

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:

- 6. **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.
- 7. **Technically Feasible** Rank 1 5 the feasibility of each proposed mitigation action, with 5 being the most feasible and 1 being the least feasible.
- 8. **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.
- 9. **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.
- 10. **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:
-------	-------------------------

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
Seek funding for, prioritize and remove and/or		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
relocate at-risk structures or construction of improved or new storm drainage systems or	Dam/Levee Failure	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
levees to protect at- risk structures.		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Adams St/Mitman Park Drainage Construction.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	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
Adams St/Mitman Park Drainage Design.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



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

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Beaver control measures.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Chapel Drive at Sycamore Drainage Materials.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Circle Drive storm drainage improvements.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



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

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Colonel Glenn drainage improvements.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Dayton-Yellow Springs drainage improvement – Commerce Center area.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Drainage area easement procurements.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



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

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Enclose Redbank Ditch between Kauffman and Maple Avenue.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
Establish a Flood Diversion program for roads	Flooding	□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Establish a Flood Diversion program for roads in Greene County using the Hyper Reach mass		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
notification system.		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Fairfield Park drainage improvements.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



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

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Fairfield Park pervious pavement of parking lots.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Hebble Creek reprofiling.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Hebble Creek Culvert Replacement, Central Ave.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



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

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Hebble Creek Culvert Replacement, Elm and Dayton Drive.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding	□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Hebble Creek engineering study.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Hidden Hills detection basin modifications.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



Name: Title and O	ganization:
-------------------	-------------

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Highview Drive storm sewer design and construction.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Identify at-risk structures in Special Flood Hazard Area.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	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
Ironwood Drive storm sewer design & construction.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



Name: Title and Organization:

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Kauffman Avenue drainage improvements.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		G G	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding	□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Langview/Royal Oaks storm sewer design & construction.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	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
Lincoln Drive storm sewer improvements construction.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



Name:	Title and Organization:

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Mark Lane ditch renovation.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Pleasant View Drainage, Phase I Construction - Redbank Parallel Trunk Sewer.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Pleasant View Drainage, Phase II Construction - Dellwood Drive Sewer	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



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

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Pleasant View Drainage, Phase II Design – Dellwood Drive Sewer.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Pleasant View Drainage, Phase III Construction – Florence Avenue Sewer.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Pleasant View Drainage, Phase III Design – Florence Avenue Sewer.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



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

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Pleasant View Drainage, Phase IV Design & Construction – Pat Lane & NE Sewer.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding	□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Redbank Ditch retaining wall replacement.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
Redstone Drive storm sewer design & construction.		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
			Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



k :	Title and Organization:
-----	-------------------------

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
Seek funding for the acquisition, elevation, or		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
retrofit of structures with repetitive loss flood insurance claims through voluntary (owner)	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
mitigation actions.		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
	Flooding	□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Stormwater master plan.		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Upper Orville Street Storm Improvements Design & Construction.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		9. 9	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



k :	Title and Organization:
-----	-------------------------

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Wrightview Park plat storm sewer.	Flooding	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
Davidan and complete a naviadia neet			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
Develop and complete a periodic post- educational campaign surveys to gather	Multiple Hazards	□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
citizens' perceptions of the risks associated with natural disasters and the tools and services available to the public to reduce risk		□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
(Method to measure the effectiveness of educational campaigns).		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
educational campaigns).		3 3	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5
			Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5
Upgrade windows to high impact windows on schools.	Terrorism	□Deleted	Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
		□Ongoing	Immediate Need	1	2	3	4	5
		J J	Risk Reduction	1	2	3	4	5



Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking						
Seek \$2.1 million in funding to install a county-wide tornado warning system complete with battery backup in communities with inadequate coverage, or no tornado siren systems.		Cost Effective	1	2	3	4	5		
		□Completed	Technically Feasible	1	2	3	4	5	
	Tornado		□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.

We encourage you to consider regularly occurring problems for each hazard listed below and suggest mitigation actions for these problems. You may also list regularly occurring problems within your community without suggesting a mitigation action.

Every jurisdiction (County, City, and Village) must have one mitigation action for each hazard they scored on their hazard priority. 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 the county's hazard priorities as follows: Severe Winter Weather, Tornadoes, Flooding, Severe Summer Weather, Drought and Extreme Heat, Invasive Species, Earthquakes, Dam/Levee Failure, Wildfire, and Landslides/Land Subsidence.



Name:	Title and Organization:			Jurisd	iction:		
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 strengthening capabilities in enacting mitigation strat		Environmentally Sound	1	2	3	4	5
	98.00.	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 participal NFIP.	ating in the	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 high-hazard potential dams have updated Emergency Action Plans (EAPs) in place.	updated	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:			Jurisd	iction:		
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 date	ms.	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:			Jurisd	iction:		
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:			Jurisd	iction:		
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:			Jurisd	iction:		
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:			Jurisd	iction:		
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