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 postdisaster 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.

		STA	۱P	LE	E/	40	TI	ON	IEV	'AL	.UA	١T	0	I T	٩B	LE												
											STA	PLE	E Cri	teria C	Cons	idera	ation	s										
		Alternative Actions							+	Favo	rable	- L	_ess	Favora	able	N	Not A	pplicab	le									
		Alternative Actions		S		Т			А			Р			L			Е					Е					
			(So	cial)	(T	ech	nical)	(A	dministr	ative)	(P	olitic	al)	(L	egal)	(Econor			•		nmei					
			Community Acceptance	Effect on Segment	Technically Feasible		Long-Term Solution Secondary Impacts	γ Γ	starring Funding Allocation	Maintenance/Operations	Political Support	Local Champion	Public Support		Existing Local Authority	Potential Legal Challenge	Benefit of Action	Cost Benefit of Action	Contribute to Economic Goa	Outsic		Effects Endangered Spe	Effects HAZM/ Consistent with	Environmental Goals	Consistant with Federal Law	plus	minus	cucco
E	A1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	Ν	Ν	-			Ν	+	+ +	-	Ν	+	N			+	11	5	54.55%
tor	A1.2	Driver Education Safety Strategies	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	Ν	+			Ν	+	+ +	+		N	N			+	13	3	76.92%
S	A1.3	Public awareness announcement development	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	Ν	+	N I	N	Ν	+	+ +	-	Ν	N	Ν	+	-	+	13	3	76.92%
Winter Storm	A1.4	Town of Coldspring, rock work, ditches, banks cut	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	Ν	+	N I	N	Ν	+	+ +	-	N	N	N	+		+	13	3	76.92%
Ň	A2.1	Critical Facilities Emergency Communication Improve	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	Ν	+	N I	N	Ν	+	+ +	-	Ν	Ν	N	+		+	12	4	66.67%
	B1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	Ν	Ν	-	+ •	+	Ν	+	+ +	-	N	N	Ν	+		+	12	5	58.33%
	B1.2	Education on "Smart Growth" in floodplain	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	Ν	Ν	-	+ •	+	-	+	+ +	-	+	N	N	+		+	12	7	41.67%
	B1.3	Research early warning systems	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	N I	N	Ν	+	+ +	-	Ν	Ν	N	+		+	12	5	58.33%
	B1.4	Support Flood Risk Mgmt Study Gowanda	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+ •	+	Ν	+	+ +	-	+	+	N	+		+	19	2	89.47%
	B1.5	Support Feasiblilty study Gowands	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+ -	+	N	+	+ +	-	+	+	N	+		+	19		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%
	B1.7 B2.1	Identify repetitively damaged infrastructure	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+		+	-	•	+ +	-E	+	N	N			+	17	4	76.47%
	B2.1 B2.2	Town of Ashford, Ahrens Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	•	т N	+		+	-	•	+ +		+	N	N			+	15	5	66.67%
	B2.2	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		60.00%
	02.1	Town of Otto, North Otto Rd, drain on private			<u> </u>	·	<u> </u>			· ·							·						· ·			10		00.007
	B2.8	property	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-		+	-	+	+ N	-	+	-	N	N		+	10	10	0.00%
		Town of Perrysburg east/west roads	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N			+	15	-	60.00%
		Town of Persia, Hawkins Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N			+	15	6	60.00%
		Village of Little Valley, Fourth St	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N			+	15	6	60.00%
		Village of Little Valley, Winship Ave	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N			+	15	6	60.00%
		Village of Little Valley, Thompson Ave	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Ν	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N	+		+	15	6	60.00%
		Town of Perrysburg explore alt methods for runoff	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Ν	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N	+		+	15	6	60.00%
		Training for Code Enforcement Officers	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	Ν	+	N I	N	Ν	+	+ +	+	Ν	N	N	+		+	13	3	76.92%
		Town of Ischua, Baxter Mill	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Ν	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N	+		+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.17	Town of Olean, Back Hinsdale & E.River Rd.	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Ν	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N	+		+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.18	Village of Allegany, 7th Street	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Ν	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N	+		+	15	6	60.00%
