

# Appendix J – STAPLEE Action Evaluation Table

**Appendix**  
**Evaluation Criteria for Mitigation Activities Using the STAPLEE Method**  
**(Goals, Objectives, and Actions)**

---

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR MITIGATION ACTIVITY (Goals, Objectives, Actions)**

The following discussion explains each of the STAPLEE evaluation criteria. It includes examples of questions the planning team should consider, as well as who may be the appropriate person or agency to answer these questions as the team works through the list of alternative mitigation actions.

**SOCIAL** - The public must support the overall implementation strategy and specific mitigation actions. Therefore, the projects will have to be evaluated in terms of community acceptance by asking questions such as:

- Will the proposed action adversely affect one segment of the population?
- Will the action disrupt established neighborhoods, break up voting districts, or cause the relocation of lower income people?
- Is the action compatible with present and future community values?
- If the community is a tribal entity, will the actions adversely affect cultural values or resources?

**TECHNICAL** - It is important to determine if the proposed action is technically feasible, will help to reduce losses in the long term, and has minimal secondary impacts. Here, you will determine whether the alternative action is a whole or partial solution, or not a solution at all, by considering the following types of issues:

- How effective is the action in avoiding or reducing future losses? If the proposed action involves upgrading culverts and storm drains to handle a 10-year storm event, and the objective is to reduce the potential impacts of a catastrophic flood, the proposed mitigation cannot be considered effective. Conversely, if the objective were to reduce the adverse impacts of frequent flooding events, the same action would certainly meet the technical feasibility criterion.
- Will it create more problems than it solves?
- Does it solve the problem or only a symptom?

**ADMINISTRATIVE** - Under this part of the evaluation criteria, you will examine the anticipated staffing, funding, and maintenance requirements for the mitigation action to determine if the jurisdiction has the personnel and administrative capabilities necessary to implement the action or whether outside help will be necessary.

- Does the jurisdiction have the capability (staff, technical experts, and/or funding) to implement the action, or can it be readily obtained?
- Can the community provide the necessary maintenance?
- Can it be accomplished in a timely manner?

**POLITICAL** - Understanding how your current community and state political leadership feels about issues related to the environment, economic development, safety, and emergency management will provide valuable insight into the level of political support you will have for mitigation activities and programs. Proposed mitigation objectives sometimes fail because of a lack of political acceptability. This can be avoided by determining:

- Is there political support to implement and maintain this action?
- Have political leaders participated in the planning process so far?
- Is there a local champion willing to help see the action to completion?
- Who are the stakeholders in this proposed action?
- Is there enough public support to ensure the success of the action?
- Have all of the stakeholders been offered an opportunity to participate in the planning process?
- How can the mitigation objectives be accomplished at the lowest —cost|| to the public?

**LEGAL** - Without the appropriate legal authority, the action cannot lawfully be undertaken. When considering this criterion, you will determine whether your jurisdiction has the legal authority at the state, tribal, or local level to implement the action, or whether the jurisdiction must pass new laws or regulations. Each level of government operates under a specific source of delegated authority. As a general rule, most local governments operate under enabling legislation that gives them the power to engage in different activities. You should identify the unit of government undertaking the mitigation action, and include an analysis of the interrelationships between local, regional, state, and federal governments. Legal authority is likely to have a significant role later in the process when your state, tribe, or community will have to determine how mitigation activities can best be carried out, and to what extent mitigation policies and programs can be enforced.

- Does the state, tribe, or community have the authority to implement the proposed action?
- Is there a technical, scientific, or legal basis for the mitigation action (i.e., does the mitigation action —fit|| the hazard setting)?
- Are the proper laws, ordinances, and resolutions in place to implement the action?
- Are there any potential legal consequences?
- Will the community be liable for the actions or support of actions, or lack of action?
- Is the action likely to be challenged by stakeholders who may be negatively affected?

