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:

Village of Cedarville

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
Push in the old water retention reservoir that is no longer in use. It is a breeding area for rodents and mosquitoes and a drowning risk for area youth.	Dam/Levee Failure	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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
Widen the culvert from SR 72 to West Xenia Ave. It is insufficient, needs to be 36 inches.	Flooding	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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
Village administrative building that can double as shelter from tornadoes for community members and a command center for disasters and other emergencies that occur in the Village or the eastern half of Greene County.	Tornado	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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:

Village of Jamestown

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
Seek funding for new storm drainage systems or levees to protect at-risk structures.	Dam/Levee Failure	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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
Seek funding for, prioritize and remove and/or relocate at-risk structures or construction of improved or new storm drainage systems or levees to protect at- risk structures.	Dam/Levee Failure	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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
Establish a Flood Diversion program for roads in Greene County using the Hyper Reach mass notification system.	Flooding	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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:

Village of Jamestown

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
Identify at-risk structures in Special Flood Hazard Area.	Flooding	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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
Develop and complete a periodic post-educational campaign surveys to gather citizens' perceptions of the risks associated with natural disasters and the tools and services available to the public to reduce risk (Method to measure the effectiveness of educational campaigns).	Multiple Hazards	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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
Upgrade windows to high impact windows on schools.	Terrorism	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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:

Village of Jamestown

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Status	Ranking					
In the event a county-wide warning siren system cannot be achieved, the following jurisdictions have requested funding to replace existing equipment or install new equipment: Jamestown.	Tornado	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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
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.	Tornado	☐Completed ☐Deleted ☐Ongoing	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

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:	Jurisdiction:

Mitigation Action (Strategy)	Risk	Ranking					
Required: Work with all jurisdictions on filling in gaps and strengthening capabilities in enacting mitigation strategies.		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
Required: Ensure all eligible jurisdictions are participating in the NFIP.		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
Required: Ensure all high-hazard potential dams have updated Emergency Action Plans (EAPs) in place.		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					
Required: Obtain or create inundation maps for all dams.		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

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