		Town of Hinsdale, Emerson Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Ν	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N	+		+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.20	Town of S.Valley, Lt Bone Rn, Birch Dr, Pierce Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Ν	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N	+		+	15	6	60.00%
	B2.21	Village of Portville, Brooklyn St.	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Ν	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N	+		+	15	6	60.00%
D	B2.22	Village of Franklinville, Lyndon Center Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Ν	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N	+	·	+	15		60.00%
din		Replace/improve culverts/drainage													Ţ	T	Ţ							Γ	Γ	Ţ	Γ	
Flooding		CR5,CR6,CR60,CR19,CR24,CR12,CR14,CR75	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N			+	17	5	70.59%
ш		Town of Little Valley, 4th Street	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+		+	+		+	-		+ +	-	+	-	Ν			+	17		70.59%
	-	Town of Farmersville, Bush Hill Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	Ν	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	Ν			+	14		50.00%
		Town of Freedom, Edmunds Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+		+	-		+ +	-	+	-	N			+	14	7	50.00%
		Town of Lyndon, Livingston Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+		+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N			+	14		50.00%
		Village of South Dayton, drainage	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	N	+		+	-		+ +	-	+	-	N			+	13		38.46%
		Town of Great Valley, study of undersized culverts	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-		N	+		+	-	-	+ +	-	+	-	N			+	14		50.00%
		City of Olean, hydraulic study of under drains	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	+		+	-		+ +	-	+	-	N			+	14		50.00%
	B2.31	Town of Red House, hydraulic study of culverts raugus County	+	+	+	+	+	-		1	+	N.	+_	- iluatio	+	-	+	+ +	-	+	-	N	+		+	14	7	50.00% Page 4

Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

		ST	AP	LE	E /	٩C	TIC)N	EV	AL	UA	١T	10	N T	AE	BLE	I • •	I I					1	1				
											STA	PLEE	E Cri	teria	Con	sidera	ation	ıs										
		Alternative Actions							+ F	avor	able	- L	.ess	Favo	rable	Ν	Not A	Applica	able									
		Alternative Actions		S		Т			А			Ρ			L			E					E					
			(Sc	ocial)	(Te	echn	ical)	(Ac	Iministrat	ive)	(P	olitica	al)	((Lega	ıl)	((Econo	omic			(Env		nenta	I)			
	P2 22	City of Salamanca, drainage study Wildwood Ave	- Community Acceptance		Technica		0)	Staffing	Funding Allocation	Maintenance/Operations	- Political Support	Z Local Champion	- Public Support	State Authority	1				Contribute to Economic Gos	Outside Funding Required	Effect on Land/Water	Effects Endangered Species	Z Effects HAZMAT/Waste Site	+ Consistent with Community Environmental Goals		snid 14	2 minus	ലാട 50.00%
	B2.32	Town of Conewango, drainage improvements on	+	+	+	+	+	-		-	+	IN	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	IN	+	+	14	1	50.00%
	B2 33	Swamp and Brown Rds	+	+	+	+	+	_			+	N	+	_	+	_	+	+	⊾	_	+	_	N	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		Identify Stream Stabilization Projects	++	+	++	++	+	-					++	-	+	E	++	+	+	-	+ +	-	N	+	++	14	7	50.00%
		Town of Humphrey, Morgan Hollow Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-				+	-	+	-	+	•	+		+	-	N	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		Town of Otto, diversion ditch North Otto Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-	-				+	-	+	-	+	· ·	+		+	-	N	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		Town of Otto, diversion ditch South Hill Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-					+	-	+	-	+	· ·	+		+		N	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		Town of Mansfield, Baase Rd - beaver dam	+	+	+	+	+	-					+	-	+	-	+	+	+		+		N	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	-	Town of New Albion, Gowin Gulf Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-					+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+		N	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.7	Town of New Albion, Maple Hill Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-			+	Ν	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	Ν	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.8	Town of New Albion, Ingersoll Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-			+	Ν	+	-	+	-	+	+ •	+	-	+	-	Ν	+	+	14	7	50.00%
