of mitigation goals from other plans.

The planning committee determined that all five previous goals from the previous plan should be updated to include other geological hazards, extreme temperatures, and wildfire. The updated plan goals for the Stoddard County Hazard Mitigation Plan are below:

1. Eliminate loss of life, minimize injuries and reduce property damage caused by tornadoes and severe thunderstorms/high winds, hail and lightning.
2. Minimize property damage due to flooding, levee failure, and dam failure.
3. Minimize injuries and property damage due to seismic and/or geological events.

4. Minimize the impact to natural and human resources caused by drought, extreme temperatures, and wildfire
5. Maintain public services to minimize the risk and reduce property damage caused by severe winter weather.

4.2 Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

44 CFR Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): The mitigation strategy shall include a section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.

During the second MPC meeting, the results of the risk assessment update were provided to the MPC members for review and the key issues were identified for specific hazards. Changes in risk since adoption of the previously approved plan were discussed. Actions from the previous plan included completed actions, on-going actions, and actions upon which progress had not been made. The MPC discussed SEMA's identified funding priorities and the types of mitigation actions generally recognized by FEMA.

The MPC included problem statements in the plan update at the end of each hazard profile. The problem statements summarize the risk to the planning area presented by each hazard and include possible methods to reduce that risk. Use of the problem statements allowed the MPC to recognize new and innovative strategies for mitigate risks in the planning area.

The focus of Meeting #3 was update of the mitigation strategy. For a comprehensive range of mitigation actions to consider^{7(a)}, the MPC reviewed the following information during Meeting #3:

- A list of actions proposed in the previous mitigation plan, the current State Plan, and approved plans in surrounding counties,
- Key issues from the risk assessments, including the problem statements concluding each hazard profile and vulnerability analysis,
- State priorities established for HMA grants, and
- Public input during meetings, responses to data collection questionnaires, and other efforts to involve the public in the plan development process.

For Meeting #3, individual jurisdictions, including school and special districts, developed final mitigation strategy for submission to the MPC. They were encouraged to review the details of the risk assessment vulnerability analysis specific to their jurisdiction. They were also provided a link to the FEMA's publication, *Mitigation Ideas: A Resource for Reducing Risk to Natural Hazards (January 2013)*. This document was developed by FEMA as a resource for identification of a range of potential mitigation actions for reducing risk to natural hazards and disasters.

The MPC reviewed the actions from the previously approved plan for progress made since the plan had been adopted, using worksheets included in Appendix C of this plan. Prior to Meeting #3, the list of actions for each jurisdiction was emailed to that jurisdiction's MPC representative along with the worksheets. Each jurisdiction was instructed to provide information regarding the "Action Status" with one of the following status choices:

- Completed, with a description of the progress;
- Ongoing, with a description of the progress made to date; or
- Not Yet Started, with a discussion of the reasons for lack of progress.

Additionally, the future inclusion of each mitigation action in the plan update was identified as either keep, delete, or modify. Based on the status updates, there were 3 completed actions, 127 continuing actions (either ongoing or modified), and 50 deleted actions.

Table 4.1 provides a summary of the action statuses for each jurisdiction:

Table 4.1. Action Status Summary

Jurisdiction	Total Number of Existing Mitigation Actions	Completed Actions	Continuing Actions (ongoing or modify)	Deleted Actions
Bell City	18	0	10	8
Bloomfield	18	0	13	5
Dexter	18	0	13	5
Dudley	18	0	10	8
Essex	18	0	13	5
Puxico	18	0	13	5
Unincorporated Stoddard County	18	0	6	12
Advance R-IV	9	2	7	0
Bell City R-II	9	0	9	0
Bernie R-XIII	9	0	9	0
Bloomfield R-XIV	9	1	8	0
Dexter R-XI	9	0	7	2
Puxico R-VIII	9	N/A	N/A	N/A
Richland R-I	9	0	9	
Total	189	3	127	50

N/A – Updated information not available/not provided by jurisdiction and/or school district

Table 4.2 provides a summary of the completed and deleted actions from the previous plan.