**ECONOMIC** - Every local, state, and tribal government experiences budget constraints at one time or another. Cost-effective mitigation actions that can be funded in current or upcoming budget cycles are much more likely to be implemented than mitigation actions requiring general obligation bonds or other instruments that would incur long-term debt to a community. States and local communities with tight budgets or budget shortfalls may be more willing to undertake a mitigation initiative if it can be funded, at least in part, by outside sources. —Big ticket|| mitigation actions, such as large-scale acquisition and relocation, are often considered for implementation in a post-disaster scenario when additional federal and state funding for mitigation is available. Economic considerations must include the present economic base and projected growth and should be based on answers to questions such as:

- Are there currently sources of funds that can be used to implement the action?
- What benefits will the action provide?
- Does the cost seem reasonable for the size of the problem and likely benefits?
- What burden will be placed on the tax base or local economy to implement this action?
- Does the action contribute to other community economic goals, such as capital improvements or economic development?
- What proposed actions should be considered but be —tabled|| for implementation until outside sources of funding are available?

**ENVIRONMENTAL** - Impact on the environment is an important consideration because of public desire for sustainable and environmentally healthy communities and the many statutory considerations, such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to keep in mind when using federal funds. You will need to evaluate whether, when implementing mitigation actions, there would be negative consequences to environmental assets such as threatened and endangered species, wetlands, and other protected natural resources.

- How will this action affect the environment ( land, water, endangered species)?
- Will this action comply with local, state, and federal environmental laws or regulations?
- Is the action consistent with community environmental goals?
- Numerous mitigation actions may well have beneficial impacts on the environment. For instance, acquisition and relocation of structures out of the floodplain, sediment and erosion control actions, and stream corridor and wetland restoration projects all help restore the natural function of the floodplain. Also, vegetation management in areas susceptible to wildfires can greatly reduce the potential for large wildfires that would be damaging to the community and the environment. Such mitigation actions benefit the environment while creating sustainable communities that are more resilient to disasters.

# STAPLEE ACTION EVALUATION TABLE

		Alternative Actions	STAPLEE Criteria Considerations																	plus	minus	score							
			+ Favorable - Less Favorable N Not Applicable																										
			S	T	A	P	L	E			E																		
			(Social)	(Technical)	(Administrative)	(Political)	(Legal)	(Economic)			(Environmental)																		
Community Acceptance Effect on Segment	Technically Feasible Long-Term Solution Secondary Impacts	Staffing Funding Allocation Maintenance/Operations	Political Support Local Champion Public Support	State Authority Existing Local Authority Potential Legal Challenge	Benefit of Action Cost Benefit of Action Contribute to Economic Goals Outside Funding Required	Effect on Land/Water Effects Endangered Species Effects HAZMAT/Waste Site Consistent with Community Environmental Goals Consistent with Federal Law																							
Winter Storm	A1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	-	N	+	N	+	+	+	11	5	54.55%
	A1.2	Driver Education Safety Strategies	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	N	N	N	+	+	+	13	3	76.92%
	A1.3	Public awareness announcement development	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	N	+	N	N	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	13	3	76.92%
	A1.4	Town of Coldspring, rock work, ditches, banks cut	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	N	+	N	N	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	13	3	76.92%
	A2.1	Critical Facilities Emergency Communication Improve	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	N	+	N	N	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	12	4	66.67%
Flooding	B1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	-	+	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	+	12	5	58.33%
	B1.2	Education on "Smart Growth" in floodplain	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	12	7	41.67%
	B1.3	Research early warning systems	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	12	5	58.33%
	B1.4	Support Flood Risk Mgmt Study Gowanda	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	N	+	+	+	-	+	+	N	+	+	+	19	2	89.47%
	B1.5	Support Feasibility study Gowanda	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	N	+	+	+	-	+	+	N	+	+	+	19	2	89.47%
	B1.6	Village of Delevan, under drain study Delevan Ave	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B1.7	Town of Allegany, adequate emergency centers	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	17	4	76.47%
	B2.1	Identify repetitively damaged infrastructure	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	17	4	76.47%
	B2.2	Town of Ashford, Ahrens Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	15	5	66.67%
	B2.3	Town of Mansfield, Erdman Hill Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.4	Town of New Albion, Waverly St	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.5	Town of New Albion, Linlyco Lake overflow	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.6	Town of Otto, Colvin Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.7	Town of Otto, Traffic Street	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.8	Town of Otto, North Otto Rd, drain on private property	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	N	-	+	-	N	N	+	+	10	10	0.00%
	B2.9	Town of Perrysburg east/west roads	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.10	Town of Persia, Hawkins Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.11	Village of Little Valley, Fourth St	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.12	Village of Little Valley, Winship Ave	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.13	Village of Little Valley, Thompson Ave	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.14	Town of Perrysburg explore alt methods for runoff	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.15	Training for Code Enforcement Officers	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	N	N	N	+	+	+	13	3	76.92%
	B2.16	Town of Ischua, Baxter Mill	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.17	Town of Olean, Back Hinsdale & E.River Rd.	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.18	Village of Allegany, 7th Street	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.19	Town of Hinsdale, Emerson Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.20	Town of S.Valley, Lt Bone Rn, Birch Dr, Pierce Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.21	Village of Portville, Brooklyn St.	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.22	Village of Franklinville, Lyndon Center Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.23	Replace/improve culverts/drainage CR5,CR6,CR60,CR19,CR24,CR12,CR14,CR75	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	17	5	70.59%
	B2.24	Town of Little Valley, 4th Street	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	17	5	70.59%
B2.25	Town of Farmersville, Bush Hill Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%	
B2.26	Town of Freedom, Edmunds Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%	
B2.27	Town of Lyndon, Livingston Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%	
B2.28	Village of South Dayton, drainage	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	13	8	38.46%	
B2.29	Town of Great Valley, study of undersized culverts	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%	
B2.30	City of Olean, hydraulic study of under drains	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%	
B2.31	Town of Red House, hydraulic study of culverts	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%	