	B3.9	Town of New Albion, Skinner Hollow Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-		-	+	Ν	+	-	+	-	+	+ ·	+	-	+		Ν	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		Town of New Albion, Waite Hollow Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-		-	+	Ν	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+		Ν	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		Town of Perrysburg, Prospect St.	+	+	+	+	+	-		-		Ν	+	-	+	-	+		+		+		Ν	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		Town of Leon, Frog Valley Rd.	+	+	+	+	+	-					+	-	+	-	+	+	+		+		Ν	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		Town of Salamanca, W.Bucktooth Run Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-				N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+		+		Ν	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		Town of Napoli, Narrows Rd	+	+	+	+	+	-				N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+		+		N	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		Town of Franklinville, Morgan Valley/Claire Valley	+	+	+	+	+	-		•		Ν	+	-	+	-	+	-	+		+		N	+	+	14	7	50.00%
		County Road 32 in Ashford Triangle Town of Machias, Bear Creek	+	+	+	+	+	+		•			+	-	+	-	+	· ·	+		+		N N	+	+	16 14		62.50%
		Plan to Clean Debris/Potential Debris from Creeks	+	++	+ +	+ N	++	-					+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	-	++	-	+ +	-	+ +		+ +		N	+ +	+	14	7 7	50.00% 41.67%
		Town of New Ablion - Maple Hill Rd	+	+	+	N	+	-				N	+	-	+	-	+	· ·	+		+	-	N	+	+	12	7	41.67%
		Town of Randolph Little Conewango/Battle Creek	+	+	+	N	+	-					+	-	+	-	+		+		++	-	N	+	+	12	7	41.67%
		Identify repetitively damaged properties	+	+	+	+	+	-	-		+		+	-	+	N	+	· ·	+				N	+	+	15	5	66.67%
		Seek funding to acquire repetitively damaged proper		+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	N	+	-	+				N	N	+	13		53.85%
-		Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-		-		N	Ν	N	+	N	+	+	+				N	+	N	11	4	63.64%
Severe Storm		Investigate Tree Maintenance Program	+	+	+	+	+	-					N	N	+	-	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	14	5	64.29%
Š		Investigate measures to protect infrastructure	+	+	+	+	+	-					N	N	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	14	5	64.29%
ere		Town of Humphrey, Morgan Hollow Bridge Repair,	1													1												
eve		upper stream bank severely washed out from																										
S		previous years storms	+	+	+	+	+	-		+	+	Ν	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	Ν	+	+	15	5	66.67%
		Town of Humphrey, South Cooper Hill repair	+	+	+	+	+	-		+		N	+	-	+	-	+	+	+			N	-	+	+	15		60.00%
	C1.6	Training for Code Enforcement Officers	+	+	+	+	+	-			+	Ν	+	Ν	Ν	Ν	+	+	+	-	N	Ν	Ν	+	+	12	4	66.67%
	D1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-		.	N	N	Ν	Ν	+	Ν	+	+	+	-	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	+	10	4	60.00%
F	D1.2	Town of Allegany, remove ROW obstructions	+	+	+	+	+	+		-	+	Ν	Ν	Ν	+	N	+	+	+	-	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	+	12	3	75.00%
lce Storm	D2.1	Identify list of at risk utility lines	+	+	+	+	+	-	_ T.	.	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	+	Ν	+	+	+]	- 1	Ν	N	N	Ν	+	10	4	60.00%
N.		Create Tree Maintenance Program	+	+	+	+	+	-					N	N	+		+	+	+				N	N	+	12		66.67%
lce		Identify historic icy pavement sites	+	+	+	+	+	-					N	N	+	-	+		+				N	N	+	12	5	58.33%
		Town of Otto, Dake Hill vertical alignment	+	+	+	+	+	-					Ν	Ν	+	-	+	+	+				Ν	Ν	+	11	5	54.55%
		Provide guide to emergency services	+	+	+	+	+	-					Ν	Ν	+	-	+	+	+				Ν	Ν	+	12		58.33%

		ST	٩P	LE	E	AC	;TI	0	ΝE	VA	LL	JA	TIC	DN	T /	AE	BLE		1										
			F	-	-	-	-			-	e.	TAPL	EE	Crite		Con	ldor			-	-	-	-	-	-		-		
										+ Fav					avor				is Applio	oblo							-		
		Alternative Actions		S	1	т			A		vorai		- Le Р	:55 F	avui		N	NOU		E				E					
				cial)	(Т	echr	nical		Admini		e)	(Poli)	(1	Lega	D D			omic)		(Env	ironr		al)			
			(00	olaly	(.	COIN	noui	· ·			<i>,</i>	(1 01	lioui	,	(,	Loga	·/		(2001		,		` 			,			