Table 4.2. Summary of Completed and Deleted Actions from the Previous Plan

	Completed Actions	Jurisdiction	Completion Details
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms	Advance R-IV	Safe room opened in November 2016
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms	Bloomfield R-XIV	Have safe room
2.5	Identify actions to mitigate effects of flooding	Advance R-IV	Stormwater Drainage plan updated for Campus in November 2016
	Deleted Actions	Jurisdiction	Reason for Deletion
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds.	Unincorporated Stoddard County	County does not have political support for building codes
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms.	Dudley; Unincorporated Stoddard County	Action/effort not applicable to jurisdiction and jurisdictional capabilities
1.3	Host Workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	Bell City	Action/effort not applicable to jurisdiction and jurisdictional capabilities
2.1	Develop design criteria for drainage structures on roads within the county's jurisdiction	Unincorporated Stoddard County	Action suited for Townships and Road Districts
2.2	Implement erosion control measures on all county highway projects.	Bell City; Bloomfield; Dexter; Dudley; Essex; Puxico; Unincorporated Stoddard County	Existing construction requirement; no new effort for action
2.4	Coordinate with USACE on impacts of levee failure.	Bell City; Dudley	Action/effort not applicable to jurisdiction and jurisdictional capabilities
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction.	Unincorporated Stoddard County	County does not have political support for building codes
3.3	Co-sponsor with appropriate school boards and earthquake public awareness programs for local schools.	Unincorporated Stoddard County	County EMA does not have budget to participate.
3.4	Designate an EOC and conduct quarterly exercises.	All	This is the same action as 3.2
4.1	Adopt "best practices" policy in conjunction with the Soil and Water Conservation Commission	Unincorporated Stoddard County	County EMA does not have budget to participate.
4.2	Meet with public electric utility companies to develop "best practices" for power conservation	Unincorporated Stoddard County	County EMA does not have budget to participate.
4.3	Sponsor annual safety meeting for county employees.	Bell City; Bloomfield; Dexter; Dudley; Essex; Puxico	Action/effort not applicable to jurisdiction and jurisdictional capabilities
4.4	Take actions during extreme heat events to safeguard the health of school children.	Bell City; Bloomfield; Dexter; Dudley; Essex; Puxico Unincorporated Stoddard County	Action/effort not applicable to jurisdiction and jurisdictional capabilities
5.1	Create an emergency snow route for county roads.	Bell City; Bloomfield; Dexter; Dudley; Essex; Puxico Unincorporated Stoddard County	Action/effort not applicable to jurisdiction and jurisdictional capabilities; Action suited for Townships and Road Districts
5.2	Meet annually with critical facilities administrators to develop severe weather strategies	Bell City	Action/effort not applicable to jurisdiction and jurisdictional capabilities
5.3	Educate the public utility end user on preventative	Bell City	Action/effort not applicable to jurisdiction and jurisdictional capabilities

	measures to reduce the risk to property.		
--	--	--	--

Source: Previously approved County Hazard Mitigation Plan; Data Collection Questionnaires.

For a comprehensive range of mitigation actions to consider, the jurisdictions were provided relevant information and sources to be used in development of new mitigation actions including:

- Updated Plan Goals
- Previous Actions from 2011 Plan
- Problem Statements from the Risk Assessment
- FEMA's Mitigation Ideas booklet
- State Priorities for Hazard Mitigation Assistance Grants
- Public Opinion from Surveys

To facilitate discussion and ideas on new actions that jurisdictions may want to submit to the plan update, the planning committee reviewed the plan goals that were updated at Meeting #2. Key issues/problem statements for hazards in the risk assessment were also discussed, as well as the actions from the 2011 plan that were identified relative to each hazard. The discussion was geared toward identifying any gaps that may exist between the problems identified and actions already developed to address the problems to develop new actions. To provide consideration of a comprehensive range of alternatives, FEMA's Mitigation Ideas Booklet was also reviewed for additional ideas/alternatives for new actions. After the committee meeting, jurisdictions reviewed the materials to determine final mitigation actions to submit to the plan update.