# STAPLEE ACTION EVALUATION TABLE

Alternative Actions		STAPLEE Criteria Considerations																				plus	minus	score					
		+ Favorable - Less Favorable N Not Applicable																											
		S	T	A	P	L	E				E																		
		(Social)	(Technical)	(Administrative)	(Political)	(Legal)	(Economic)				(Environmental)																		
Community Acceptance Effect on Segment	Technically Feasible Long-Term Solution Secondary Impacts	Staffing Funding Allocation Maintenance/Operations	Political Support Local Champion Public Support	State Authority Existing Local Authority Potential Legal Challenge	Benefit of Action Cost Benefit of Action Contribute to Economic Goals Outside Funding Required	Effect on Land/Water	Effects Endangered Species	Effects HAZMAT/Waste Site	Consistent with Community Environmental Goals	Consistent with Federal Law																			
B2.32	City of Salamanca, drainage study Wildwood Ave	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%	
	Town of Conewango, drainage improvements on Swamp and Brown Rds	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%	
	B3.1	Identify Stream Stabilization Projects	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.2	Town of Humphrey, Morgan Hollow Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.3	Town of Otto, diversion ditch North Otto Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.4	Town of Otto, diversion ditch South Hill Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.5	Town of Mansfield, Baase Rd - beaver dam	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.6	Town of New Albion, Gowin Gulf Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.7	Town of New Albion, Maple Hill Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.8	Town of New Albion, Ingersoll Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.9	Town of New Albion, Skinner Hollow Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.10	Town of New Albion, Waite Hollow Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.11	Town of Perrysburg, Prospect St.	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.12	Town of Leon, Frog Valley Rd.	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.13	Town of Salamanca, W.Bucktooth Run Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.14	Town of Napoli, Narrows Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.15	Town of Franklinville, Morgan Valley/Claire Valley	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.16	County Road 32 in Ashford Triangle	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	16	6	62.50%
	B3.17	Town of Machias, Bear Creek	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B4.1	Plan to Clean Debris/Potential Debris from Creeks	+	+	+	N	+	-	-	-	N	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	12	7	41.67%
B4.2	Town of New Ablion - Maple Hill Rd	+	+	+	N	+	-	-	-	N	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	12	7	41.67%	
B4.3	Town of Randolph Little Conewango/Battle Creek	+	+	+	N	+	-	-	-	N	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	12	7	41.67%	
B5.1	Identify repetitively damaged properties	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	N	+	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	15	5	66.67%	
B5.2	Seek funding to acquire repetitively damaged property	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	N	+	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	N	+	+	13	6	53.85%	
Severe Storm	C1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	N	N	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	+	N	11	4	63.64%	
	C1.2	Investigate Tree Maintenance Program	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	14	5	64.29%	
	C1.3	Investigate measures to protect infrastructure	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	14	5	64.29%	
	C1.4	Town of Humphrey, Morgan Hollow Bridge Repair, upper stream bank severely washed out from previous years storms	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	+	+	15	5	66.67%	
	C1.5	Town of Humphrey, South Cooper Hill repair	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	-	+	+	15	6	60.00%	
	C1.6	Training for Code Enforcement Officers	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	N	N	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	+	+	12	4	66.67%	
Ice Storm	D1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	10	4	60.00%	
	D1.2	Town of Allegany, remove ROW obstructions	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	N	N	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	12	3	75.00%	
	D2.1	Identify list of at risk utility lines	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	10	4	60.00%	
	D2.2	Create Tree Maintenance Program	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	12	4	66.67%	
	D2.3	Identify historic icy pavement sites	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	N	N	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	N	+	12	5	58.33%	
	D2.4	Town of Otto, Dake Hill vertical alignment	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	N	N	+	-	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	11	5	54.55%	
D2.5	Provide guide to emergency services	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	N	N	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	N	+	12	5	58.33%		