			Community Acceptance	Effect on Segment	Technically Feasible	Long Torm Solution		Secondary Impacts	Staffing	Funding Allocation	_		Local Champion	Public Support	State Authority	Existing Local Authority		Benefit of Action	Cost Benefit of Action	Contribute to Economic Goa	Outside Funding Required	Effect on Land/Water	Effects Endangered Species		Consistent with Commur	Environmental Goals Consistant with Federal Law	snlq		score
	E1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	4	- 1	N	+	Ν	+	+	+	-	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	+	11	4	63.64%
0		Listing of Emergency Shelters and preparedness																											
adc		resources and needs	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N			-	N	+	+	+	+	+			N	N	N	+	11		63.64%
Tornado		Develop revers 911 database for early warning	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N				+	+	+	+	+			N	N	Ν	+	13		69.23%
Ĕ		Develop building codes	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N				+	+	+	+	+	-		N	N	N	+	13		69.23%
	E2.1 E2.2	Plan to remove debris from waterways after Tornado Support the enforcement of Building Codes	N +	++	++	++	++	-	-	-	N					+ +	- +	++	+	+ +	-	•	N N	N N	N N	+	10		40.00% 63.64%
				+	-	+	+	-	-		_	_				+		+	+	+				_	-	+	_		
	F1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N				N	+	Ν	+	+	+		N	N	N	Ν	+	11		63.64%
ē	F1.2	Increase media coverage	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N					+	Ν	+	+	+			Ν	N	Ν	+	11		63.64%
Wildfire	F1.3	Increase enforcement of open burning laws	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N		-		N	+	Ν	+	+	+			N	N	Ν	+	11		63.64%
Ň	F2.1	ID water resources/dry hydrants existing and propose	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+				+	N	+	+	+			N	N	Ν	+	13		69.23%
	-	ID proposed future dry hydrant sites	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	4		••	+	N	+	+	+			N	N	N	+	13		69.23%
	F2.3 F2.4	Listing of Equipment resources and needs Town/Village Ellicottville water retention reservoir	+ +	+ +	++	++	+	-	-	-	++	++	4			+ +	N N	++	++	+ +			N N	N N	N N	+	13 14		69.23% 71.43%
	,	3	+ N	_	_	+	+	-	-	-	+ N				_	++	N	_	+	+			N	N	N	+	9		55.56%
	G1.1 G1.2	Continuous Public Education ID vulnerable structures	1N +	+	+	++	+	-	-	-	N					++	N N	+ +	++	+			N	N N	N	+	11		55.56% 63.64%
		Acquire vulnerable structures	+ N	++	++	++	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	-	-	-	N					+ +	IN	++	+	+	-		N	N N	N	+	11	_	63.64% 54.55%
		Enforce "Smart Growth" practices	N	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	IN	N		N .		++	-	+	+	+	-		N	N	N	+	9		11.11%
	-	Town of Mansfield, Hollister Hill replace pipe/undrmn		+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N				+	-	++	+	+	-	+		N	+	+	14		57.14%
		Towns New Albion/Otto/Mansfield - Skinner Hollow	т _	+	+	+	- T	_		- T	+	N			_	т -	_	т _	- -	т 1	_	т _	_	N	+		14		57.14%
les	G1.7	Village of Cattaraugus	т _	+	+	+	- T	_		- T	+	N	-	-	_	+	_	+	- -	+	_	+	_	N	+		14	-	57.14%
slic	-	Towns of Ashford, East Otto, Otto - Cattaraugus Cr	+	+	+	+	+	-	_	+	+	N				+	_	+	+	+	-	+	_	N	+	+	14	-	57.14%
andslides	-	Town of Portville near Allegheny River	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N		.	-	+	-	+	+	+		+	-	N	+	+	14	-	57.14%
Ľ		Town of Otto, Dunkleman Hill	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N			-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	14		57.14%
		Town of Mansfield, Hollister Hill	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	N	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	13	-	46.15%
		Town of Persia, Gowanda water reservoir/Pt. Peter	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	N				+	-	+	+	+		+	-	N	+	+	13		46.15%
	-	County Roads 21 and 76	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	4		-	+	-	+	+	+		+	-	N	+	+	17		70.59%
	-	Town of Yorkshire, properties Cattaraugus Creek	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	N			-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	14		50.00%
		Town of Carrollton, Parkside Dr.	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	N		۱ ۱	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	13		46.15%
<u>o</u>	H1.1	Continuous Public Education	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	4		N	+	Ν	+	+	+	-	+	Ν	N	Ν	+	12	4	66.67%
Failure		Prepare and update Emergency Action Plans	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+				+	N	+	+	+	-	N	N	N	N	+	14		71.43%
