



---

## SECTION 7 CAPABILITY AND HAZARD MITIGATION STRATEGY

---

### 7.1 JURISDICTION CAPABILITIES

This section of the Plan discusses the capability of Scott County and the participating local jurisdictions to implement hazard mitigation actions.

#### 7.1.1 Capability Assessment Overview

The purpose of conducting a capability assessment is to determine the ability of a local jurisdiction to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy, and to identify potential opportunities for establishing or enhancing specific mitigation policies, programs, or projects. It is important to establish goals, objectives and actions that are feasible, based on an understanding of the organizational capacity of those agencies or departments tasked with their implementation. A capability assessment helps determine which mitigation actions are practical and likely to be implemented given a local government's regulatory framework, level of administrative and technical support, and fiscal resources.

A capability assessment has two primary components: an inventory of a local jurisdiction's relevant plans, ordinances, or programs already in place, and an analysis of its capacity to carry them out. A capability assessment also highlights the positive mitigation measures already in place or being implemented at the local level, which should continue to be supported and enhanced through future mitigation efforts. The capability assessment completed for Scott County and its jurisdictions serves as a critical planning step and is an integral part of the foundation for designing an effective multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation strategy. Coupled with the Risk Assessment, the Capability Assessment helps identify and target meaningful mitigation actions for incorporation in the Mitigation Strategy section of the Hazard Mitigation Plan. It not only helps establish the goals and objectives for Scott County, but also ensures that those goals and objectives are realistically achievable under given local conditions.

#### 7.1.2 Conducting the Capability Assessment

In order to facilitate the inventory and analysis of local government capabilities throughout Scott County, a Capability Assessment Survey was distributed to Scott County and its municipalities. The survey was completed by appropriate local government officials and requested information on a variety of "capability indicators" such as existing local plans, policies, programs, or ordinances that contribute to the community's ability to implement hazard mitigation actions. Other indicators requested included information related to each jurisdiction's fiscal, administrative, and technical capabilities, such as access to local budgetary and personnel resources for mitigation purposes. At a minimum, survey results provide an extensive inventory of existing local plans, ordinances, programs, and resources in place or under development. The survey instrument not only helps to accurately assess each jurisdiction's degree of local capability, but also serves as a good source of introspection for those jurisdictions wishing to improve their capability as identified gaps, weaknesses, or conflicts can be viewed as opportunities for specific actions to be proposed as part of the community's mitigation strategy.



---

### 7.1.3 Capability Assessment

On the following pages are three worksheets for each participating jurisdiction hazard mitigation-planning representative to complete. This information is necessary in order to evaluate proposed mitigation actions versus what is feasible in terms of jurisdictional legal, administrative, fiscal, and technical capabilities. The worksheet for Scott County is included in this section. The worksheets for each municipality are included in the individual Mitigation Action Plans for each municipality.

#### **Worksheet 1: Legal and Regulatory Capability**

This worksheet documents authorities available to the jurisdiction and/or enabling legislation at the state level affecting planning and land management tools that support local hazard mitigation planning efforts. The following planning and land management tools are typically used by states and local and tribal jurisdictions to implement hazard mitigation activities. If the jurisdiction does not have this capability or authority, does another entity/jurisdiction have this authority at a higher level of government (county, parish, or regional political entity), or does the state prohibit the local jurisdictions from having this authority?

Building codes regulate construction standards. In many communities, permits and inspections are required for new construction. Decisions regarding the adoption of building codes (that account for hazard risk), the type of permitting process required both before and after a disaster, and the enforcement of inspections all affect the level of hazard risk faced by a community.

Capital Improvements Plans (CIP) guides the scheduling of spending on public improvements. A CIP can serve as an important mechanism to guide future development away from identified hazard areas. Limiting public spending in hazardous areas is one of the most effective long-term mitigation actions available to local governments.

Comprehensive Plans incorporates all aspects of the various tactical plans and programs into a strategic county plan that guides the county and its jurisdictions to successfully improve and enhance the quality of life for all citizens.

COOP/COG Plans Are Continuity of Operations Plans/ Continuity of Government Plans that define jurisdiction succession and recovery from disasters. The plan identifies alternate sites, critical processes, records, personnel, tools etc. that are required to re-establish critical services to the community within 12 hours and be sustained for a minimum of 30 days

Economic Development Plans provides for development of existing business in the county and a strategy to attract new business to locate in the county. A successful Economic Development Plan provides long-term, attractive employment opportunity to communities and increases the tax base.

EMAP Certification is certification by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program that certifies that the jurisdiction meets all the NIMS and NFPA-1600 requirements.

Emergency Response Plans are part of an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) that outlines responsibilities and the means by which resources are deployed following an emergency incident or disaster.

Flood Management Plans (or a flood mitigation plan) provides a framework for action regarding the corrective and preventative measures in place to reduce flood-related impacts. Typical flood control activities include: structural flood control works (such as bank stabilization, levees, and drainage channels), acquisition of flood-prone land, flood insurance programs and studies, river



---

and basin management plans, public education programs, and flood warning and emergency preparedness activities.

National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) contains specific regulatory measures that enable government officials to determine where and how growth occurs relative to flood hazards. Participation in the NFIP is voluntary for local governments. The program is promoted by FEMA as a basic first step for implementing and sustaining an effective hazard mitigation program. It is used as a key indicator for measuring local capability as part of this assessment. In order for a county or municipality to join the NFIP, it must adopt a local flood damage prevention ordinance that requires jurisdictions to follow established minimum building standards in the floodplain.

Community Rating System (CRS) is an incentive-based program that encourages counties and municipalities to undertake defined flood mitigation activities that go beyond the minimum requirements of the NFIP, by adding extra measures to provide protection from flooding. All of the 18 creditable CRS mitigation activities are assigned a range of point values. This rating can reduce the cost of flood insurance for the community.

Growth Control Ordinances are primarily used by local governments to encourage growth in an orderly manner in the areas covered by the ordinance. The purpose of most growth control ordinances is to preserve residential housing values, protect historic areas, and insure that local governments can provide appropriate services to citizens.

Hazard Setback and Hillside Ordinances or Regulations are usually part of a comprehensive land use plan. Typically a comprehensive plan is comprised of demographics, land use, transportation elements, and community facilities. Given the nature of the plan and its regulatory standing, the integration of hazard mitigation measures into the comprehensive plan enhances the likelihood of achieving risk reduction goals, objectives, and actions.

Historic Ordinances identify and protect historic assets, structures or areas through the use of zoning and building regulations

Post Disaster Ordinances provides for the protection of lives and property and enhances the recovery from disasters. The ordinance is used to control price gouging, and allows local governments to facilitate the purchase and deployment of equipment and resources to speed disaster recovery.

A Post Disaster Recovery Plan provides the framework to establish assistance to victims of disaster, assess the long-term economic effects of disaster on the community, facilitate post-disaster recovery, and assist the community with redevelopment plans.

Real Estate Disclosure facilitates real estate transactions and ensures that both buyers and sellers fully understand any mitigating circumstances associated with properties.

Site Plans/Subdivision Ordinance is intended to regulate the development of residential, commercial, industrial, or other uses, including public infrastructure, as land is subdivided into lots for future development. Subdivision design that accounts for natural hazards can dramatically reduce the exposure of future development.

Wildfire Ordinances are a means to control the potential of wildfire occurrence by requiring burn permits and the reduction of fuel for wildfires in both urban interfaces and forests in general.

Zoning Ordinances are the means to control land use by local governments. As part of a community's police power, zoning ordinances are used to protect the public health, safety and



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

welfare of its citizens. Since zoning regulations enable local jurisdictions to limit the type and density of development, it can serve as a powerful tool when applied in identified hazard areas.

The Legal and Regulatory Capability table documents authorities available to the jurisdiction and/or enabling legislation at the state level affecting planning and land management tools that support local hazard mitigation planning efforts. The identified planning and land management tools are typically used by states and local and tribal jurisdictions to implement hazard mitigation activities. If the jurisdiction does not have this capability or authority, another entity/jurisdiction may have this authority at a higher level of government (county, parish, or regional political entity), or the state may prohibit the local jurisdictions from having this authority.

<b>Table 7.1 Scott County Legal And Regulatory Capability</b>						
<b>Regulatory Tools/Plans</b>	<b>Regulatory Type: Ordinance, Resolution, Codes, Plans Etc.</b>	<b>Date Adopted</b>	<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>State Prohibited</b>	<b>Higher Authority</b>	<b>Electronic copy included</b>
Building Codes	International Building Codes	2007	Y	N	Y	N
Capital Improvements Plan	Annual Budget	Annually	Y	N	N	Y
Comprehensive Plan	County Comprehensive Plan	2008	Y	N	N	N
Continuity of Operations Plan	No		N	N	Y	N
Community Rating System (Flood)	NO		N	N	Y	N
Economic Development Plan	County Comprehensive Plan	2008	Y	N	N	Y
Emergency Management Accredited	NO		N	N	Y	N
Emergency Response Plan	County Emergency Operations Plan	2005	Y	N	Y	Y
Flood Management, Plan	County Flood Management Plan	2002	Y	N	Y	N
Growth Control Ordinance	County Comprehensive Plan	2008	Y	N	N	Y
Hazard Mitigation Plan	County All Hazards Mitigation Plan	2010	Y	N	Y	Y
Hazard Setback Regulations	County Ordinance	208	Y	N	N	N
Hillside Ordinance Erosion Control	County Ordinance	2008	Y	N	N	N
Historic Ordinance	NO		N	N	N	N
NFIP Participant	County Flood Management Plan	2002	Y	N	Y	N
Post-disaster Ordinance	NO		N	N	N	N
Post-disaster Recovery Plan	County Emergency Operations Plan	2005	Y	N	N	Y
Real Estate Disclosure	State Real Estate Commission	1999	N	N	Y	N
Site Plan Requirements	County Ordinance	2008	Y	N	N	N
Subdivision Regulations	County Ordinance	2008	Y	N	N	N
Wildfire Ordinance	None	2008	N	N	N	N
Zoning Ordinances	County Ordinance	2008	Y	N	N	N



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

The Administrative and Technical Capacity table documents personnel employed by a jurisdiction and the public and private sector resources that may be accessed to mitigate hazards in the community. For smaller jurisdictions with limited capacities, no local staff resources may be available for many of the categories. If so resources at the next higher level of government are identified that may be able to provide technical assistance to the community.