The jurisdictions were encouraged to be comprehensive and include all appropriate actions to work toward becoming more disaster resistant. They were encouraged to maintain a realistic approach and were reminded that the hazard mitigation plan is a "living document". As capabilities, vulnerabilities, or the nature of hazards that threaten each jurisdiction change, the mitigation actions can and should be updated to reflect those changes, including addition or deletion of actions, as appropriate.

As part of the meeting discussion, jurisdictions were instructed to consider the potential cost of each project in relation to the anticipated future cost savings. This type of discussion allowed the committee as a whole to understand the broad priorities and enable discussion of the types of projects most beneficial to all jurisdictions within Stoddard County.

4.3 Implementation of Mitigation Actions

44 CFR Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): The mitigation strategy shall include an action strategy describing how the actions identified in paragraph (c)(2)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefits review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.

Jurisdictional MPC members were encouraged to meet with others in their community to finalize the actions to be submitted for the updated mitigation strategy. Throughout the MPC consideration and discussion, emphasis was placed on the importance of a benefit-cost analysis in determining project priority. The Disaster Mitigation Act requires benefit-cost review as the primary method by which mitigation projects should be prioritized. The MPC decided to pursue implementation according to when and where damage occurs, available funding, political will, jurisdictional priority, and priorities identified in the 2018 Missouri State Hazard Mitigation Plan. The benefit/cost review at the planning stage primarily consisted of a qualitative analysis and was not the detailed process required grant funding application. For each action, the plan sets forth a narrative describing the types of benefits that could be realized from action implementation. The cost was estimated as closely as possible, with further refinement to be supplied as project development occurs.

FEMA's STAPLEE methodology was used to assess the costs and benefits, overall feasibility of mitigation actions, and other issues impacting project. During the prioritization process, the jurisdictions used worksheets to assign scores. The worksheets posed questions based on the STAPLEE elements as well as the potential mitigation effectiveness of each action. Scores were based on the responses to the questions as follows:

Definitely YES = 3 points
Maybe YES = 2 points
Probably NO = 1 points
Definitely NO = 0 points

The following questions were asked for each proposed action.

- **Social:** Will the action be acceptable to the community? Could it have an unfair effect on a particular segment of the population?
- **Technical:** Is the action technically feasible? Are there secondary impacts? Does it offer a long-term solution?
- **Aministrative:** Are there adequate staffing, funding, and maintenance capabilities to implement the project?
- **Political:** Will there be adequate political and public support for the project?
- **Legal:** Does your jurisdiction have the legal authority to implement the action?
- **Economic:** Is the action cost-beneficial? Is there funding available? Will the action contribute to the local economy?
- **Environmental:** Will there be negative environmental consequences from the action? Does it comply with environmental regulations? Is it consistent with community environmental goals?

Will historic structures be saved or protected?
Could it be implemented quickly?
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?
Will the implanted action result in a reduction of disaster damage?

The final scores are listed below in the analysis of each action. The worksheets are attached to this plan as Appendix C. The STAPLEE final score for each action, absent other considerations, such as a localized need for a project, determined the priority. Low priority action items were those that had a total score of between 0 and 24. Moderate priority actions were those scoring between 25 and 29. High priority actions scored 30 or above. A blank STAPLEE worksheet is shown in Figure 4.1

The mitigation action summary table presenting the summary of continuing and new mitigation actions for each jurisdiction is provided in Table 4.3 and for each school district in Table 4.4. The Action ID for each action has been carried over from the 2011 plan for continuing actions. As a result of completed and deleted actions, the Action ID does not follow a sequential order. New actions were assigned the next sequential Action ID for each jurisdiction. Following the action summary tables, additional details are provided for each continuing and new through action worksheets for each specific jurisdiction. The action worksheets, see Figure 4.2 serves as the action plan describing how each action will be implemented and administered by the local jurisdiction. The final table, Table 4.5 provides the results from the action prioritization.

