

MITIGATION ACTION SCORING MATRIX

Step One:

In the following tables, enter your name and position and select one of the following status options for each mitigation action in your jurisdiction:

- Completed (Use this if the action was completed)
- **Deleted** (Use this if you would like to remove the action from your new plan)
- Ongoing (Use this if you would like the action to carry through to your next plan)

Step two:

By marking the actions as Ongoing the action will be added to the new plan. In order to rank them effectively we ask that you score each of the following:

- 1. **Cost Effective** Rank 1 5 the cost effectiveness of each proposed mitigation action, with 5 being the most cost effective and 1 being the least cost effective.
- 2. **Technically Feasible** Rank 1 5 the feasibility of each proposed mitigation action, with 5 being the most feasible and 1 being the least feasible.
- 3. **Environmentally Sound** Rank 1 5 the proposed mitigation action in terms of how environmentally sound it seems, with 5 being the most sound and 1 being the least sound.
- 4. **Immediate Need** Rank 1 5 whether each proposed mitigation action is needed immediately, with 5 being the most immediate need and 1 being not an immediate need.
- 5. **Risk Reduction** Rank 1 5 the proposed mitigation action on the extent to which it will reduce the total risk of the associated hazard, with 5 being the greatest contribution to risk reduction and 1 being the least contribution to risk reduction.

If you have any additional comments for a mitigation action, please leave them below each action.



Name:	Title and Organization:
-------	-------------------------

Village of New Vienna

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
Manitor avardance deaths enisid	□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5	
Monitor overdoses, deaths, opioid prescriptions, and drug related crimes to	Drug Misuse & Addiction	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
identify problem areas.		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Produce an annual report on the status of overdoses, deaths, and drug related crimes in	Drug Misuse & Addiction	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
the County.		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
Create a task force of local law enforcement,		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
public health officials, mental health professionals, medical professionals, elected officials, and other appropriate personnel to identify problems and potential solutions. Drug Misuse & Addiction	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5	
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5	
		□Ongoing	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



Name:	Title and Organization:
-------	-------------------------

Village of New Vienna

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
Create an informational neglect an enjoid	□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5	
Create an informational packet on opioid alternatives and distribute to all practicing	Drug Misuse & Addiction	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
doctors, hospitals, and dentists.		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
Collaborate with public and private sector		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
interests to obtain/create information regarding disaster preparedness, recovery	Multiple Hazards	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
assistance and other post- disaster strategies for citizens and businesses.	5	□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Ensure that all critical facilities and public buildings have backup generators in case of power failure. Utility Failure	Utility Failure	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



MITIGATION ACTION SCORING MATRIX

Instructions

To complete this matrix, please write in each mitigation action applicable to your jurisdiction. Please score it from 1-5 for each category described below. For each category, a rating of 1 is the lowest score, a rating of 3 is neutral/unsure, and a rating of 5 is the highest score.

- 1. Cost Effective Rank 1 5 the cost effectiveness of each proposed mitigation action, with 5 being the most cost effective and 1 being the least cost effective.
- 2. **Technically Feasible Rank 1 5** the feasibility of each proposed mitigation action, with 5 being the most feasible and 1 being the least feasible.
- 3. **Environmentally Sound Rank 1 5** the proposed mitigation action in terms of how environmentally sound it seems, with 5 being the most sound and 1 being the least sound.
- 4. **Immediate Need Rank 1 5** whether each proposed mitigation action is needed immediately, with 5 being the most immediate need and 1 being not an immediate need.
- 5. **Risk Reduction Rank 1 5** the proposed mitigation action on the extent to which it will reduce the total risk of the associated hazard, with 5 being the greatest contribution to risk reduction and 1 being the least contribution to risk reduction.

Every jurisdiction (County, City, and Village) must have one mitigation action for each hazard. The following pages include four new FEMA-required actions for you to score. If an action is applicable, please score the action. If it is not applicable to your jurisdiction (i.e. your jurisdiction doesn't have any dams) please skip (don't score) the action.

Following the required new actions, you will have the space to draft new mitigation actions that are applicable to your jurisdiction and score them. Please list the applicable hazard for each new drafted action. Any new actions must correspond with one of the county's hazard priorities as follows:

Hazard	Score	Rank
Severe Wind and Tornadoes	4.21	1
Severe Winter Weather	3.91	2
Utility Failure	3.91	2
Hazardous Materials	3.53	4
Drug Misuse and Addiction	3.26	5
Severe Summer Weather	3.24	6
Extreme Temperatures	3.06	7
Flooding	3.06	7
Terrorism	2.91	9
Epidemic/Pandemic	2.79	10
Drought	2.59	11
Invasive Species	2.09	12
Wildfire	2.09	13
Dam/Levee Failure	1.71	14
Landslides, Erosion, and Subsidence	1.56	15
Earthquakes	1.50	16



Name:	Title and Organization:	Jurisdiction:

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Ranking					
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Required: Work with all jurisdictions on filling in gaps and strengthening capabilities in enacting mitigation strategies.		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Required: Ensure all eligible jurisdictions are participating in the NFIP.		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
Required: Ensure all high-hazard potential dams have updated Emergency Action Plans (EAPs) in place.		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



Name:	Title and Organization:	Jurisdiction:

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Ranking					
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Required: Obtain or create inundation maps for all dams.		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



Name:	Title and Organization:	Jurisdiction:

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Ranking					
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



Name:	Title and Organization:	Jurisdiction:

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Ranking					
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



Name:	Title and Organization:	Jurisdiction:

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Ranking					
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



Name:	Title and Organization:	Jurisdiction:

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Ranking					
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5