For some hazard mitigation actions, consider federal agencies that provide technical assistance, such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Cooperative Extension Service, which has offices in most counties. The planning team in rural communities must be creative in identifying outside resources to augment limited local capabilities. This information will be used when evaluating alternative mitigation actions and when preparing your mitigation.

**Table 7.2 Scott County Administrative And Technical Capabilities**

Position	Staff/Personnel Resources	C=County Provides #, S=State Provides #, F=Federal Provides Department/Agency	Number		Total Personnel
			Fully Trained	Fully Equipped	
Agriculture Resource	Agent	County Extension Svc.	2	2	2
Building Inspector	Professional	Zoning and Inspections	1	1	1
Emergency Communications	911 specialists	E-911	18	18	18
Emergency Manager	Certified Professional	Emergency Management	1	1	1
Emergency Staff	Professional(s)	Emergency Management	1	1	1
EMT First Responders	Certified	Fire/Rescue Service	0	0	0
Fire Personnel	Professional(s)	Fire Department	0	0	0
Floodplain Manager	Engineer(s)	Engineering/Public Works	1	1	1
GIS Specialist	Professional(s)	Info Technology	3	3	3
Government Elected	Elected Officials	Sheriff/County Attorney/Commissioners	7	7	7
Government Administration	Employees	Jurisdiction Total	7	7	7
Grant writer	Professional(s)	Jurisdiction	0	0	0
Hazards Analysis Mgr.	Certified	Emergency Management	0	0	0
Hazmat Team	Certified	Fire/Sheriff Department	25	25	25
Information Systems	Professional	Information Technology	12	12	12
Land Use/Management	Engineer(s)/Planners	State/Local Planning	5	5	5
Law Enforcement	Sheriff Deputies	Sheriff Office	35	35	35
Medical Practitioners	Doctor-Medical Consultant	Medical Facilities	1	1	1
Public Health	Professionals	Public Health	19	19	19
Public Works	Engineers/Staff	Public Works	2	2	2
Public Utilities	Professionals	Public Utilities	0	0	0
Surveyor	Professional	Employed/Contracted	1	1	1
Total Jurisdiction Employees				141	



The Fiscal Capability survey identifies whether the jurisdiction has access to or is eligible to use certain financial resources for hazard mitigation.

<b>Table 7.3 Scott County Fiscal Capabilities</b>						
Financial Resources	Description			Status		
				Yes	No	TBD
Community Grants	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)			X		Y
	Hazard Mitigation Planning Grants (HMPG) – disaster related			X		Y
	PDM for Disaster Resistant Universities				X	N
	PDM Grants for communities				X	Y
	Department of Health Grants			X		N
	Department of Justice Grants			X		Y
	Department of Agriculture Grants			X		Y
	Department of Energy Grants			X		N
	Department of Education Grants			X		N
	Fire Department Grants				X	N
	Flood Management Grants (FMA)			X		N
	Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)			X		Y
	Repetitive Flood Claims Grants (RFC)			X		N
	Severe Repetitive Loss Grants (SRL)			X		N
	Private foundation grants			X		N
	Private business/industry grants			X		N
Debt Procurement	Incur debt based on special tax/revenue bonds			X		N
Dept Procurement	Incur debt through private activity bonds (private/jurisdiction bonds)				X	N
Impact Fees	Charge developer fees for new developments (impact fees)			X		N
Jurisdiction Bonds	Incur debt via general obligation bonds (no guaranteed repayment source)			X		N
Project Funding	Capital improvement budget			X		Y
Spending Restrictions	Able to withhold spending in hazard-prone areas (permits)				X	N
Special Taxes	Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes (i.e. sales tax)			X		Y
Utility Fees	Collect fees for water, sewer, gas, cable or electric service				X	N
Annual Revenue	Annual Budget		Sales Tax Revenue			
Public Structures	Number	Total Value	Total Sq. Ft.			
Private Facilities	Number of Business		Number of Industries			

### 7.1.4 Participating Jurisdictions Capability Assessment Findings

The findings of the capability assessment are summarized in this section to provide insight into relevant capability of Scott County’s jurisdictions to implement hazard mitigation activities. The summary is based upon the responses provided by local government officials to the Capability Assessment Survey and during meetings throughout the planning process.

The information provided by participating jurisdictions was scored using a simple scoring methodology to rank each jurisdiction’s overall capability. A total score and general capability rating of “High,” “Medium” or “Low” was then determined for each jurisdiction according to the



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

total number of points. The result of this multi-jurisdictional capability assessment provides critical information for developing an effective and meaningful mitigation strategy.

**Planning and Regulatory Capability**

Planning and regulatory capability is based on the implementation of existing plans, ordinances, and programs by a local government. These measures can help demonstrate a local jurisdiction’s commitment to guiding and managing growth, development, and redevelopment in a responsible manner while maintaining the general welfare of the community. Such measures include emergency response and mitigation planning, comprehensive land use planning, and transportation planning, in addition to the enforcement of zoning or subdivision ordinances and building codes that regulate how land is developed and structures are built. This information will help identify opportunities to address existing gaps, weaknesses, or conflicts with other initiatives, in addition to integrating this Plan with existing planning mechanisms.

**Table 7.4 Planning and Regulatory Capability Summary**

Regulatory Control in place Yes=1 No=0 0-7=Low 8-14=Medium 15-21=High	Table 7.4 Planning and Regulatory Capability Summary																						
	Building Codes	Capital Improvement Plan	Comprehensive Plan	COOP/COG Plan	Community Rating System	Economic Development Plan	EMAP Certified	Emergency Response Plan	Flood Management Plan	Growth Control Ordinance	Hazard Setback Ordinance	Hillside Ordinance	Historic Ordinance	Post Disaster Ordinance	Post Disaster Recovery Plan	Real Estate Disclosure	Shoreline Ordinance	Site Plan Requirements	Subdivision Regulations	Wildfire Ordinance	Zoning Regulations	Score	CAPABILITY
Scott County	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Belle Plaine	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Belle Plaine Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Blakeley Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Cedar Lake Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Credit River Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Elko-New Market	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Helena Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Jackson Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Jordan	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Louisville Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
M Sioux Tribal Area	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
New Market Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
New Prague	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Prior Lake	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
St Lawrence Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Sand Creek Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Savage	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Shakopee	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M
Spring Lake Township	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14	M



### 7.1.4.1 Administrative and Technical Capability

The ability of a local government to develop and implement mitigation projects, policies, and programs is directly tied to its ability to direct staff time and resources for that purpose. Administrative capability is evaluated by determining how mitigation activities are assigned to local departments and the personnel resources available to implement the activities. Key Resources to respond to and mitigate disaster include the following:

Table 7.5 Administrative and Technical Capability Summary																							
Resources in place Yes=2 Other Authority=1 No=0 30-42=High 17-29=Medium 0-17=Low	Agriculture Risk Assessor	Building Inspector	Emergency Manager	Emergency Staff	Emt's Certified	Fire Service	Flood Plain Manager	GIS	Government Administrative	Government Elected	Grant Writer	Hazard Risk Assessor	HAZMAT Team	Information Systems	Land Use Management	Law Enforcement	Medical Personnel	Public Works	Public Communications	Public Utilities	Surveyor	Score	CAPABILITY
Scott County	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	37	H
Belle Plaine	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	36	H
Belle Plaine Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	24	M
Blakeley Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	24	M
Cedar Lake Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	M
Credit River Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	M
Elko-New Market	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	33	H
Helena Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	24	M
Jackson Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	24	M
Jordan	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	36	H
Louisville Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	24	M
M Sioux Tribal Area	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	38	H
New Market Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	M
New Prague	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	33	H
Prior Lake	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	36	H
St Lawrence Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	M
Sand Creek Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	M
Savage	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	36	H
Shakopee	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	36	H
Spring Lake Township	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	M

### 7.1.4.2 Fiscal Capability

The ability of a local government to take action is closely associated with the amount of money available to implement policies and projects. This may take the form of outside grants or local-based revenue and financing. The costs associated with mitigation policy and project implementation vary widely. In some cases, policies are tied primarily to staff or administrative costs. In other cases, direct expenses are linked to an actual project such as the acquisition of



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

flood prone homes, which can require a substantial commitment from local, state, and federal funding sources. The Capability Assessment Survey was used to capture information on each jurisdiction's fiscal capability through the identification of locally available financial resources.

The survey identifies whether the jurisdiction does or does not have the capability and scores overall fiscal capability.