Figure 4.1. Blank STAPLEE Worksheet

STAPLEE Worksheet		
Name of Jurisdiction:		
Action or Project		
Action/Project Number:	Insert a unique action number for this action for future tracking purposes. This can be a combination of the jurisdiction name, followed by the goal number and action number (i.e. Joplin1.1)	
Name of Action or Project:		
Mitigation Category:	Prevention; Structure and Infrastructure Projects; Natural Systems Protection; Education and Outreach; Emergency Services	
STAPLEE Criteria		Score
Evaluation Rating Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0		
S: Is it Socially Acceptable		
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		
A: Does the jurisdiction have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment ?		
Will historic structures be saved or protected?		
Could it be implemented quickly?		
STAPLEE SCORE		
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	Assign from 5-10 points based on the likelihood that lives will be saved.	
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damages?	Assign from 5-10 points based on the relative reduction of disaster damages.	
MITIGATION EFFECTIVENESS SCORE		
TOTAL SCORE (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)		

<input type="checkbox"/> High Priority (30+ points)	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium Priority (25 - 29 points)	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Priority (<25 points)
---	---	--

Completed by _____
 (Name, Title, Phone Number)

Figure 4.2. Mitigation Action Worksheet

Action Worksheet	
Name of Jurisdiction:	
Risk / Vulnerability	
Hazard(s) Addressed:	List the hazard or hazards that will be addressed by this action
Problem being Mitigated:	Provide a brief description of the problem that the action will address. Utilize the problem statement developed in the risk assessment.
Action or Project	
Applicable Goal Statement:	Choose the goal statement that applies to this action
Action/Project Number:	Insert a unique action number for this action for future tracking purposes. This can be a combination of the jurisdiction name, followed by the goal number and action number (i.e. Joplin1.1)
Name of Action or Project:	
Mitigation Category:	Prevention; Structure and Infrastructure Projects; Natural Systems Protection; Education and Outreach; Emergency Services
Action or Project Description:	Describe the action or project.
Estimated Cost:	Provide an estimate of the cost to implement this action. This can be accomplished with a range of estimated costs.
Benefits:	Provide a narrative describing the losses that will be avoided by implementing this action. If dollar amounts of avoided losses are known, include them as well.
Plan for Implementation	
Responsible Organization/Department:	Which organization will be responsible for tracking this action? Be specific to include the specific department or position within a department.
Supporting Organization/Department:	Which organization/department will assist in implementation of this action?
Action/Project Priority:	Include the STAPLEE score and Priority (H, M, L)
Timeline for Completion:	How many months/years to complete.
Potential Fund Sources:	List specific funding sources that may be used to pay for the implementation of the action.
Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:	
Progress Report	
Action Status:	Indicate status as New, Continuing Not Started, or Continuing in Progress)
Report of Progress:	For Continuing actions only, indicate the report on progress. If the action is not started, indicate any barriers encountered to initiate the action. If the action is in progress, indicate the activity that has occurred to date.