# STAPLEE ACTION EVALUATION TABLE

		Alternative Actions	STAPLEE Criteria Considerations																					plus	minus	score			
			+ Favorable - Less Favorable N Not Applicable																										
			S	T	A			P			L			E			E												
			(Social)	(Technical)	(Administrative)			(Political)			(Legal)			(Economic)			(Environmental)												
Community Acceptance Effect on Segment	Technically Feasible Long-Term Solution Secondary Impacts	Staffing	Funding Allocation	Maintenance/Operations	Political Support	Local Champion	Public Support	State Authority	Existing Local Authority	Potential Legal Challenge	Benefit of Action	Cost Benefit of Action	Contribute to Economic Goals	Outside Funding Required	Effect on Land/Water	Effects Endangered Species	Effects HAZMAT/Waste Site	Consistent with Community Environmental Goals	Consistent with Federal Law										
Tornado	E1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	11	4	63.64%	
	E1.2	Listing of Emergency Shelters and preparedness resources and needs	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	11	4	63.64%	
	E1.3	Develop revers 911 database for early warning	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	13	4	69.23%	
	E1.4	Develop building codes	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	13	4	69.23%	
	E2.1	Plan to remove debris from waterways after Tornado	N	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	N	N	+	10	6	40.00%
	E2.2	Support the enforcement of Building Codes	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	11	4	63.64%	
Wildfire	F1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	11	4	63.64%	
	F1.2	Increase media coverage	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	11	4	63.64%	
	F1.3	Increase enforcement of open burning laws	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	11	4	63.64%	
	F2.1	ID water resources/dry hydrants existing and propose	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	13	4	69.23%	
	F2.2	ID proposed future dry hydrant sites	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	13	4	69.23%	
	F2.3	Listing of Equipment resources and needs	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	13	4	69.23%	
	F2.4	Town/Village Ellicottville water retention reservoir	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	N	+	14	4	71.43%	
Landslides	G1.1	Continuous Public Education	N	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	9	4	55.56%	
	G1.2	ID vulnerable structures	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	11	4	63.64%	
	G1.3	Acquire vulnerable structures	N	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	N	+	11	5	54.55%	
	G1.4	Enforce "Smart Growth" practices	N	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	9	8	11.11%	
	G1.5	Town of Mansfield, Hollister Hill replace pipe/undrmn	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	N	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	14	6	57.14%	
	G1.6	Towns New Albion/Otto/Mansfield - Skinner Hollow	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	N	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	14	6	57.14%	
	G1.7	Village of Cattaraugus	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	N	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	14	6	57.14%	
	G1.8	Towns of Ashford, East Otto, Otto - Cattaraugus Cr	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	N	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	14	6	57.14%	
	G1.9	Town of Portville near Allegheny River	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	N	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	14	6	57.14%	
	G1.10	Town of Otto, Dunkleman Hill	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	N	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	14	6	57.14%	
	G1.11	Town of Mansfield, Hollister Hill	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	N	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	13	7	46.15%	
	G1.12	Town of Persia, Gowanda water reservoir/Pt. Peter	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	N	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	13	7	46.15%	
	G1.14	County Roads 21 and 76	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	17	5	70.59%	
	G1.15	Town of Yorkshire,properties Cattaraugus Creek	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	14	7	50.00%	
G1.13	Town of Carrollton, Parkside Dr.	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	N	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	13	7	46.15%		
Dam Failure	H1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	+	N	+	N	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	N	+	12	4	66.67%	
	H1.2	Prepare and update Emergency Action Plans	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	14	4	71.43%	
	H1.3	Update maintenance and repair program	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	N	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	N	+	13	6	53.85%
	H1.4	Seek funding for inundation mapping/plan updates	N	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	N	N	N	+	9	7	22.22%
	H1.5	Conduct Emergency Drills	N	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+	N	+	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	11	4	63.64%