Table 7.6 Fiscal Capability Summary																									
Fiscal Capability Yes=1 No=0 0-7=Low 8-14=Medium 15-21=High	CDBG Grants	HMPG Grants	Education PDM Grant	Community PDM	DOH Grants	DOJ Grants	DOA Grants	DOE Grants	DOED Grants	Fire Dept Grant	FMA	HSGP	RPL	SRL	Private Grants	Tax Bonds	Private Bonds	Developer Fees	General Bonds	Capital Budget	Hazard Spending	Tax Levies	Utility Fees	Score	CAPABILITY
Scott County	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	17	H
Belle Plaine	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	20	H
Belle Plaine Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	L
Blakeley Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	L
Cedar Lake Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	L
Credit River Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	L
Elko-New Market	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	19	H
Helena Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	L
Jackson Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	L
Jordan	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	20	H
Louisville Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	L
M Sioux Tribal Area	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	20	H
New Market Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	L
New Prague	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	20	H
Prior Lake	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	20	H
St Lawrence Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	L
Sand Creek Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	L
Savage	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	20	H
Shakopee	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	20	H
Spring Lake Township	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	L



### 7.1.4.3 External Resources Capabilities

The table below lists the resources available to Scott County and its municipalities.

<b>Table 7.7 Scott County Mitigation Capability Assessment</b>					
<b>Agency/Department Name and Function</b>	<b>Contact Name and email</b>	<b>Contact Telephone</b>	<b>Effect on Loss Reduction</b>		
			<b>Support</b>	<b>Facilitate</b>	<b>Hinder</b>
Scott County Emergency Management	Chris Weldon	952-496-8381	X	X	
Scott County Sheriff's Communications	Jeff Swedin	952-496-8300	X	X	
Scott County Fire Chiefs Association	Rick Colman	952-445-6921	X	X	
Property Tax Revenue & Records Manager	Cynthia Geis	952-496-8167	X	X	
Scott County Highway Department	Lezlie Vermillion	952-496-8346	X	X	
Scott County Parks Department	Mark Themig	952-496-8783	X	X	
Scott County Emergency Medical Service Providers	Jeff Lanenberg	952-894-5492	X	X	
Twin Cities Chapter American Red Cross	Gretchen Hurr	612-460-3699	X	X	
Scott County Police Chiefs Association	Kevin Studnicka	952-496-8300	X	X	
Scott County Public Health	Jennifer Deschaine	952-496-8270	X	X	
<b>FEDERAL AND STATE MITIGATION CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT</b>					
<b>Agency/Department Name and Function</b>	<b>Contact Name and email</b>	<b>Contact Telephone</b>	<b>Effect on Loss Reduction Support</b>	<b>Facilitate</b>	<b>Hinder</b>
Federal Emergency Management Agency	Nancy Ward	800-621-3362	X	X	
U. S. Department of Homeland Security	Janet Napolitano	202-282-8000	X	X	
National Flood Insurance Program	Rich Slevin	708-326-3072	X	X	
Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program	Vikki Hanson	312-480-5327	X	X	
Minnesota Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management	Gary Peterson	612-384-5219	X	X	
Minnesota Department of Public Safety	Michael Campion	651-201-7000	X	X	
National Weather Service-Chanhassen	Todd Krause	952-361-6670	X	X	
Minnesota Department of Human Services	Cal Ludeman	651-431-2709	X	X	
Minnesota Department of	Dr. Sanne Magnan	651-201-5000	X	X	



Table 7.7 Scott County Mitigation Capability Assessment					
Agency/Department Name and Function	Contact Name and email	Contact Telephone	Effect on Loss Reduction		
			Support	Facilitate	Hinder
Health					
Minnesota State Fire Marshal/Office of Pipeline Safety	Jerry Rosendahl	651-201-7201	X	X	
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Mark Holsten	651-259-5555	X	X	
Minnesota Department of Transportation	Thomas Sorel	651-366-4800	X	X	

#### 7.1.4.4 Shelter Capability

Scott County and its participating jurisdictions have several shelters. There are designated Red Cross shelters and other facilities that are designated as shelters by municipalities and Scott County. Below is a table that identifies the shelters and their characteristics.

Table 7.8 Scott County Shelters									
Location	Capacity	Sleeping Capacity	Kitchen Facilities	Commodities On site	Emergency Generator	Heat/AC	Communications	Safety Rating	Comments
This information available upon request At your Emergency Management Agency.									

## 7.2 LINKING CAPABILITY, RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

The findings of the Capability Assessment and Risk Assessment serve as the foundation for a meaningful hazard mitigation strategy. During the process of identifying the goals, objectives and mitigation actions, each jurisdiction must consider not only its level of hazard risk but also its existing capability to minimize or eliminate that risk.

In jurisdictions where the overall hazard risk is considered to be HIGH, and local capability is considered LOW, specific mitigation actions that account for these conditions should be considered. This may include less costly actions such as minor ordinance revisions or public awareness activities. Also, specific capabilities may need to be improved in order to address recurring threats.

In cases where the hazard vulnerability is LOW and overall capability is HIGH, more emphasis can be placed on actions that may impact future vulnerability such as guiding development away from known hazard areas.



## 7.2.1 Repetitive Flooding Mitigation

This section describes the source of repetitive flooding problems and identifies the number and type (residential, commercial or governmental) of repetitive loss properties in the jurisdiction.

Additional information on repetitive loss properties can be found in Section 6

The table below identifies the repetitive flooding sources structures and mitigation measures taken to reduce future incidents.

Number of Structures	Structure Type Residential Commercial Government Critical Facility Etc.	Flood Type Storm Water Out Of Banks Low Lying Maintenance	Location	Number of events	Mitigation Action Structure Buy Out Levee Built Drainage Improvement Etc.
1	Residential	Out of Banks	Scott County	2	Drainage Improvement
3	Commercial	Out of Banks	Shakopee	7	Drainage Improvement
2	Residential	Out of Banks	Prior Lake	4	Drainage Improvement

## 7.3 MITIGATION STRATEGY

The intent of the Mitigation Strategy is to provide Scott County and its municipal jurisdictions with goals that will guide future mitigation policy and project administration, along with a list of proposed actions deemed necessary to meet those goals and reduce the impact of natural and manmade hazards. It is designed to be comprehensive and strategic in nature.

Development of the comprehensive strategy included a thorough review of all natural and selected manmade hazards, and identification of policies and projects to reduce the future impacts of hazards and assist the county and municipalities to achieve compatible economic, environmental, and social goals. The strategy ensures that all policies and projects are linked to established priorities and assigned to specific departments or individuals responsible for their implementation with target implementation deadlines. When applicable, funding sources are identified that can be used to assist in project implementation.

**Mitigation Strategy §201.6(c)(3):** The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.

The first step in designing the Mitigation Strategy includes a review of existing mitigation measures and the identification of countywide Mitigation Goals. Mitigation Goals represent broad statements that are achieved through the implementation of more specific, action-oriented objectives listed in the county's Mitigation Action Plan. These actions include both hazard mitigation policies (such as the regulation of land in known hazard areas through a local ordinance), and hazard mitigation projects that seek to address specifically targeted hazard risks (such as the mitigation of an area prone to repetitive flooding).

The second step involves the identification and analysis of available mitigation measures to help achieve the identified mitigation goals. This is a long-term, continuous process sustained through the development and maintenance of this Plan. Alternative mitigation measures will continue to



be considered as future mitigation opportunities become identified, as data and technology improve, as mitigation funding becomes available, and as this Plan is maintained.

The third and last step in designing the Mitigation Strategy is the creation of the local Mitigation Action Plans (MAPs); The MAPs represent unambiguous plans for action, and are considered to be the most essential outcome of the mitigation planning process. They include a prioritized listing of proposed hazard mitigation actions (policies and projects) for each of Scott County’s jurisdictions, along with accompanying information regarding those agencies or individuals assigned responsibility for their implementation, potential funding sources and an estimated target date for implementation. The MAPs provide those individuals or agencies responsible for implementing mitigation actions with a clear roadmap that also serves as an important tool for monitoring progress over time.

### 7.3.1 Mitigation Goals and Objectives

The hazard mitigation planning process has brought together a group of dedicated representatives from the jurisdictions comprising Scott County. An early suggestion from several members of the planning committee that the group continue to meet on a regular schedule after Plan approval speaks for the cooperation and sense of community each jurisdiction brings to the planning effort, and instills confidence that the jurisdictions will unite in mitigation and other efforts.

It is the vision of Scott County and its municipalities to promote citizen and governmental responsibility for hazard awareness and preparedness, and to foster cooperative planning among the jurisdictions to reduce the impact of natural and manmade hazards on public and private assets, and on the safety and welfare of all citizens.

The goals and objectives of the Scott County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan were crafted early in the planning process through a facilitated discussion and brainstorming session with the Mitigation Steering Committee. Both State and local risk assessment findings were used as the bases of goal and objective setting. At each step of the planning process the goals and objectives were reviewed and modified, if necessary, based on any new information that was gathered and assimilated into the Plan. The goals and objectives established address each profiled hazard. The Mitigation Committee believes that all of the following goals and objectives are necessary to begin to address hazard issues in Scott County. The following goal and objective statements represent a broad target for Scott County and its municipalities to achieve through the implementation of their own specific Mitigation Action Plans before the next Plan update.

