|  |
| --- |
| **Action Worksheet** |
| **Name of Jurisdiction:** **Name of Haz. Mit. Plan:** |  |
| **Risk / Vulnerability** |
| **Problem being Mitigated:** |  |
| **Potential Actions/Projects (not being Implemented at this time)** |
| **Actions/Projects Considered with Summary Evaluation of Each:** |  |
| **Action or Project Intended for Implementation** |
| **Action/Project Number:****Name of Action or Project:** |  |
| **Action or Project Description:** |  |
| **Summary of Evaluation[[1]](#footnote-1)****Benefits (losses avoided)****Estimated Cost****Other Factors Considered** |  |
| **Plan for Implementation** |
| **Responsible Organization:** |  |
| **Action/Project Priority:** |  |
| **Timeline for Completion:** |  |
| **Potential Fund Sources:** |  |
| **Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:** |  |
| **Progress Report** |
| **Date of Status Report:** **Report of Progress:****Evaluation of Effectiveness:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Action Worksheet****Instructions** |
| **Name of Jurisdiction:** **Name of Haz. Mit. Plan:** | *Give the name of your municipality* *Name of the Hazard Mitigation Plan when it is a Multi-Jurisdictional Plan* |
| **Risk / Vulnerability** |
| **Problem being Mitigated:** | *Describe the specific problem or area of concern. Each Action Worksheet should describe a unique problem. A well written problem statement is key to a successful mitigation action.* |
| **Potential Actions/Projects (not being Implemented at this time)** |
| **Actions/Projects Considered with Summary Evaluation of Each:** | *For each problem, consider different types of mitigation actions/projects. Document this consideration by naming the potential actions/projects considered and by explaining why each is not being implemented. The documentation of alternatives encourages comprehensive thinking and facilitates the preparation of grant applications.* |
| **Action or Project Intended for Implementation** |
| **Action/Project Number:****Name of Action or Project:** | *Give each action a unique number and name (title) for easy reference. It is recommended that the municipality’s initials be part of the action number to avoid confusion in multi-jurisdiction plans. For example, the City of Long Beach might use the number LB-1 for their first action.*  |
| **Action or Project Description:** | *Describe the work to be done. It should be a unique statement of work, not a generic statement. Sources, such as FEMA’s Mitigation Ideas publication, include generic actions to trigger the brainstorming of specific actions that could be taken. These generic actions must be refined into specific actions that address the specific problem at hand.*  |
| **Summary of Evaluation****Benefits (losses avoided)****Estimated Cost****Other Factors Considered** | *Summarize the evaluation of the action/project. Part of this evaluation must be a consideration of the benefits (losses avoided) and costs for the project. Describe any other factors and how they affected the decision. Factors such as technical, legal, environmental, social, and political considerations. The capacity of the jurisdiction to undertake this work should also be considered.* |
| **Plan for Implementation** |
| **Responsible Organization:** | *This should be the name of a department or agency, not the name of the municipality.*  |
| **Action/Project Priority:** | *Actions may be numbered in priority order or could be assigned a general priority, such as high, medium, or low.* |
| **Timeline for Completion:** | *State the target time when the action/project will be completed. Other timeline information might also be provided, such as the estimated start date. All actions must have a point in time when they will be completed in order to be considered a mitigation action as defined by FEMA. Actions which are “ongoing” (e.g. maintenance) reduce risk for the short-term and may be very worthy activities, but they do not meet the definition of mitigation action for this plan. Mitigation action for this plan must reduce risk for the long-term.* |
| **Potential Fund Sources:** | *Multiple sources of potential funding should be listed when appropriate.*  |
| **Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:** | *Other plans (e.g. land use plans) and processes (e.g. capital budgeting process) are often means through which mitigation actions can be more easily implemented. Consider the use of local planning mechanisms and identify any existing planning mechanisms that will be used to implement this action/project.* |
| **Progress Report** |
| **Date of Status Report:** **Report of Progress:****Evaluation of Effectiveness:** | *In the future this space may be used to report on progress. Leave this space blank until it is time to complete a status report.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Action Worksheet****Example** |
| **Name of Jurisdiction:** **Name of Haz. Mit. Plan:** | Town of London, Bristol County NYBristol County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan |
| **Risk / Vulnerability** |
| **Problem being Mitigated:** | The Taunton River is subject to ice jams near River Road. On multiple occasions homes in this area have been flooded. Homeowners have incurred high rebuilding costs, over and above insurance claims. Traffic along this thoroughfare is disrupted during flood events. |
| **Potential Actions/Projects (not being Implemented at this time)** |
| **Actions/Projects Considered with Summary Evaluation of Each:** | Taunton River Rock Removal – Remove the large rocks from the river that catch ice flows. This alternative is not being pursued because the financial costs would be very high and the effectiveness of this is in doubt. It would also jeopardize the viability of the river as a fishing destination.Acquire Homes – Offer to purchase the affected homes. Upon taking ownership, remove the homes and return the land to its natural state. This alternative is not being pursued because homeowners do not want to leave the community. Removal of these homes would also diminish the town’s tax base.Educate River Road Homeowners – Distribute a brochure to River Road homeowners describing the probability of future flooding and suggesting possible mitigation steps they may take. This option is not being pursued because the homeowners are well aware of the risk and the mitigation actions they may take. They have already several smaller / affordable mitigation actions. They cannot afford to do more.  |
| **Action or Project Intended for Implementation** |
| **Action/Project Number:****Name of Action or Project:** | L-1: River Road Home Elevations Program |
| **Action or Project Description:** | Offer to partially fund the elevation of homes that have been multiple times over the past thirty-years. When homeowners accept this offer, homes will be elevated above base flood evaluation and according to NYS building code. |
| **Summary of Evaluation****Benefits (losses avoided)****Estimated Cost****Other Factors Considered** | Partially funding home elevations makes this option affordable to homeowners and avoids a lessening of the town’s tax base. The mitigation action would avoid future flood damage of about $750,000. The cost of the elevation program is expected to be just under $500,000. The program would be voluntary, making it more socially and politically acceptable. |
| **Plan for Implementation** |
| **Responsible Organization:** | Town Planning Department |
| **Action/Project Priority:** | High |
| **Timeline for Completion:** | An application for a FEMA grant will be made in year 1and the program should be completed within 3 years. |
| **Potential Fund Sources:** | FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) fundsFEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM) funds |
| **Local Planning Mechanisms to be Used in Implementation, if any:** | The administration of this activity will be added to Planning Department’s annual work plan. |
| **Progress Report** |
| **Date of Status Report:** **Report of Progress:****Evaluation of Effectiveness:** | No report at this time. |

1. Summarize the evaluation of potential actions and the action selected for implementation. Always consider the benefits and costs. Other criterion might include: Technical Feasibility, Political Support, Legal Authority, Environmental Impacts, positive and negative Social Impacts, and whether the jurisdiction has a person willing to be the Local Champion for implementation and is this person with the full support of the jurisdiction Administratively Capable of implementing the action selected for implementation. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)