Table 4.3. Mitigation Action Matrix - Jurisdictions

#	Action	Bell City	Bloomfield	Dexter	Dudley	Essex	Puxico	Unincorporated Stoddard County	Mitigation Category	Hazards Addressed	Address Current Development	Address Future Development	Continued Compliance with NFIP
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	X	X	X	X	X	X		Prevention	Tornadoes/Severe Thunderstorm		X	
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms	X	X	X		X	X	X	Structural/Infrastructure	Tornadoes/Severe Thunderstorm	X	X	
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators		X	X	X	X	X	X	Education and Outreach	Tornadoes/Severe Thunderstorm	X	X	
2.1	Develop design criteria for drainage structures on roads within the county's jurisdiction	X	X	X	X	X	X		Prevention	Flood-Related Hazards		X	X
2.2	Implement erosion control measures on all county highway projects								Natural Systems	Flood-Related Hazards	X	X	X
2.3	Continued compliance with, participation in, and implementation of NFIP requirements to reduce flood risks within flood hazard areas by seeking grant funds for flood buyouts, elevation projects, etc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Prevention	Flood-Related Hazards		X	X
2.4	Coordinate with USACE on impacts of levee failure (new action in 2011 Update)		X	X		X	X	X	Prevention	Flood-Related Hazards	X	X	X
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	X	X	X	X	X	X		Prevention	Seismic / Geological Hazards		X	
3.2	Designate an Emergency Operations Center and conduct annual coordination exercises	X	X	X		X	X	X	Emergency Services	Seismic / Geological Hazards	X	X	
3.3	Co-sponsor with appropriate school boards and earthquake public awareness programs for local schools	X	X	X	X	X	X		Education and Outreach	Seismic / Geological Hazards	X	X	
3.4	Designate an EOC and conduct quarterly exercises								Emergency Services	Seismic / Geological Hazards	X	X	
4.1	Adopt "best practices" policy in conjunction with the Soil and Water Conservation Commission	X	X	X	X	X	X		Prevention	Drought/Extreme Temp/Wildfire	X	X	
4.2	Meet with public electric utility companies to develop "best practices" for power conservation	X	X	X	X	X	X		Prevention	Drought/Extreme Temp/Wildfire	X	X	
4.3	Sponsor annual safety meeting for county employees							X	Emergency Services	Drought/Extreme Temp/Wildfire	X	X	
4.4	Take actions during extreme heat events to safeguard the health of school children								Emergency Services	Drought/Extreme Temp/Wildfire	X	X	
5.1	Create an emergency snow route for county roads								Prevention	Severe Winter Weather	X	X	
5.2	Meet annually with critical facilities administrators to develop severe winter weather strategies		X	X	X	X	X	X	Prevention	Severe Winter Weather	X	X	
5.3	Educate the public utility end user on preventive measures to reduce the risk to property		X	X	X	X	X	X	Education and Outreach	Severe Winter Weather	X	X	

Table 4.4. Mitigation Action Matrix – School Districts

#	Action	Advance R-IV	Bell City R-II	Bernie R-XIII	Bloomfield R-XIV	Dexter R-XI	Puxico R-VIII	Richland R-I	Priority	Mitigation Category	Hazards Addressed	Address Current Development	Address Future Development	Continued Compliance with NFIP
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	X	X	X	X		X	X		Prevention	Tornadoes/Severe Thunderstorm		X	
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms		X	X		X	X	X		Structure/Infrastructure	Tornadoes/Severe Thunderstorm	X	X	
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		Education and Outreach	Tornadoes/Severe Thunderstorm	X	X	
2.5	Identify actions to mitigate effects of flooding on school day, such as seeking funds for storm water control, altering bus routes and school schedule to accommodate flooded bus routes, inform parents of effects of school day due to flooding.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		Prevention	Flood-Related Hazards	X	X	X
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	X	X	X	X		X	X		Prevention	Seismic / Geological Hazards		X	
3.4	Designate an EOC and conduct quarterly exercises	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		Emergency Services	Seismic / Geological Hazards	X	X	
3.5	Inform parents of crisis plan and how it affects their students in case of a disaster (new action in 2011 Update)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		Education and Outreach	Seismic / Geological Hazards	X	X	
4.4	Take actions during extreme heat events to safeguard the health of school children	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		Emergency Services	Drought/Extreme Temp/Wildfire	X	X	
5.4	Develop school policies to protect students and staff during severe winter weather, such as meeting with officials to set priorities for snow removal, canceling classes and informing parents when road conditions are dangerous	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		Prevention	Severe Winter Weather	X	X	