<p><b>Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i):</b> The hazard mitigation strategy shall include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.</p> <p><b>A:</b> Does the new or updated plan include a description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards?</p> <p><b>CRS Step 6: Set Goals:</b> Credit is based on a statement of goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerability to the identified hazards.</p>
---



<b>Table 7.10 Countywide Community Goals and Objectives</b>	
Goals	Objectives
Goal 1: Improve Scott County and participating jurisdiction capability to minimize or eliminate loss of life and property from profiled hazard events	Objective 1.1: Improve Scott county's and participating jurisdictions information distribution and alert and warning capabilities for minimize or eliminate citizens loss of life and property from all profiled hazards Objective 1.2: Improve Scott County's and participating jurisdictions 1 <sup>st</sup> responder capabilities to prepare for and respond to all profiled hazards to reduce or eliminate citizens loss of life and property from all profiled hazards
Goal 2: Improve Scott County and participating jurisdiction capability to minimize or eliminate loss of Public property from profiled hazards	Objective 2.1: Improve Scott County's and participating jurisdictions 1 <sup>st</sup> responder capabilities to prepare for and respond to all profiled hazards to reduce or eliminate damage to public property from profiled hazards Objective 2.2: Improve Scott County's and participating jurisdictions capability to prepare for and respond to all profiled hazards to reduce or eliminate public property loss from profiled hazards
Goal 3: Improve Scott County and participating jurisdiction capability to recover from loss of life and all property damage caused by profiled hazards	Objective 3.1: Improve Scott County's and participating jurisdictions citizen's to recover from profiled hazards impact to life and property from profiled hazards Objective 3.2: Improve Scott County's and participating jurisdictions businesses to recover from the impact of all profiled hazards Objective 3.3 Improve Scott County's and participating jurisdictions public infrastructure to recover from the impact of profiled hazards
Specific Jurisdiction Objectives	Improve Scott County's capability to handle debris management Improve Scott County's ability to minimize the impact of drought on water supplies Improve groundwater quality in Scott County Develop an education and awareness program on the hazards of the river and boating safety. Address issues with Commercial and Recreational Navigation on Minnesota River Improve Scott County's ability to response to non-native invasive agriculture species Mitigate the impact of all hazards on Scott County by using volunteers

### 7.3.2 Local and State Goal Continuity

The State of Minnesota Hazard Mitigation Plan establishes for goals:

- GOAL 1. Maintain and enhance the Minnesota Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management's capacity to continuously make Minnesota less vulnerable to all hazards
- GOAL 2. Build and support local capacity and commitment to continuously become less vulnerable to natural hazards.
- GOAL 3. Improve coordination and communication with other relevant entities.
- GOAL 4. Increase public understanding, support, and demand for hazard mitigation.

The mitigation goals, objectives and actions of the Scott County Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards Mitigation Plan are congruent with the State goals.



### 7.3.3 Identification of Mitigation Actions

In formulating Scott County’s Mitigation Strategy, a wide range of actions were considered in order to help achieve countywide and jurisdiction goals and objectives. All actions considered by the Mitigation Steering Committee can be classified under one of the following six broad categories of mitigation techniques:

Prevention activities are intended to keep hazard problems from getting worse, and are typically administered through government programs or regulatory actions that influence the way land is developed and buildings are constructed. They are particularly effective in reducing a community’s vulnerability, in areas where development is limited or capital improvements have not been substantial. Examples of preventative activities include:

- Planning and zoning
- Building codes
- Hazard mapping
- Open space preservation
- Floodplain regulations
- Storm water management regulations
- Drainage system maintenance
- Capital improvements programming
- Shoreline/riverine/fault zone setbacks
- Site planning and landscape design

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure. A. Does the new or updated plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?

**CRS Step 7. Review Possible Activities:** Credit is based on a comprehensive evaluation of hazard mitigation measures reviewed in the plan. The review must include a description of why certain activities were recommended and why others were not.

Property Protection measures involve the modification of existing buildings and structures to help them better withstand the forces of a hazard, or removal of the structures from hazardous locations. Examples include:

- Acquisition
- Relocation
- Building elevation
- Critical facilities protection
- Retrofitting (e.g., wind proofing, flood proofing, seismic design techniques, etc.)
- Safe rooms, shutters, shatter-resistant glass
- Insurance

Natural Resource Protection reduces the impact of natural hazards by preserving or restoring natural areas and their protective functions. Such areas include floodplains, wetlands, steep slopes, and sand dunes. Parks, recreation, or conservation organizations often implement these protective measures. Examples include:

- Floodplain protection
- Watershed management
- Riparian buffers
- Forest and vegetation management (e.g., fire resistant landscaping, fuel breaks, etc.)



- 
- Erosion and sediment control
  - Wetland preservation and restoration
  - Habitat preservation
  - Slope stabilization

Structural Mitigation Projects are intended to lessen the impact of a hazard by modifying the environmental natural progression of the hazard event through construction. They are usually designed by engineers and managed or maintained by public works staff. Examples include:

- Reservoirs
- Dams/levees/dikes/floodwalls
- Diversions/detention/retention
- Channel modification
- Storm sewers

Emergency Services emergency service measures minimize the impact of a hazard event on people and property. These commonly are actions taken immediately prior to, during, or in response to a hazard event. Examples include:

- Warning systems
- Evacuation planning and management
- Emergency response training and exercises
- Sandbagging for flood protection

Public Education and Awareness are used to alert residents, elected officials, business owners, property buyers, and visitors about hazards, hazardous areas, and mitigation techniques they can use to protect themselves and their property. Examples of measures to educate and inform the public include:

- Outreach projects
- Speaker series/demonstration events
- Hazard map information
- Real estate disclosure
- Library materials
- Education programs for school children

### **7.3.4 Selection of Mitigation Actions**

In order to determine the most appropriate mitigation techniques for Scott County and its municipal jurisdictions, local government officials reviewed and considered the findings of the Capability Assessment and Risk Assessment. Other considerations included each mitigation action's effect on overall risk to life and property, its ease of implementation, its degree of political and community support, its general cost-effectiveness, and funding availability (if necessary). The following table of alternative mitigation actions was the basis for developing the mitigation actions.



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

Table 7.11 Alternative Mitigation Actions																
HAZARDS>	Drought	Earthquake	Extreme Temp	Flooding	Hail	High Winds	Ice/Snow	Landslides etc	Land Subsidence	Lightning	Wildfire	Hazmat	Illegal Meth Labs	Pandemic	Terrorism	Urban Fire
Alternative Mitigation Actions that can affect the adjacent hazards																
Building codes	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
Density regulations			X	X		X			X	X	X	X		X		X
Easements				X				X	X		X	X			X	X
Development regulations		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X
Wildfire fuel reduction	X										X					X
Hillside regulations		X					X	X								
Performance standards	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Setback regulations		X		X				X	X		X	X				
Special use permits				X							X	X		X		
Storm water controls				X												
Rights transfer controls				X		X	X				X	X	X	X		X
Zoning		X		X				X			X	X				X
Acquire in-hazard assets				X								X				
Facility hazard barriers				X											X	
Structure elevation				X												
Acquisition & Buyouts/Relocation of structures				X				X	X							
Structure retrofits		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
Dams monitoring		X		X			X	X	X						X	
Levee mgt		X		X		X	X	X	X							
Real estate disclosure				X		X		X	X		X	X				
Forest management	X			X		X				X	X			X		
Erosion controls				X												
Waterway management	X			X			X	X								
Landscape management	X			X	X	X	X	X							X	X
Wetlands regulations				X			X									
Vital facilities protection		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
COOP/COG Plan		X		X		X	X				X	X		X	X	X
Emergency Ops. Plan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hazard/threat recognition	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hazard warning systems	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Health/safety information		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Pre-disaster mitigation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Post disaster mitigation	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Safe rooms and shelters				X	X	X	X			X	X	X				X
Public education	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X



### 7.3.5 Reducing Hazard Impact on New Buildings and Infrastructure

Some of the mitigation actions and projects included in this plan include:

- Adopting and/or enforcing comprehensive building codes
- Requiring emergency generator pigtails on new government and special needs structures
- Providing builders information on hazard areas and associated restrictions
- Restrictions on building structures in hazard areas
- Developing and or enforcing a comprehensive land use plan.
- Encouraging new power lines to be buried to reduce power outages.
- Extend water lines and hydrants to combat fires.

### 7.3.6 Reducing Hazards Impact on Existing Buildings and Infrastructure

Some of the mitigation actions in this plan that reduce impact on existing buildings and infrastructure include:

- Potential buyout of structures in hazard areas.
- Elevating structures to reduce flood loss
- Retrofitting structures to reduce high wind loss
- Improving drainage capacity of canals and ditches
- Installing emergency generators on critical government and special needs structures
- Clearing “right of ways” of public utility power lines

### 7.3.7 National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Compliance

Participation in the NFIP is based on an agreement between communities and FEMA. The NFIP has three basic aspects:

- Floodplain identification and mapping
- Floodplain management
- Flood insurance

First, NFIP participation requires community adoption of flood maps. Mapping flood hazards creates broad-based awareness of the flood hazards and provides the data needed to administer floodplain management programs and to actuarially rate new construction for flood insurance. Second, to be a participant, the NFIP requires communities to adopt and enforce minimum floodplain management regulations that help mitigate the effects of flooding on new and improved structures. Third, community participation in the NFIP enables property owners to purchase insurance as a protection against flood losses in exchange for State and community floodplain management regulations that reduce future flood damages.

<p><b>Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(ii):</b> The mitigation strategy] must also address the jurisdiction’s participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate.</p> <p>A. Does the new or updated plan describe each jurisdiction’s participation in the NFIP?</p> <p>B. Does the mitigation strategy identify, analyze and prioritize actions related to continued compliance with the NFIP?</p> <p><b>CRS Step 8: Action Plan:</b> CRS credits regulations that go above and beyond the minimum of the NFIP.</p>
--



Scott County and its municipalities have fully complied with the above NFIP requirements with the exception of Elko-New Market. In addition to the above all jurisdictions have comprehensive plans that identify flood management issues, goals and objectives. The comprehensive plans address wetlands and storm water management activities. Most of the jurisdictions have implemented ordinances that apply to wetlands and Stormwater runoff.