Partner Projects		Mitigation Strategy Category	"X" - Indicates Participation Commitment																																	** Cost: H >100K, M >25K AND <100k, L < 25K																					
			Cities			Towns																	Villages									Priority (H-high, M-medium, L-low)	Responsible Parties, Lead/Support	Cost (H-High, M-Moderate, N-Nominal) & Funding Source	Time Frame																						
			Cattaraugus County	Olean	Salamanca	Allegany	Ashford	Carrollton	Coldspring	Conewango	Dayton	East Otto	Ellicottville	Farmersville	Franklinville	Freedom	Great Valley	Hinsdale	Humphrey	Ischua	Leon	Little Valley	Lyndon	Machias	Mansfield	Napoli	New Albion	Olean	Otto	Perrysburg	Persia					Portville	Randolph	Red House	Salamanca	South Valley	Yokshire	Allegany	Cattaraugus	Delevan	Ellicottville	Franklinville	Gowanda	Limestone	Little Valley	Portville	South Dayton						
Severe Storms	C1.1	Continuous Public Education	Education	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	H	Co.Plann	N	General	< 2 yrs							
	C1.2	Investigate Tree Maintenance Program	Prevention	x																																												M	Co.DPW	M	General	<5 yrs					
	C1.3	Investigate protection of bridges/culverts from scour	Prevention	x																																													M	Co.DPW	N	General	<10 yrs				
	C1.4	Town of Humphrey, Morgan Hollow Bridge Repair, upper stream bank severely washed out from previous years storms	Structural Project																																															H	T.Humphrey	H	Grant	< 5 yrs			
	C1.5	Town of Humphrey, South Cooper Hill Rd	Structural Project																																														H	T.Humphrey	H	Grant	< 5 yrs				
	C1.6	Training for Code Enforcement Officers	Education	x																																													H	Co.DPW	N	General	<5 yrs				
Ice Storm	D1.1	Continuous Public Education	Education	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	H	Co.Plann	N	General	< 2 yrs					
	D1.2	Town of Allegany, remove ROW obstructions	Structural Project				x																																											L	T.Allegany	N	Grant	< 5 yrs			
	D2.1	Identify list of at risk utility lines	Emergency Svcs	x																																														M	Co.E.S.	N	General	< 2 yrs			
	D2.2	Create Tree Maintenance Program	Emergency Svcs	x																																													M	Co.DPW	M	General	< 5 yrs				
	D2.3	Identify historic icy pavement sites	Prevention	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		L	Co.DPW	N	General	< 5yrs				
	D2.4	Town of Otto, Dake Hill vertical alignment	Structural Project																																																L	T.Otto	M	Grant	< 10 yrs		
D2.5	Provide guide to emergency services	E	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		L	Co. E.S.	N	General	<5 yrs					
Tornado	E1.1	Continuous Public Education	Education	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	H	Co.Plann	N	General	< 2 yrs				
	E1.2	Listing of Emergency Shelters and preparedness resources and needs	Emergency Svcs	x																																															M	Co.E.S.	N	General	< 2 yrs		
	E1.3	Develop revers 911 database for early warning	Emergency Svcs	x																																															M	Co.Sheriff	N	General	< 5 yrs		
	E1.4	Develop building codes	Prevention	x																																															M	Co. DPW	N	General	< 5yrs		
	E2.1	Long term plan to remove debris from waterways	Prevention	x																																														M	Catt.Co	N	General	< 5 yrs			
	E2.2	Support Enforcement of Building Codes	Prevention	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		M	Co.DPW	N	General	< 5 yrs			
