

ACTION ITEM EVALUATION AND PRIORITIZATION

This section includes information regarding the methodology and process followed by participating jurisdictions to evaluate and prioritize unique hazard mitigation actions for their particular communities.

The action item evaluation and prioritization was undertaken by the Planning Group. After reviewing the many types of action items suggested in the previous section, and adding any new items that might be unique for their community, each participant was asked to select a manageable number of action items which they felt their jurisdiction could reasonably commit to achieving in the next five years (the first plan maintenance cycle).

In order to prioritize the mitigation actions a jurisdiction had selected, participants identified the *benefits* and *costs* of each action using a planning concept called “STAPLEE”. Their evaluation methodology is presented below in the table below.

STAPLEE Criteria	
S Social	Is the action unfair to one section of the community over others? If yes, it is a social cost associated with the action. If the implementation of the action helps achieve a social goal of the community, it is a social <i>benefit</i> associated with the action.
T Technical	Is the action a good technical solution to the problem? If yes, it is a <i>benefit</i> associated with the action. The better the solution, the higher the <i>benefits</i> .
A Administrative	Is the action difficult to implement because of the administrative problems associated? If yes, it is an administrative <i>cost</i> .
P Political	Is the action politically favored? If yes, it is a <i>benefit</i> . If the action is likely to be politically unacceptable, it is a <i>cost</i> associated with the action.
L Legal	Are there perceived legal problems in implementing the action? If yes, it is a <i>cost</i> associated with the action.
E Economic	Does implementing the action make economic sense? Are the <i>costs</i> too prohibitive? If yes, it is a cost associated with the action.
E Environmental	Does the action have adverse environmental effects? If yes, it is a <i>cost</i> associated with the action.

Now using the STAPLEE factors discussed above for each action, each jurisdiction rated the overall benefits and costs of each action they had selected, and assigned priorities. To determine overall “benefits” for a certain action, each jurisdiction considered individual social, technical, administrative, political, legal, economic, and environmental benefits for the action and then indicated whether the net benefits, overall, could be characterized as high, medium, or low. To determine overall “costs” for a certain action, each jurisdiction considered individual social, technical, administrative, political, legal, economic, and environmental costs for that action and then indicated whether the net costs, overall, could be characterized as high, medium, or low. These overall ‘benefits’ and ‘costs’ were noted on the worksheet, and the jurisdictions prioritized each action based on its overall benefits and costs (i.e., an action with High benefits and Low costs should be High priority).

Action items not selected for prioritization by a given community received a low priority at this time. In the future, communities may still seek to pursue actions (and associated studies, funding, etc. for these actions) which they evaluated in June but did not select for prioritization at that time.

The attached Table remaining pages of this section (Table 50) contain prioritization sheets completed by each participant for their selected actions. Each participant identified at least one action item for implementation.

Note to the reviewer: The next section in this plan, entitled “Implementation Strategy,” will expand upon the prioritization step by identifying the hazard addressed, if the action applies to new and/or existing assets, the primary agency responsible for action item completion, any existing local planning mechanisms through which the action item will be implemented, target date for completion, estimated cost, and funding source.