The table below identifies Scott County and its municipalities NFIP Status

Table 7.12 NFIP Status					
NFIP #	Community	Initial Firm Identified	Current Effective Map Date	Reg-Emer Date	Initial FHBM
270429#	BELLE Plaine City of	3/8/1974	12/18/1986	12/18/1986	12/18/1986
	Elko-New Market	Not Mapped			
270430#	JORDAN City Of	3/8/1974	1/6/1982	1/6/1982	1/6/1982
270249#	NEW Prague City Of	5/10/1974	11/1/1978	7/21/1999	11/1/1978
270432#	PRIOR Lake City of	7/26/1974	9/29/1978	11/19/1997	9/29/1978
270433#	SAVAGE City Of	3/29/1974	6/18/1980	5/16/1994	6/18/1980
270428#	SCOTT County	12/20/1974	4/11/1980	2/19/1987	4/3/1978
270434#	SHAKOPEE City Of	6/7/1974	9/29/1978	9/29/1978	9/29/1978

### 7.3.8 Analyzing and Prioritizing NFIP Compliance Actions

All Local Mitigation Plans approved by FEMA after October 1, 2008 must describe each jurisdiction’s participation in the NFIP and must identify, analyze and prioritize actions related to continued compliance with the NFIP. Simply stating an action such as, “The community will continue to comply with NFIP,” will not meet this requirement. Basic compliance NFIP actions could include, but are not limited to:

- 1 - Adoption and enforcement of floodplain management requirements, including regulating all and substantially improved construction in Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs)
- 2 - Floodplain identification and mapping, including any local requests for map updates, if needed
- 3 - Description of community assistance and monitoring activities.

The table below identifies NFIP related actions that are included in the jurisdictions Mitigation Action Plans



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

Table 7.13 NFIP Mitigation Action Items									
Action Item	Action Description	Jurisdictions participating							
		Scott County	Belle Plaine	Elko-New Market	Jordan	New Prague	Prior Lake	Savage	Shakopee
FL3c	Adopt/enforce an NFIP flood plain Mgnt plan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL3d	Adopt/enforce floodplain legislation requiring new structures be elevated above the BSE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL3e	Obtain and maintain NFIP FIRMS to identify community flood plains	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL3f	Obtain funding to retrofit, elevate or relocate repetitive flooding structures in flood plains	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL3g	Adopt/enforce flood plain wetlands and watershed land use zoning	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL3l	Update Land Use Plans to identify areas where development should be restrictive	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL3m	Perform a study of the feasibility of community waterways flood control	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL3n	Obtain equipment to build water flow and water retention areas to mitigate flooding	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL4b	Complete flood damage study for downtown Jordan	X			X				
FL4c	Complete updated floodplain maps for staff and public use	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL4e	Assist each local government to Adopt Elevation standards legislation for new structures	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL4h	Require floodplain and shoreline ordinances to comply with MN DNR requirements	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL4o	Work with local units of government to insure completion of local flooding risk projects.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL4y	Use digital terrain modeling to identify potential flooding areas.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FL4a	Require city engineer to inspect and make recommendations regarding flood control measures on an annual basis.		X	X					
FL4b	Develop a drainage master plan for the entire community		X						
FL4a	Improve dike along Sand Creek			X					
FL4b	Install floodwall along First Street			X					
FL4a	Construct elevated drainage pipes in order to divert flood water out of a residential area							X	
FL4a	Work with engineering and public works department to ensure parks and city land is properly drained and graded.								X
FL4b	Regularly check water levels on river.								X
FL4c	Mitigate with planning/engineering on future projects developing flood plains								X



### 7.3.9 Analyzing and Prioritizing Mitigation Actions

FEMA guidance for meeting planning requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2002 (DMAK2) specifies that governments prioritize their mitigation actions based on the level of risk a hazard poses to the lives and property of a given jurisdiction. In response to this requirement, the Scott County Mitigation Steering Committee completed a Mitigation Technique Matrix to make certain they addressed, at a minimum, those hazards posing the greatest threat. The matrix provides the committee with the opportunity to cross-reference each of the priority hazards with the comprehensive range of available mitigation techniques, including prevention; property protection; natural resource protection; structural projects; emergency services; and public education and awareness.

Despite the diligence of the Mitigation Committee in completing the STAPLEE Criteria form, scores for many goal actions were identical, and provided little help in assigning priority. This form did allow the committee a thorough dissection of each goal's action, and prompted the elimination of some goals. Regardless of numerical priority ranking, early implementation dates are assigned to those actions needed to serve as a foundation upon which to build other actions. Also assigned early implementation dates are those actions leading to maintaining eligibility for current grant funding, as well as those which will promote acquisition of new funding sources.

Each participating jurisdiction prioritized its selected mitigation items individually. The "STAPLEE" evaluation and prioritization is included in each individual MAP in the Annex. A weighting factor of 3 is used for loss of life and a weighting factor of 2 is used for Property Loss and Economic impact of the hazard event.

**Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(iii):** The mitigation strategy section shall include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.

Does the new or updated mitigation strategy include how the actions are prioritized? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)

Does the new or updated mitigation strategy address how the actions will be implemented and administered? (For example, does the action plan identify the responsible department, existing and potential resources, and timeframe?)

Does the new or updated prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a cost-benefit review to maximize benefits?

D. Does the updated plan identify the completed, deleted or deferred actions from the previously approved mitigation plan?

**CRS Step 8: Action Plan:** Credit is based on an action plan that identifies who does what, when it will be done, and how it will be financed. The actions must benefits of the proposed projects and their associated costs.

<b>Table 7.14 STAPLEE Mitigation Action Priority Process</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
Social Community Acceptance	Potential objection from public and/or very expensive	Unknown if objectionable, or costs may be significant	Not objectionable and low/no costs
Effect on saving lives	Life saving impact is negligible	Life saving impact is moderate	Life saving impact is significant
Effect on reducing property loss	Effect on reducing property loss is negligible	Effect on reducing property loss is moderate	Effect on reducing property loss is significant



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.14 STAPLEE Mitigation Action Priority Process</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
Effect on reducing economic loss	Effect on reducing economic loss is negligible	Effect on reducing economic loss is moderate	Effect on reducing economic loss is significant
Technical Feasibility	Technology not currently existing	Emerging or untested technology or unknown	Technology readily available
Long-Term Solution	No, is not effective in helping reduce losses in the long term	Potentially or unknown	Yes, is effective in helping reduce losses in the long term
Secondary Impacts	Yes, likely to create secondary problems	Potentially or unknown	No, unlikely to create secondary problems
Administrative Staffing	Need to hire a permanent employee(s)	Potentially need to hire a temporary employee(s) or unknown.	Do not have to hire
Funding Potential	No obvious source of funding available and action has significant cost impact	Limited or unknown funding available	Little or no funding required or funding can be readily obtained
Maintenance/Operations	The action is likely to require high level of ongoing maintenance	Unknown or action has the potential for moderate ongoing maintenance	Action requires limited or no ongoing maintenance
Political Support	Local Elected Official likely to be contentious	Local Elected Official may be controversial	Local Elected Official likely to be supportive
Local Champion	Unlikely there is a Local Elected Official to support	Uncertain if there is a Local Elected Official to champion	A Local Elected Official is likely to support and champion
Public Support	Public Political support is unlikely	Public Political support is uncertain	Public Political support is likely
Legal State Authority Exists	No legal state authority exists	Legal state authority is unclear, uncertain or adoption is in progress	Legal state authority exists
Local Authority Exists	No legal authority exists	Legal authority is unclear, uncertain or adoption is in progress	Legal authority exists
Potential Legal Challenge	High likelihood of legal challenge by stakeholders	Moderate likelihood of legal challenge by stakeholders	Low likelihood of legal challenge by stakeholders
Economic Action Benefit	Low benefit to the jurisdiction from the action	Moderate benefit to the jurisdiction from the action	High benefit to the jurisdiction from the action
Action Cost	High cost to implement action	Moderate cost to implement action	Low cost to implement action
Economic Contribution	Low contribution to other community economic goals	Moderate contribution to other community economic goals	High contribution to other community economic goals
Outside Funding Required	Likely for action to be delayed pending outside sources of funding	Possible for action to be delayed pending outside sources of funding	Unlikely for action to be delayed pending outside sources of funding
Environmental Land/Water Effect	High likelihood of negative consequences to land/water	Moderate likelihood of negative consequences to land/water	Low likelihood of negative consequences to land/water
Endangered Species Effect	High likelihood of potential negative consequences to endangered species	Moderate likelihood of negative consequences to endangered species	Low likelihood of negative consequences to endangered species
Hazmat Waste Site affect	High likelihood of potential affect on hazardous materials and waste sites	Moderate likelihood of affect on hazardous materials and waste sites	Low likelihood of affect on hazardous materials and waste sites



<b>Table 7.14 STAPLEE Mitigation Action Priority Process</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
Environmental Effect	No, project is not consistent with jurisdiction environmental goals	Possible, project is consistent with jurisdiction environmental goals	Yes, project is consistent with jurisdiction environmental goals
Federal Law Compliant	No	Uncertain	Yes
Prioritizing mitigation actions for each jurisdiction was based on the “STAPLEE” process. “STAPLEE” uses multiple factors under the categories of <u>S</u> ocial, <u>T</u> echnical, <u>A</u> ministration, <u>L</u> egal, <u>E</u> conomic and <u>E</u> nvironment			

The Table prioritizing Scott County mitigation actions is at the end of this section and the prioritization of Individual jurisdictions mitigation actions is included in the Individual Mitigation Action Plans (IMAP) in the IMAP Annex.