Table 4.5. Mitigation Action Prioritization

ID	Mitigation Action	Social	Technical	Administrative	Political	Legal	Economic	Environment	Will Historic Structures be saved or protected?	Could it be implemented quickly?	Will lives be saved?	Will implementation result in a reduction of disaster damages?	Score	Priority
		YES (3); Maybe YES (2); Maybe NO (1); NO (0)								Assign 5-10 points				
BELL CITY														
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	3	3	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	8	5	23	Low
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	0	0	7	5	28	Medium
2.1	Develop design criteria for drainage structures on roads within the county's jurisdiction	2	2	1	2	2	0	3	0	2	6	8	28	Medium
2.3	Continued compliance with, participation in, and implementation of NFIP requirements to reduce flood risks within flood hazard areas by seeking grant funds for flood buyouts, elevation projects, etc.	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	8	8	40	High
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	0	0	7	7	26	Medium
3.2	Designate an Emergency Operations Center and conduct annual coordination exercises	3	2	2	3	0	2	3	1	1	5	5	27	Medium
3.3	Co-sponsor with appropriate school boards and earthquake public awareness programs for local schools	3	3	2	2	0	1	2	0	2	8	8	31	High
4.1	Adopt "best practices" policy in conjunction with the Soil and Water Conservation Commission	3	2	1	2	0	1	2	1	1	5	5	23	Low
4.2	Meet with public electric utility companies to develop "best practices" for power conservation	3	3	2	2	1	3	2	0	2	5	5	28	Medium
BLOOMFIELD														
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	6	6	37	High
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	6	6	28	Medium
2.1	Develop design criteria for drainage structures on roads within the county's jurisdiction	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	1	1	6	6	28	Medium
2.3	Continued compliance with, participation in, and implementation of NFIP requirements to reduce flood risks within flood hazard areas by seeking grant funds for flood buyouts, elevation projects, etc.	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	6	6	36	High
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	6	6	35	High
3.3	Co-sponsor with appropriate school boards and earthquake public awareness programs for local schools	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	6	6	33	High
4.1	Adopt "best practices" policy in conjunction with the Soil and Water Conservation Commission	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	6	6	28	Medium
4.2	Meet with public electric utility companies to develop "best practices" for power conservation	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	6	6	29	Medium
DEXTER														
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	3	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	7	6	24	Low
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	0	6	6	25	Medium
2.3	Continued compliance with, participation in, and implementation of NFIP requirements to reduce flood risks within flood hazard areas by seeking grant funds for flood buyouts, elevation projects, etc.	3	3	3	3	1	2	2	1	3	3	7	31	High
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	2	2	3	2	1	1	0	0	2	4	7	24	Low
3.3	Co-sponsor with appropriate school boards and earthquake public awareness programs for local schools	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	0	3	7	7	26	Medium
4.1	Adopt "best practices" policy in conjunction with the Soil and Water Conservation Commission	2	2	3	2	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	17	Low
4.2	Meet with public electric utility companies to develop "best practices" for power conservation	2	2	3	3	0	2	3	0	3	5	3	26	Medium
ESSEX														
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	10	10	46	High
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	10	10	44	High