Га		Update maintenance and repair program	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+				+	-	+	+	+	-	+	N	N	N	+	13		53.85%
Dam	H1.4	Seek funding for inundation mapping/plan updates	Ν	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	N	N	١	۱.	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	Ν	Ν	Ν	+	9	7	22.22%
Ö	H1.5	Conduct Emergency Drills	Ν	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	N	4	- 1	N	+	Ν	+	+	+	-	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	+	11	4	63.64%

				ties										- Indica	ates Pa	articipa	tion C	Commitm	nent					r		Vill	ages		** Cos	st: H >100	K, M >25K AND	<100k,	L < 25K	
	Partner Projects	Mitigation Strategy Category	nuty	ca	Allegany Ashford	Carrollton Coldspring	Conewango Dayton	East Otto	Farmersville	Franklinville Freedom	Great Valley	Hinsaale Humphrey	Ischua	Leon Little Valley	Lyndon	Macnias Mansfield	Napoli New Alhion	New Albion Olean	Perrysburg	Persia	Randolph	Red House Salamanca	South Valley Yokshire	Allegany	Callaraugus Delevan	Ellicottville Franklinville	Gowanda	Limestone Little Valley	Portville H-H M-me South Dayton	nigh, dium,	Responsible Parties, _ead/Support	Moc Nor	it (H- igh, M- derate, N- ninal) & i ng Sourc	Time Frame e
	A1 Continuous Public Education			x >		x x	x x											x x x					x x			x x	х	x x	X X H		Co. Plann	Ν	General	,
Stor	A1.2 Driver Education Safety Stategies		x x	x >	(X	X X	x x	x x	x	x x	х)	K 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	х	x x	X X N	Л	Co. E.S.	Ν	General	,
anter 5	A1.3 Public awareness announcement development	Emergency Svcs Structural Project	х			x	_																		_				L	-	Co. E.S.	N	Grant	< 5 yrs
241.	A1.4 Town of Coldspring, rock work, ditches, banks cut A2.1 Critical Facilities Emergency Communication Improve	Emergency Svcs	Y			*																							N		T.Coldspring Co. E.S.	M	Grant Grant	< 10 yrs <5 yrs
	B1.1 Continuous Public Education		x x	x >	< X	x x	x x	x x	x	x x	х)	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	х	x x			Co.Plan	N	General	ý
	B1.2 Education on "Smart Growth" in floodplain	Education	х																										ŀ		Co.Plan	N	General	
	B1.3 Research early warning systems	Emergency Svcs	х																										Ν	A	V.Gowanda	Ν	General	< 5 yrs
	B1.4 Support Flood Risk Mgmt Study Gowanda		х				х												х								х		ŀ		V.Gowanda	Ν	General	,
	B1.5 Support Feasibility Study Gowanda		х				x										_		x	х							х			-	V.Gowanda	Н	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B1.6 Village of Delevan, under drain study Delevan Ave B1.7 Town of Allegany, adequate emergency centers	Prevention Prevention)	(_													X				L	-	V.Delevan T.Allegany	M	Grant Grant	< 10 yrs < 5 yrs
	B2.1 Identify/Acquire repetitively damaged infrastructure		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			Co.DPW	н	Grant	< 10 yrs
	B2.2 Town of Ashford, Ahrens Rd	Structural Project			x																								H		T.Ashford	M	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.3 Town of Mansfield, Erdman Hill Rd	Structural Project													×	x													H		T.Mansfield	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.4 Town of New Albion, Waverly St B2.5 Town of New Albion, Linlyco Lake overflow	Structural Project Structural Project		+ +	+			+				+		+		+	x	ĸ			+			$\left - \right $	+						T.New Albion T.New Albion	M	Grant Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
	B2.6 Town of Otto, Colvin Rd	Structural Project																x													T.Otto	M	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.7 Town of Otto, Traffic Street	Structural Project															_	X											ŀ		T.Otto	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.8Town of Otto, North Otto Rd, drain on private propertyB2.9Town of Perrysburg east/west roads	Structural Project Structural Project																X	x						_						T.Otto T.Perrysburg	M	Grant Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
	B2.10 Town of Persia, Hawkins Rd	Structural Project																	×	x									r		T.Persia	M	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.11 Village of Little Valley, Fourth St	Structural Project																										х	ŀ		V.Little Valley	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.12 Village of Little Valley, Winship Ave	Structural Project Structural Project										_									_				_			x			V.Little Valley	M	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.13 Village of Little Valley, Thompson Ave B2.14 Town of Perrysburg explore alt methods for runoff	Structural Project										_							×						_			x	- F		V.Little Valley T.Perrysburg	M	Grant Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