Wildfire	F1.1	Continuous Public Education	Education	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	H	County Plann	N	General	< 2 yrs				
	F1.2	Increase media coverage	Emergency Svcs	x																																																H	Emergency Servcs	N	General	< 5 yrs	
	F1.3	Increase enforcement of open burning laws	Prevention	x																																																M	Emergency Servcs	N	General	< 5 yrs	
	F2.1	ID water resources/dry hydrants existing and proposed	Prevention	x																																															M	Emergency Servcs	N	General	< 5 yrs		
	F2.2	ID proposed future dry hydrant sites	Prevention	x																																															M	Emergency Servcs	N	General	< 5 yrs		
	F2.3	Listing of Equipment resources and needs	Emergency Svcs	x																																															M	Emergency Servcs	N	General	< 5 yrs		
F2.4	Town/Village water retention reservoir study	Structural Project																																																M	Town/Vill Ellicottville	N	Grant	< 10 yrs			
Landslide	G1.1	Continuous Public Education	Education	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	H	County Plann	N	General	< 2 yrs					
	G1.2	ID vulnerable structures	Emergency Svcs	x																																															M	Catt.Co	N	General	< 5 yrs		
	G1.3	Acquire vulnerable structures	Prevention	x																																																M	Catt.Co	H	Grant	< 10 yrs	
	G1.4	Enforce "Smart Growth" practices	Prevention	x																																																H	County Plann	N	General	< 5 yrs	
	G1.5	Town of Mansfield, Hollister Hill replace pipe/undrmn	Structural Project																																																H	T.Mansfield	M	Grant	< 5 yrs		
	G1.6	Towns New Albion/Otto/Mansfield - Skinner Hollow	Structural Project																																																H	T.NewAlb/Man	H	Grant	< 5 yrs		
	G1.7	Study slide conditions in Village of Cattaraugus	Prevention																																																H	V.Cattaraugus	H	Grant	< 5 yrs		
	G1.8	Study Towns of Ashford, East Otto, Otto - Catt. Cr	Prevention				x																																											H	T.Ash/Eotto/Otto	H	Grant	< 5 yrs			
	G1.9	Study slide Town of Portville near Allegheny River	Prevention																																															H	T.Portville	H	Grant	< 5 yrs			
	G1.10	Study slide Town of Otto, Dunklema Hill Rd	Prevention																																															H	T.Otto	H	Grant	< 5 yrs			
	G1.11	Study slide Town of Mansfield, Hollister Hill	Prevention																																																H	T.Mansfield	H	Grant	< 5 yrs		
	G1.12	Study slideTown of Persia, Gowanda water reservoir/P	Prevention																																															H	T.Persia	H	Grant	< 5 yrs			
	G1.14	Stabilize slides on county roads 21 and 76	Structural Project	x																																														H	Catt.Co	H	Grant	< 5 yrs			
G1.15	Town of Yorkshire, list of properties along Catt. Crk	Prevention																																															L	T.Yorkshire	N	General	< 5 yrs				
G1.13	Study slide conditions Town of Carrollton, Parkside Dr	Prevention																																																H	T.Carrollton	H	Grant	< 5 yrs			
Dam Failure	H1.1	Continuous Public Education	Education	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	H	Co.Plann	N	General	< 2 yrs				
	H1.2	Prepare and update Emergency Action Plans	Emergency Svcs	x																																																	M	Co.E.S.	N	General	< 5 yrs