ID	Mitigation Action	Social	Technical	Administrative	Political	Legal	Economic	Environment	Will Historic Structures be saved or protected?	Could it be implemented quickly?	Will lives be saved?	Will implementation result in a reduction of disaster damages?	Score	Priority
		YES (3); Maybe YES (2); Maybe NO (1); NO (0)									Assign 5-10 points			
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	10	10	46	High
2.1	Develop design criteria for drainage structures on roads within the county's jurisdiction	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	7	6	38	High
2.3	Continued compliance with, participation in, and implementation of NFIP requirements to reduce flood risks within flood hazard areas by seeking grant funds for flood buyouts, elevation projects, etc.	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	6	6	36	High
2.4	Coordinate with USACE on impacts of levee failure (new action in 2011 Update)	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	7	7	40	High
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	8	8	42	High
3.2	Designate an Emergency Operations Center and conduct annual coordination exercises	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	8	8	42	High
3.3	Co-sponsor with appropriate school boards and earthquake public awareness programs for local schools	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	8	8	42	High
4.1	Adopt "best practices" policy in conjunction with the Soil and Water Conservation Commission	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	37	High
4.2	Meet with public electric utility companies to develop "best practices" for power conservation	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	37	High
5.2	Meet annually with critical facilities administrators to develop severe winter weather strategies	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	7	6	39	High
5.3	Educate the public utility end user on preventive measures to reduce the risk to property	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	5	5	37	High
PUXICO														
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	6	6	27	Medium
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	6	6	25	Medium
2.1	Develop design criteria for drainage structures on roads within the county's jurisdiction	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	6	6	23	Low
2.3	Continued compliance with, participation in, and implementation of NFIP requirements to reduce flood risks within flood hazard areas by seeking grant funds for flood buyouts, elevation projects, etc.	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	6	6	36	High
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	6	6	23	Low
3.3	Co-sponsor with appropriate school boards and earthquake public awareness programs for local schools	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	6	6	28	Medium
4.1	Adopt "best practices" policy in conjunction with the Soil and Water Conservation Commission	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	6	6	23	Low
4.2	Meet with public electric utility companies to develop "best practices" for power conservation	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	6	6	22	Low
UNINCORPORATED STODDARD COUNTY														
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	2	2	1	2	0	1	2	0	2	6	6	24	Low
2.3	Continued compliance with, participation in, and implementation of NFIP requirements to reduce flood risks within flood hazard areas by seeking grant funds for flood buyouts, elevation projects, etc.	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	6	6	36	High
2.4	Coordinate with USACE on impacts of levee failure (new action in 2011 Update)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	6	6	30	High
3.2	Designate an Emergency Operations Center and conduct annual coordination exercises	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	0	1	6	6	23	Low
4.3	Sponsor annual safety meeting for county employees	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	6	6	21	Low
5.2	Meet annually with critical facilities administrators to develop severe winter weather strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	12	Low
5.3	Educate the public utility end user on preventive measures to reduce the risk to property	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	14	Low
ADVANCE R-IV														
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	3	2	1	3	0	1	2	2	2	10	10	36	High
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	1	0	10	5	34	High
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	7	5	27	Medium