### 7.3.10 Mitigation Actions Implementation

The success of this Plan hinges on two major action items;

1. Emergency Management staff must pursue all grant opportunities to assist with funding of mitigation actions. Staff must receive necessary grant writing training and evaluation of grant criteria. Without grant funding, Scott County cannot afford to begin many of the more expensive mitigation actions described in this plan.
2. Scott County Emergency Management is tasked with Plan oversight, to include project tracking, progress reports, and reconvening the Steering Committee as needed for Plan review and revision

It was the intent of the committee to establish realistic, attainable actions that can be implemented within the present fiscal capabilities of the participating jurisdictions and accepted by the citizens of the county. All members of the Planning Committee agreed that starting with small steps, accomplishing the stated goals, and publicizing the success of the county’s mitigation efforts will open the community to accept larger, more costly, projects in the future. Specific mitigation actions were identified to prevent future losses; however, current funding is not identified for all of these actions at present. The County has limited resources to take on new responsibilities or projects. The implementation of these mitigation actions is dependent on the approval of the local elected governing body and the ability of the community to obtain funding from local or outside sources. Where such actions are high priorities, the community will work with MEMA, FEMA and other Federal, State and County agencies to secure funds.

In addition to the assignment of a local lead department or agency, an implementation time period or a specific implementation date has been assigned in order to assess whether actions are being implemented in a timely fashion.

Many of the actions are interrelated (e.g. providing various categories of preparedness and awareness information to citizens at community events); these will be accomplished under a single, ongoing project. Many of the actions can be accomplished within existing department budgets, costing only the time of employees already on staff. While “time is money” and hours have been estimated in dollars for each action item, there will be no requirement for additional funds to be budgeted to accomplish many of the action items. In general, mitigation actions ranked as high priorities will be addressed first. However, medium or even low priority mitigation actions will be considered for concurrent implementation. Therefore, the ranking



levels should be considered as a first-cut, preliminary ranking and will evolve based on input from the County departments and representatives, the public, MEMA, and FEMA as the Plan is implemented.

### **7.3.11 Mitigation Action Benefit/Cost Review**

Section 201.6.c.3iii of 44CFR requires the prioritization of the action plan to emphasize the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost/benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs. The County utilized the economic criteria in the following “STAPLEE” evaluation. This benefit/cost review is qualitative; that is, it does not include the level of detail required by FEMA for project grant eligibility under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) and Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) grant program. This qualitative approach was used because projects may not be implemented for up to 10 years, and the associated costs and benefits could change dramatically in that time. Each project was assessed by assigning the subjective ratings (high, medium, and low) to its costs as described in the Economic “STAPLEE” section.

### **7.3.12 Previously Implemented Mitigation Measures**

The success of future mitigation efforts in a community can be gauged to some extent by its ongoing or past efforts. Previously implemented mitigation measures indicate that there is, or has been, a desire to reduce the effects of natural hazards, and the success of these projects can be influential in building local government support for new mitigation efforts. Scott County’s previous mitigation efforts and programs include the following:

- Each jurisdiction in Scott County supports a public works department and many provide water and wastewater treatment facilities.
- All Fire Departments provide EMT’s emergency medical service throughout the county.
- Law enforcement is provided for each municipality, either by the municipal law enforcement agencies, or by the Scott County Sheriffs Office.
- Fire Protection and fire medical / rescue services are provided for each municipality by fire departments, with either all paid, a combination of paid and volunteer, or all volunteer firefighters.
- Scott County and the municipalities within, participate in the National Flood Insurance Program.
- Minnesota health officials helped to develop a mass clinic plan.
- Scott County is responsible for planning a mass vaccination process should this be necessary due to contagious disease outbreak. Locations for mass dispensing sites have been identified, and a process for administering medicines is being refined and tested.
- Practice exercises are conducted between HSEM, NWS, FBI, Scott County Emergency Medical Services, city first responders and Scott County Emergency Management to assure preparedness.
- All facilities involved with hazardous materials provide annual TIER II reports.
- Cities throughout Scott County continue to add outdoor warning sirens to improve warning effectiveness, and to maintain existing sirens to insure proper operation.



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

- 
- The American Red Cross has multiple designated emergency shelters.
  - Scott County is part of the North Metro Drug Task Force, which is active in Methamphetamine and other drug enforcement, effectively reducing the number of clandestine labs in the county.
  - Multiple Scott County communities have been active in the Firewise program, which works with the state Department of Natural Resources to remove potential fuel sources that may be involved in wild land fires. This mitigation effort limits the spread of wild land fires, and helps to protect homes.
  - Scott County participates in the Joint Terrorism Task Force.

State mitigation efforts and programs that are significant to Scott County include the following:

State of Minnesota Pipeline Safety Plan: The state of Minnesota, along with gas and oil pipeline providers, maintains a pipeline safety plan. Pipeline providers are required to schedule meetings with local officials to facilitate discussions about mitigation and response to pipeline disasters.

The State Emergency Response Commission is responsible for implementing federal Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) provisions in Minnesota and serving as a technical advisor and information clearinghouse for state and federal hazardous materials programs. The Minnesota Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency is the lead agency responsible for implementing EPCRA.

Minnesota Emergency Operations Plan (MEOP): The Minnesota Emergency Operations Plan (MEOP) is the document that provides the foundation for all disaster and emergency response operations conducted within the state of Minnesota. Minnesota state law requires HSEM to develop this plan and update it on a periodic basis.

Each county in Minnesota has its own Local Emergency Management Director that serve at the direction of the respective County Boards. Because disasters occur at the local government level, the Local Director is the key to comprehensive community emergency management. Some local Emergency Management programs receive federal funding assistance through HSEM. Such programs must meet minimum mutually agreed upon criteria. These counties are called Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) counties. The HSEM Regional Offices are responsible for ensuring EMPG counties meet or exceed the minimum EMPG criteria. Scott County is an EMPG county.

The Domestic Preparedness Program is a partnership of federal, state and local agencies with the goal of insuring that, as a nation, we are prepared to respond to a terrorist attack involving nuclear, biological or chemical weapons - weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Today, the term "Homeland Security" is used to denote the concept of preparing for these kinds of events.



### 7.3.13 Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

The Mitigation Actions proposed by each of Scott County’s local governing bodies participating under this Plan are in the Individual Mitigation Action Plans (MAP’s) Annex. Each MAP has been designed to address the jurisdiction description, capabilities and the multi-jurisdictional goals, objectives and actions of the overall Hazard Mitigation Plan. Some Action items in the below table and the Individual Mitigation Action Plans address specific hazards, others are general action items that address multiple hazards. Actions identified are general community wide actions and specific jurisdiction actions (highlighted in green). The action items detailed in the mitigation actions table’s address;

1. Both current and future buildings (i.e. building codes, zoning)
2. Current and future infrastructure
3. Each profiled hazard (minimum of 2)
4. Each participating jurisdiction (minimum of 2)

**Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv):** For multi-jurisdictional plans, there must be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan. A. Does the **new or updated** plan include identifiable **action items** for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?

The cohesive collection of actions listed in each jurisdiction’s Mitigation Action Plan also can serve as an easily understood menu of mitigation policies and projects for local decision-makers who want to quickly review their jurisdiction’s respective element of the countywide Plan. In preparing the individual MAP’s, each jurisdiction considered their overall hazard risk and capability to mitigate identified hazards as recorded through the risk and capability assessment process and to meet the countywide mitigation goals and the unique needs of their community.

**CRS Step 8: Draft an Action Plan:** For CRS credit, when a multi-jurisdictional plan is prepared, it must have action items from at least two of the six categories that directly benefit each community seeking CRS credit.

In preparing the individual MAP’s, each jurisdiction considered their overall hazard risk and capability to mitigate identified hazards as recorded through the risk and capability assessment process and to meet the countywide mitigation goals and the unique needs of their community.

Each jurisdiction participating in this Plan is responsible for implementing specific mitigation actions as prescribed in the adopted Mitigation Action Plan. In each Mitigation Action Plan, every proposed action is assigned to a specific local department or agency in order to assign responsibility and accountability and increase the likelihood of subsequent implementation. This approach enables individual jurisdictions to update their unique mitigation strategy as needed without altering the broader focus of the countywide Plan. The separate adoption of locally specific actions also ensures that each jurisdiction is not held responsible for monitoring and implementing the actions of other jurisdictions involved in the planning process. The cost/benefit estimates are based on previous and/or expected expenditures and estimated cost avoidance or reduction in the loss of life or property damage. The estimated completion dates is an estimate of the completion year and crosses two budget years. In many cases the action item is completed annually or is on going.



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

The following Table identifies the hazard and action item identifier.