	B2.14 Town of Penysburg explore all methods for runoin B2.15 Training Code Enforcement Officers	Education	x																^										r		Co.DPW	N	General	
	B2.16 Town of Ischua. Baxter Mills	Structural Project											x																		00.21 11		Conordi	
	B2.17 Town of Olean, Back Hinsdale/East River Rds	Structural Project																x											ŀ	-	T.Olean	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.18 Village of Allegany, 7th Street	Structural Project																						x					ŀ	4	V.Allegany	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.19 Town of Hinsdale, Emerson Rd	Structural Project									>	ĸ																	ŀ	-	T.Hinsdale	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.20 Town of South Valley, Lt. Bone Rn, Birch Dr, Pierce	Structural Project																					x						ŀ		South Valley	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.21 Village of Portville, Brooklyn St	Structural Project																							_	x			× ŀ		V.Portville	M	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.22 Village of Franklinville, Lyndon Center Rd. Replace/improve culverts/drainage	Structural Project										_													_	X				- V	/.Franklinville	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
in ⁰		Structural Project	х																										H	-	Catt.Co	н	Grant	< 10 yrs
\$100U	B2.24 Town of Little Valley, 4th Street	Structural Project												х															F	- 1	T.Little Valley	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B2.25 Town of Farmersville, Bush Hill Rd	Structural Project							х																				Ν	Л	.Farmersville	М	Grant	< 10 yrs
	B2.26 Town of Freedom, Edmunds Rd	Structural Project								x															_				N		T.Freedom	М	Grant	< 10 yrs
	B2.27 Town of Lyndon, Livingston Rd	Structural Project													x		_												N		T.Lyndon	M	Grant	< 10 yrs
	B2.28 Village of South Dayton, drainage B2.29 Town of Great Valley, study of undersized culverts	Structural Project Prevention									x														_				× N		.South Dayton .Great Valley	H M	Grant Grant	<10 yrs
	B2.30 City of Olean, hydraulic study of undersized cuiverts	Prevention	x								^																		N		C.Olean	M	Grant	< 10 yrs
	B2.31 Town of Red House, hydraulic study of culverts	Prevention		++								+					+				+	x		\vdash							T.Red House	M	Grant	< 10 yrs
	B2.32 City of Salamanca, drainage study Wildwood Ave	Prevention		x																											C.Salamanca	M	Grant	< 10 yrs
	Town of Conewango, drainage improvements on	Structural Project		$ \top$			x																						Ν		Concurrent	м	Crost	. 10
	B2.33 Swamp and Brown Rds B3.1 Identify Stream Stabilization Projects	Structural Project	x	++								+		+			+				+			+					N		Conewango Catt.Co	M	Grant Grant	< 10 yrs < 5 yrs
	B3.2 Town of Humphrey, Morgan Hollow Rd	Structural Project										x																	ŀ	-	T.Humphrey	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B3.3 Town of Otto, diversion ditch North Otto Rd	Structural Project		+	$+ \overline{-}$	-+		+				$+ \overline{+}$		$+ \overline{+}$		+		X			$+ \overline{+}$			\vdash	+-		\mid	-+-			T.Otto	M	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B3.4 Town of Otto, diversion ditch South Hill Rd B3.5 Town of Mansfield, Baase Rd - beaver dam	Structural Project Structural Project	-	+	+		_	+				+		+		x	+	x			+		_	\vdash							T.Otto T.Mansfield	M	Grant Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
	B3.6 Town of New Albion, Gowin Gulf Rd	Structural Project															x												ŀ	- 1	T.New Albion	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B3.7 Town of New Albion, Maple Hill Rd B3.8 Town of New Albion, Ingersoll Rd	Structural Project Structural Project		+	+							+					X		+		+		_				$\left - \right $	-			T.New Albion T.New Albion	M	Grant Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
	B3.8 Town of New Albion, Ingersoll Rd B3.9 Town of New Albion, Skinner Hollow Rd	Structural Project		+													x							+					- F		T.New Albion	M	Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