ID	Mitigation Action	Social	Technical	Administrative	Political	Legal	Economic	Environment	Will Historic Structures be saved or protected?	Could it be implemented quickly?	Will lives be saved?	Will implementation result in a reduction of disaster damages?	Score	Priority
		YES (3); Maybe YES (2); Maybe NO (1); NO (0)									Assign 5-10 points			
2.5	Identify actions to mitigate effects of flooding on school day, such as seeking funds for storm water control, altering bus routes and school schedule to accommodate flooded bus routes, inform parents of effects of school day due to flooding.	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	5	5	25	Medium
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	2	2	0	2	2	1	2	1	1	5	5	23	Low
3.2	Designate an Emergency Operations Center and conduct annual coordination exercises	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	7	5	28	Medium
3.5	Inform parents of crisis plan and how it affects their students in case of a disaster (new action in 2011 Update)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	8	5	30	High
4.4	Take actions during extreme heat events to safeguard the health of school children	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	6	5	26	Medium
5.4	Develop school policies to protect students and staff during severe winter weather, such as meeting with officials to set priorities for snow removal, canceling classes and informing parents when road conditions are dangerous	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	8	6	32	High
BERNIE R-XIII														
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	0	8	5	34	High
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	0	10	5	32	High
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	0	5	5	27	Medium
2.5	Identify actions to mitigate effects of flooding on school day, such as seeking funds for storm water control, altering bus routes and school schedule to accommodate flooded bus routes, inform parents of effects of school day due to flooding.	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	1	0	5	5	21	Low
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	3	3	2	3	2	1	2	2	1	9	9	37	High
3.2	Designate an Emergency Operations Center and conduct annual coordination exercises	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	7	5	33	High
3.5	Inform parents of crisis plan and how it affects their students in case of a disaster (new action in 2011 Update)	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	0	2	6	5	33	High
4.4	Take actions during extreme heat events to safeguard the health of school children	3	3	3	3	3	0	2	0	1	6	5	29	Medium
5.4	Develop school policies to protect students and staff during severe winter weather, such as meeting with officials to set priorities for snow removal, canceling classes and informing parents when road conditions are dangerous	3	3	3	3	3	0	2	0	1	6	5	29	Medium
DEXTER R-XI														
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	10	5	34	High
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	10	5	32	High
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	3	3	3	2	3	1	2	1	2	10	5	35	High
2.5	Identify actions to mitigate effects of flooding on school day, such as seeking funds for storm water control, altering bus routes and school schedule to accommodate flooded bus routes, inform parents of effects of school day due to flooding.	3	3	3	2	3	1	2	1	2	10	5	35	High
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	3	3	3	2	3	1	2	1	2	10	5	35	High
3.2	Designate an Emergency Operations Center and conduct annual coordination exercises	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	10	5	37	High
3.5	Inform parents of crisis plan and how it affects their students in case of a disaster (new action in 2011 Update)	2	2	3	2	3	1	2	1	2	10	5	34	High
4.4	Take actions during extreme heat events to safeguard the health of school children	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	10	5	37	High
5.4	Develop school policies to protect students and staff during severe winter weather, such as meeting with officials to set priorities for snow removal, canceling classes and informing parents when road conditions are dangerous	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	1	2	10	5	36	High
RICHLAND R-I														
1.1	Encourage construction codes on new buildings to withstand high winds and possible F1 tornado	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	10	10	47	High
1.2	Seek grant funds for construction of safe rooms	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	10	10	47	High

ID	Mitigation Action	Social	Technical	Administrative	Political	Legal	Economic	Environment	Will Historic Structures be saved or protected?	Could it be implemented quickly?	Will lives be saved?	Will implementation result in a reduction of disaster damages?	Score	Priority
		YES (3); Maybe YES (2); Maybe NO (1); NO (0)								Assign 5-10 points				
1.3	Host workshops annually for business owners and public facilities administrators	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	10	10	47	High
2.5	Identify actions to mitigate effects of flooding on school day, such as seeking funds for storm water control, altering bus routes and school schedule to accommodate flooded bus routes, inform parents of effects of school day due to flooding.	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	10	10	47	High
3.1	Consider BOCA seismic design building codes for future construction	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	10	10	47	High
3.2	Designate an Emergency Operations Center and conduct annual coordination exercises	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	10	10	47	High
3.5	Inform parents of crisis plan and how it affects their students in case of a disaster (new action in 2011 Update)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	10	10	47	High
4.4	Take actions during extreme heat events to safeguard the health of school children	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	10	10	47	High
5.4	Develop school policies to protect students and staff during severe winter weather, such as meeting with officials to set priorities for snow removal, canceling classes and informing parents when road conditions are dangerous	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	10	10	47	High

Action Worksheet	
Name of Jurisdiction:	In Progress. To be completed 12/17
Risk / Vulnerability	
Hazard(s) Addressed:	
Problem being Mitigated:	
Action or Project	
Applicable Goal Statement:	
Action/Project Number:	
Name of Action or Project:	
Mitigation Category:	
Action or Project Description:	
Estimated Cost:	
Benefits:	
Plan for Implementation	
Responsible Organization/Department:	
Supporting Organization/Department:	
Action/Project Priority:	
Timeline for Completion:	
Potential Fund Sources:	
Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:	
Progress Report	
Action Status:	
Report of Progress:	