Table 7.15 Action Identifier Table																				
Action Identifier and Application	All Hazards	Drought	Earthquake	Extreme Temp	Flooding	Hail	High Wind	Ice/Snow	Land/Mudslide	Land Subsidence	Lightning	Wildfire	Pandemic	HAZMAT	Illegal Drugs	Terrorism	Transportation	Urban Fire	Utility Power	Utility Water
	AH	DR	EX	ET	FL	HA	HW	IS	LM	LS	LG	WF	PD	HM	IL	TR	TN	UF	UP	UW
	1			2				3			4			a-z						
	Public Populations				1 <sup>st</sup> Responder				Jurisdiction General			Jurisdiction Specific			Sequence Character					

Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions							
Hazard & Action	Action/Project Description	Responsibility	Funding Source	Estimated Cost/Benefit	Completion Date	Priority	
AH1a	Obtain and/or expand audible warning units to all uncovered community areas	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	260,000 1,000,000	2012 2013	69	
AH1b	Distribute safe room/shelter in place information to schools, special needs and all community populations	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA, BOE, Red Cross	Cnty/City/Twp Budget	2,000 20,000	Annually	67	
AH1c	Assist citizens to develop emergency preparedness, response and recovery plans.	EMA, Fire Depts Sheriffs office	Cnty/City/Twp Budget	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	85	
AH1d	Obtain/install an automated community wide rapid notification system.	EMA, Cnty IT Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	150,000 1,000,000	2014 2015	72	
AH1e	Develop a media warning program to warn the community of a potential hazard event	EMA, Media NWS 1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies	Cnty Budget Grants	4,000 120,000	2010	80	
AH1h	Add hazard preparedness and response information to a community web site	EMA, Cnty IT Cnty Commission	Cnty Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	82	
AH2a	Obtain/distribute interoperable radios for all 1 <sup>st</sup> responders	EMA, 1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Depts Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	82,000 200,000	2012 2013	70	
AH2b	Train and equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders for search and rescue missions	Police/Fire Depts, EMA	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	50,000 150,000	2011	60	
AH2c	Train and equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to Mass causality events and exercise response	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA Public Health	Cnty/City/Twp Public Health Budget, Grants	50,000 150,000	2010	62	
AH2e	Recruit/train and equip volunteers for CERT, a Medical Reserve Corps, SAFCOM, etc	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	5,000 100,000	2010	71	
AH2f	Train 1 <sup>st</sup> responders and community officials on the National Incident Mgmt System	1 <sup>st</sup> responder Agencies, EMA,	Cnty/City/Twp Budget	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	73	
AH2g	Train 1 <sup>st</sup> responders and community officials on EOC Operations and the EOP	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City/Twp Budget	2,000 20,000	Annually	73	



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions</b>						
<b>Hazard &amp; Action</b>	<b>Action/Project Description</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Cost/Benefit</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
AH3b	Obtain and continually update 911 technology and capabilities	911, Fire/Police, Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp 911 Budget, Grants	100,000 1,000,000	2013 2014	77
AH3c	Obtain Crisis Mgmt Software and Equipment for primary and secondary EOC's	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	150,000 1,000,000	2013 2014	65
AH3d	Obtain/install emergency generators or "pigtailes" for critical government facilities and fuel depots.	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	500,000 2,000,000	2012 2014	54
AH3e	Assist non-governmental critical facilities to obtain emergency generators and/or pigtailes	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	500,000 2,000,000	2013 2015	53
AH3f	Develop EOP ESF's/annexes for all hazards that may impact the community	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget	1,000 10,000	2011	70
AH3g	Review/revise the Emergency Operations Plan annually and after each disaster	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty Budget, Grants	2,000 20,000	Annually	70
AH3h	Obtain funding to add disaster shelters as necessary	EMA, Red Cross Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	400,000 2,000,000	2010 2015	58
AH3i	Coordinate a shelter program with the Red Cross and volunteers	EMA, Red Cross Volunteer Groups	Cnty Red Cross Budget, Grants	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	66
AH3j	Assist schools to implement a disaster phone line	EMA Board of Education	Cnty/Education Budget, Grants	2,000 20,000	2010	84
AH3l	Assist utilities in developing restoration and mitigation plans	Utilities EMA	Cnty Utility Budget, Grants	2,000 200,000	2011	66
AH3m	Assist businesses, schools, special needs and public facilities to post evacuation routes	Law Enforcement EMA, Public Works	Cnty Budget, Grants	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	66
AH3n	Obtain signage to direct the public evacuation during hazard events	EMA, Public Works	Cnty Budget, Grants	12,000 50,000	2012	63
AH3o	Develop/implement/maintain the community's Mitigation Action Plan	1 <sup>st</sup> responder agencies, EMA	Cnty Budget, Grants	20,000 2,000,000	Annually	81
AH3p	Develop a process to ensure that all damages resulting from a disaster event is reported to the National Weather Service	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty NWS Budget, Grants	2,000 20,000	2010	62
AH3q	Obtain funds for critical government departments to develop Continuity of Operations Plans	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty Budget, Grants	52,000 2,000,000	2011 2012	69
AH3r	Assist businesses to develop Business Continuity Plans	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Business Budget, Grants	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	67
AH3s	Assist communities in developing strategies to prevent loss of public records	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget	12,000 200,000	Ongoing	65
AH3t	Annually review and update hazard related legislation	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget	2,000 20,000	Annually	65



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions</b>						
<b>Hazard &amp; Action</b>	<b>Action/Project Description</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Cost/ Benefit</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
AH3u	Ensure mutual aid, shelter, response, mass casualty & recovery agreements are current	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget	2,000 80,000	Annually	72
AH3v	Assist critical sites to develop and provide to EMA an emergency plan	EMA,	Cnty/City Budget, Grants	12,000 200,000	Ongoing	74
AH3w	Insure building code compliance Inspections are conducted on construction projects	Cnty Commission Inspections	Cnty/City/Twp Budget	12,000 200,000	Ongoing	64
AH4a	Identify/deliver CPR, First Aid, Search and Rescue, NIMS, etc. disaster training to volunteers	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	15,000 50,000	2011	71
AH4b	Improve/upgrade facilities & equip. at the Scott County Regional Training Facility	EMA, Police/Fire Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/Twp Budget, Grants	2,000,000 3,000,000	2011 2012	66
AH4c	Develop plan to trim and clear trees in county owned parkland.	EMA Public Works Community Development	Cnty Budget, Grants	50,000 500,000	2010	56
AH4d	Identify/reserve county land as a staging area to store and process storm debris.	EMA Public Works Community Development	Cnty Budget, Grants	2,000 100,000	2011	43
AH4e	Identify/obtain resources needed to process storm debris. (i.e., chippers, backhoes, etc.)	EMA Public Works Community Development	Cnty Budget, Grants	2,000 500,000	2011	48
AH4f	Modify zoning ordinances allowing temporary debris staging areas	EMA Public Works Community Development	Cnty Budget, Grants	5,000 500,000	2010	51
DR1a	Distribute drought awareness and response to the public	Agriculture, EMA	Cnty/City/Twp Budget	2,000 20,000	Annually	65
DR4a	Support the DNR's rules for water use conservation for all cities applying for new high-capacity municipal wells.	Community Development	Cnty Budget, Grants	5,000 2,000,000	Ongoing	58
EQ1a	Distribute earthquake preparedness and response information to special needs, schools and the community	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City/Twp Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	70
ET1a	Distribute Extreme Temperature preparation/response information to school, special needs and the community	EMA, Red Cross BOE, Business	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Annually	64
ET3a	Identify citizens subject to suffering from extreme temperatures	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 50,000	2010	65
FL1a	Distribute flood preparedness and response information to schools, special needs and all community populations	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	82
FL2a	Train and equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to flood events and exercise response	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	22,000 200,000	Ongoing	75
FL2b	Train and equip a swift water rescue team	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	200,000 500,000	2012 2013	55



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions**

Hazard & Action	Action/Project Description	Responsibility	Funding Source	Estimated Cost/ Benefit	Completion Date	Priority
FL3c	Adopt/enforce an NFIP flood plain Mgnt plan <u>by reviewing all building permits to ensure compliance.</u>	EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 2,000,000	Ongoing	67
FL3d	Adopt/enforce floodplain legislation requiring new structures be elevated above the BSE	EMA, EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty Budget	2,000 2,000,000	Ongoing	70
FL3e	Obtain and maintain NFIP FIRMS to identify community flood plains	EMA, EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Annually	72
FL3f	Obtain funding to retrofit, elevate or relocate repetitive flooding structures in flood plains	EMA, EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty/City Budget Grants	2,000,000 5,000,000	2011 2015	65
FL3g	Adopt/enforce flood plain wetlands and watershed land use zoning	EMA, EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty Budget	2,000 200,000	Ongoing	68
FL3h	Assist in developing storm water Mgnt plans for the communities	EMA, EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty/Dept Budget	22,000 200,000	Ongoing	66
FL3i	Install/replace/maintain culverts and bridges to reduce flooding	Public Works Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Budget Grants	502,000 1,200,000	2011 2014	61



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions</b>						
<b>Hazard &amp; Action</b>	<b>Action/Project Description</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Cost/ Benefit</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
FL3j	Obtain equipment to mitigate street bridge, culverts, and road flooding	Public Works Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Budget Grants	200,000 500,000	2011 2014	62
FL3l	Update Land Use Plans to identify areas where development should be restrictive	EMA, EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty/Dept Budget	12,000 50,000	2010	63
FL3m	Perform a study of the feasibility of community waterways flood control	EMA, EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty Budget Grants	5,000 200,000	2011	67
FL3n	Obtain equipment to build water flow and water retention areas to mitigate flooding	EMA, Public Works EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty/City Budget Grants	500,000 2,000,000	2012 2013	63
FL3o	Develop a Dam/Levee hazard identification and inspection program with DNR	EMA, DNR	Cnty/City/State Budget Grants	12,000 200,000	2011	74
FL3p	Identify the communities vulnerability to a Dam/Levee failure	EMA, DNR	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	2011	78
FL4a	Coordinate between Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization and Local Governments storm water discharges to ensure sufficient downstream capacity	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$10,000 100,000	2012	66
FL4b	Complete flood damage study for downtown Jordan	Community Development	Cnty, City Budget, Grants	500,000 2,000,000	2010	73
FL4c	Complete updated floodplain maps for staff and public use	IT Department /Community Development, EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$25,000 2,000,000	2010	64