	B3.10 Town of New Albion, Waite Hollow Rd	Structural Project															x	ĸ											ŀ	- 1	T.New Albion	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B3.11 Town of Perrysburg, Prospect St. B3.12 Town of Leon, Frog Valley Rd	Structural Project Structural Project	_	+	+							+		x			_		x		+		_	$\left - \right $							T.Perrysburg T.Leon	M	Grant Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
	B3.13 Town of Salamanca, West Branch Bucktooth Run	Structural Project																				x							ŀ	- 1	T.Salamanca	М	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B3.14 Town of Napoli, Narrows Rd. B3.15 Town of Franklinville, Morgan Valley and Claire Valley	Structural Project		$+ \top$	$+ \overline{-}$	$-+\mp$						$+ \overline{+}$		$+ \overline{+}$			х	$+ \top$			$+ \top$			\vdash	-				ŀ		T.Napoli	M	Grant	< 5 yrs
	B3.15 Town of Franklinville, Morgan Valley and Claire Valley B3.16 County Road 32, Ashford Triangle	Structural Project Structural Project	x	+	+					x							_				+			\vdash							T.Franklinville Catt.Co	M	Grant Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
	B3.17 Town of Machias, Bear Creek	Structural Project													×	x													L	-	T.Machias	М	Grant	< 10 yrs
	B4.1 Clean Debris/Potential Debris from Creeks B4.2 Town of New Ablion - Maple Hill Rd	Structural Project Prevention	x	+ +	+		x	+				+		+		+	x		x	х	x			$\left - \right $	+		х			И И П	Catt.Co T.New Albion	N N	Grant Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
	B4.3 Town of Randolph Little Conewango/Battle Creek	Prevention																			x								N		T.Randolph	N	Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
	B5.1 Identify Repetitive Loss Properties		х														_													л I	Catt.Co	N	General	
	B5.2 Seek funding to acquire Repetetive Loss Properties	Prevention	х													n Evalu													Ν	N	Catt.Co	Ν	Grant	< 10 yrs age 7 of 8

Cattaraugus County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

											"X"	- Indic	ates Par	ticinat	ion Comn	nitment											** C	ost H <	100K. M >25K AND	<100k < 25K	
				Cities	S							owns											Vil	lages			Ĭ				-
		Partner Projects	Mitigation Strategy Category	Cattaraugus County Olean	Salamanca Allegany Ashford	Carrollton Coldspring	Conewango Dayton	Ellicottville Farmersville	Franklinville Freedom	Great Valley Hinsdale	Ischua	Little Valley	Lyndon Machias	Mansfield	Napoli New Albion Olean	Otto Perrysburg	Persia Portville	Randolph	Ked House Salamanca	South Valley Yokshire	Allegany	Delevan	Ellicottville Franklinville	Gowanda	Limestone		H) Daytor	iority -high, nedium, -low)	Responsible Parties, Lead/Support	Cost (H High, M- Moderate, N Nominal) & Funding Sour	Time Frame
	C1.1	Continuous Public Education	Education	X X X	X X	ХХ	X X X	ХХ	х х	X X X	хх	х	ХХ	X X	(XX	X X	хх	X X	х х	хх	x x	Х	х х	Х	ХХ	Х	х	Н	Co.Plann	N Genera	l < 2 yrs
		Investigate Tree Maintenance Program	Prevention	х			x									х	х							х				М	Co.DPW	M Genera	l <5 yrs
	əC1.3	Investigate protection of bridges/culverts from scour	Prevention	x																								М	Co.DPW	N Genera	l <10 yrs
Severe Stor		Town of Humphrey, Morgan Hollow Bridge Repair, upper stream bank severely washed out from previous years storms								×	:																	н	T.Humphrey	H Grant	< 5 yrs
		Town of Humphrey, South Cooper Hill Rd	Structural Project							X	[Н	T.Humphrey	H Grant	< 5 yrs
		Training for Code Enforcement Officers	Education	х																								Н	Co.DPW	N Genera	,
	D1.2	Continuous Public Education Town of Allegany, remove ROW obstructions	Education Structural Project	x x >	x x x	x x	X X X	X X	x x	X X X	× >	x	X X	x	<u>(x x</u>	X X	X X	x :	x x	X X	x x	x	x x	x	x x	x		H L	Co.Plann T.Allegany	N Genera N Grant	< 5 yrs
. offi		Identify list of at risk utility lines	Emergency Svcs	X																								М	Co.E.S.	N Genera	
100 Storm		Create Tree Maintenance Program Identify historic icy pavement sites	Emergency Svcs Prevention	X		v v	x x x	v v	v v	v v v			v v	- · ·	/ v v	v v	v v	v,		v v	v v	~	v	~	v	~		M	Co.DPW Co.DPW	M Genera N Genera	,
Ŵ		Town of Otto, Dake Hill vertical alignment	Structural Project			XX		X X	x x				× ×	X		XX	× ×	× .	× ×	× ×	× ×		× ×	×	X X	X	*	L	T.Otto	M Genera M Grant	< 10 yrs
		Provide guide to emergency services	F	x x x		x y	x x x	x x	x y	x x v	x	x	x x	x ,	x x	X X	x x	x	xx	хv	x v	¥	x v	Y	x v	Y	x	L	Co. E.S.	N Genera	
		Continuous Public Education	Education			X X		X X	X X					_		14				XX	XX	x	XX	x	XX	x		H	Co.Plann	N Genera	
		Listing of Emergency Shelters and preparedness resources and needs	Emergency Svcs	x																		~		~		~		M	Co.E.S.	N Genera	
200	E1.3	Develop revers 911 database for early warning	Emegency Svcs	x																								м	Co.Sheriff	N Genera	l < 5 yrs
10h			Prevention	v																											,
		Develop building codes		x																								M M	Co. DPW	N Genera	,
		Long term plan to remove debris from waterways Support Enforcement of Building Codes	Prevention Prevention	~	/ X X	v v	x x x	v v	v v			/ v	× ×	~ `	/ v v	x x	× ×	× ,	~ ~	× ×	× ×	v	× ×	v	v v	v		M	Catt.Co Co.DPW	N Genera N Genera	
			Education																		x x										,
	F1.1	Continuous Public Education		X X X		X X	X X X	XX	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	Н	County Plann	N Genera	l < 2 yrs
	F1.2	Increase media coverage	Emergency Svcs	x																								Н	Emergency Servcs	N Genera	l < 5 yrs
.01	F1.3	Increase enforcement of open burning laws	Prevention	х																								М	Emergency Servcs	N Genera	l < 5 yrs
udine	F2.1	ID water resources/dry hydrants existing and proposed	Prevention	x																								М	Emergency Servcs	N Genera	l < 5 yrs
24.		ID proposed future dry hydrant sites	Prevention	x																									Emergency Serves		
				~																		-							· ·		
		Listing of Equipment resources and needs	Emergency Svcs	X																									Emergency Servcs	N Genera	,
L		Town/Village water retention reservoir study	Structural Project					х															Х						Town/Vill Ellicottville		< 10 yrs
		Continuous Public Education	Education	x x >	(XX	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	х	x x	х	x x	х		Н	County Plann	N Genera	,
	-	ID vulnerable structures Acquire vulnerable structures	Emergency Svcs	X	+ $+$ $+$			+ $+$ $+$								+ $+$ $+$		++	+		\vdash	+		+		+ $+$		M	Catt.Co	N Genera	
		Acquire vulnerable structures Enforce "Smart Growth" practices	Prevention Prevention	x				+ $+$ $+$								+ $+$ $+$		+								+		M H	Catt.Co County Plann	H Grant N Genera	< 10 yrs
		Town of Mansfield, Hollister Hill replace pipe/undrmn	Structural Project	X		-								x				+				+	_	+		+	_	н	T.Mansfield	M Genera M Grant	< 5 yrs < 5 yrs
		Towns New Albion/Otto/Mansfield - Skinner Hollow	Structural Project											<u> </u>	x			+				+				+		Н	T.NewAlb/Man	H Grant	< 5 yrs
هر		Study slide conditions in Village of Cattaraugus	Prevention															+			x							Н	V.Cattaraugus	H Grant	< 5 yrs
delion	G1.8	Study Towns of Ashford, East Otto, Otto - Catt. Cr	Prevention		x																							Н	T.Ash/Eotto/Otto	H Grant	< 5 yrs
Sal	G1.9	Study slide Town of Portville near Allegheny River	Prevention														х											Н	T.Portville	H Grant	< 5 yrs
	G1.10	Study slide Town of Otto, Dunkleman Hill Rd	Prevention													х												Н	T.Otto	H Grant	< 5 yrs
		Study slide Town of Mansfield, Hollister Hill	Prevention											х														Н	T.Mansfield	H Grant	< 5 yrs
		Study slideTown of Persia, Gowanda water reservoir/P														+ $+$ $+$	х					_		х		+		Н	T.Persia	H Grant	< 5 yrs
		Stabilize slides on county roads 21 and 76	Structural Project	x	+ $+$ $+$			+ $+$ $+$		+ $+$ $+$						+ $+$ $+$		+								+		H	Catt.Co	H Grant	< 5 yrs
		Town of Yorkshire, list of properties along Catt. Crk Study slide conditions Town of Carrollton, Parkside Dr	Prevention Prevention			,										+ $+$ $+$		+		х				+		+		L H	T.Yorkshire T.Carrollton	N Genera H Grant	
		Continuous Public Education	Education	v v v			x x x	vv	v v	v v v		, ,	x x	v .	/ v v	v v	v v	v,	~ ~	v v	v v	v	v	v	v	~		н Н	Co.Plann		< 5 yrs
		Prepare and update Emergency Action Plans	Education Emergency Svcs			^ X		^ X	<u>^ X</u>				^ X	<u> </u>		^ X	^ X		^ X	^ X		X	X	*	^ X	X		М	Co.E.S.	N Genera N Genera	
c allur		Update maintenance and repair program	Prevention	x														++			\vdash	+			-+	+		M	Co.DPW	M Genera	
ant		Seek funding for inudation maps/plan updates	Prevention	x														+				-						M	Co.DPW	N Genera	
\diamond		Conduct Emergency Drills		X														+				1				+		M	Co.E.S.	N Genera	
l				<u> </u>		-				<u> </u>	1 1		1			1 1	1	<u> </u>			<u> </u>			1	-						