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions</b>						
<b>Hazard &amp; Action</b>	<b>Action/Project Description</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Cost/ Benefit</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
FL4d	Conduct a study to identify hillside erosion cost/benefit on Scott Cnty Rd 51 and 6.	Scott County Public Works	Cnty Budget, Grants	75,000 50,000	2010	63
FL4e	Assist each local government to Adopt Elevation standards legislation for new structures	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization, EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$5,000 100,000	2011	63
FL4f	Obtain grant funding to study for Markley Lake and O'Dowd Lake outlet improvements	Community Development	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$200,000 2,000,000	2012	61
FL4g	Promote disconnected storm water Mgmt and low impact development.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$10,000 100,000	Ongoing	62
FL4h	Require floodplain and shoreline ordinances to comply with MN DNR requirements	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$5,000 50,000	2010	61
FL4i	Require peak runoff rate control standards for new developments.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$5,000 100,000	2011	61
FL4j	Require analysis for major drainage alterations.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$50,000 100,000	2012	61
FL4k	Acquire/prepare property to increase storm water storage capacity for Spring Lake TWP	Prior Lake Soil and Water District	Cnty Budget, Grants	2,000,000 5,000,000	2013	58
FL4l	Require an analysis of landlocked areas prior to the installation of outlets	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$25,000 100,000	2012	58
FL4m	Conduct a feasibility study on the need for a new outlet on O'Dowd/Thole lake.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$25,000 100,000	2010	58
FL4n	Work with the City of Jordan on flood damage reduction efforts.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$25,000 100,000	2012	58



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions**

Hazard & Action	Action/Project Description	Responsibility	Funding Source	Estimated Cost/ Benefit	Completion Date	Priority
FL4o	Work with local units of government to insure completion of local flooding risk projects.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$10,000 100,000	Ongoing	58
FL4p	Obtain additional temporary road closure supplies (i.e. signs, cones barrels, and concrete barriers).	Scott County Public Works	Cnty, City Budget, Grants	\$100,000 500,000	2011	57
FL4q	Develop solutions If hillside erosion studies has a cost/benefit and achievable methods	Scott County Public Works	Cnty Budget, Grants	500,000 1,000,000	2011	56
FL4r	Reconstruct outlet structure on Prior Lake	Prior Lake Soil and Water District	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$500,000 3,000,000	2012	55
FL4s	Work with Scott County Public Works to plan and discuss future public ditch operations.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$5,000 50,000	2011	60
FL4t	Coordinate with other local units of government with maintenance of outlet structures.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$10,000 50,000	2010	60
FL4u	Coordinate with Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems permit requirements.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$5,000 50,000	Ongoing	60
FL4v	Promote and facilitate regional storm water Mgmt.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$5,000 50,000	Ongoing	60
FL4w	Work on a Hwy 169 area drainage feasibility assessment in Louisville Township.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$25,000 100,000	2011	60
FL4x	Communicate with local governments to understand local flooding risks.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$10,000 100,000	Ongoing	60
FL4y	Use digital terrain modeling to identify potential flooding areas.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization, EMA, EMA, Scott Cnty, Belle Plaine, Elko-New Market, Jordan, New Prague, Prior Lake, Savage, Shakopee	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$15,000 150,000	2012	65
FL4z	Require a floodplain capacity standard.	Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization	Cnty Budget, Grants	\$5,000 100,000	2011	63
FL4za	Clean out drainage channel from Prior Lake to Minnesota River.	Prior Lake Soil and Water District	Cnty, City Budget, Grants	\$250,000 3,000,000	2011	59



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions</b>						
<b>Hazard &amp; Action</b>	<b>Action/Project Description</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Cost/ Benefit</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
HM1a	Distribute Hazard Materials event preparedness and response information to schools, special needs and the community	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA, BOE,	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	67
HM1b	Educate the public on common hazardous materials in home	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 120,000	Annually	66
HM1c	Educate schools special needs, and the community on chemical hazards in the area and evacuation routes.	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	70
HM2a	Train and equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to hazmat incidents and exercise response	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	52,000 200,000	Ongoing	59
HM2b	Maintain inventories of Mark I packs to respond to chemical agents	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	20,000 80,000	Annually	64
HM2d	Obtain and equip a hazardous materials response vehicle	Fire/Hazmat Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	102,000 200,000	2011 2012	59
HM3a	Develop evacuation perimeters and routes for high risk hazmat sites	Police/Fire Depts EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	2011	63
HM3b	Maintain and annually update an inventory of hazmat sites.	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Annually	66
HM3c	Develop/maintain a countywide hazard materials response plan	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	12,000 200,000	Annually	65
HM3d	Obtain monitoring equipment for high risk hazmat sites	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	29,000 80,000	2012 2013	54
HM3e	Obtain hazmat containment equipment for water, roads/railroads	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City/Dept Budget Grants	20,000 200,000	2012 2013	56
HM3f	Enforce SARA. Title III/Tier II facility hazardous materials reporting.	EMA Fire Svcs	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	65
HM3j	Adopt/enforce hazardous materials site building setback legislation	Cnty Commission	Cnty Budget	2,000 20,000	2013	57
HW1a	Obtain NOAA weather radios for schools, government and special needs facilities	EMA BOE Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/BOE Budget Grants	20,000 200,000	2011 2012	69
HW1b	Distribute High Wind preparedness and response information to special needs, schools and the community	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	80
HW2b	Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to High Wind events and exercise response	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	12,000 90,000	Ongoing	58
HW3a	Adopt/enforce comprehensive Building Code legislation	Cnty Commission	Cnty Budget	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	73
HW3b	Develop a debris clearance program that can be utilized countywide	Public Works Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget	8,000 50,000	2010	59
HW3c	Obtain funding to build mobile home community storm shelters	EMA Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Budget Grants	500,000 2,000,000	2011 2014	58
HW3d	Adopt/enforce mobile home tie down and skirting legislation	Cnty Commission	Cnty Budget	2,000 200,000	Ongoing	68



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions</b>						
<b>Hazard &amp; Action</b>	<b>Action/Project Description</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Cost/Benefit</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
HW4a	Identify storm shelters in the development of master plans for county parks	EMA Community Development	Cnty Budget, Grants	5,000 500,000	2011	58
HW4b	Research the feasibility of requiring the burying of power lines in all new rural cluster subdivisions.	Community Development	Cnty/Utility Budget, Grants	20,000 1,000,000	2010	58
IL1a	Distribute Meth Lab awareness information to schools and the community	Law Enforcement Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Annually	68
IL2a	Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to Meth Lab incidents	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	22,000 200,000	Ongoing	58
IL3a	Join/participate in local state and federal drug task forces	Police/Sheriff Dept Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	69
IS13b	Establish with the media and NWS an Ice and snow community alert system	EMA, Media NWS Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 120,000	2010	72
IS1a	Distribute Ice/Snow preparedness and response information to schools, special needs and the community	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 100,000	Annually	75
IS2a	Train and equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to an Ice/Snow event and exercise response	Public Works, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	12,000 50,000	Ongoing	55
IS3b	Assist communities to establish an Ice/snow removal program for roadways	EMA, Public Works Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Budget Grants	2,000 200,000	Ongoing	63
IS4a	Identify and purchase appropriate equipment needed to help remove large amounts of snow. (Large snow blowers for use on front-end loaders, or other heavy equipment.)	Public Works EMA Community Development	Cnty Budget, Grants	500,000 2,000,000	2012 2013	56
LM1a	Distribute to the community information on areas of potential landslides or mudslides	Public Works DOT Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Budget	2,000 20,000	Annually	60
LM1b	Develop with the DOT and media a process to alert the public on landslide/mudslide locations	EMA, Media NWS DOT Cnty Commission	Cnty/City/State Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	60
LM2a	Assist in obtaining equipment to respond to landslide/mudslide events	Public Works DOT Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Budget Grants	200,000 500,000	2012 2013	50
LM3a	Develop a map of potential landslide and mudslide areas	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	53
LM3b	Adopt/enforce landslide/mudslide legislation to restrict development in hazard areas	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty Budget	2,000 20,000	2011	58
LS1a	Distribute land subsidence (sinkhole) awareness information to the public	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget, DOT	2,000 20,000	Annually	58
LS1b	Develop with the appropriate agencies an alerting process to alert the public of sinkhole locations	Public Works, DOT, EMA	Cnty/City Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	57



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions</b>						
<b>Hazard &amp; Action</b>	<b>Action/Project Description</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Cost/Benefit</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
LS3a	Assist in obtaining equipment to respond to Land subsidence events	EMA, Public Works Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Budget Grants	200,000 400,000	2014 2015	48
LT1a	Distribute lightning awareness information to the public	Fire Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Annually	62
LT1b	Develop with media and the NWS a lightning alerting process for the public	EMA, Media NWS Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	62
PD1a	Distribute Pandemic awareness and response information schools, special needs and the community	EMA Public Health	Cnty/City Public Health Budget Grants	2,000 20,000	Annually	70
PD1b	Develop a program to direct citizens to the Department of Public Health and CDC Web-page for Pandemic Event preparedness	EMA Public Health Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Public Health Budget Grants	2,000 20,000	2010	70
PD2a	Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to a Pandemic/Epidemic event and exercise response	Public Health Cnty Commission, 1 <sup>st</sup> Responders EMA	Cnty/City Public Health Budget Grants	32,000 200,000	2010 2011	55
PD2c	Assist in developing a 1 <sup>st</sup> responder infectious disease early vaccination program	Public Health Cnty Commission, 1 <sup>st</sup> Responders EMA	Cnty/City Public Health Budget Grants	2,000 40,000	Ongoing	63
PD2f	Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders on agriculture and vector disease and infection response	DOA, DNR, EMA	Cnty/City Public Health Budget Grants	32,000 1,000,000	Annually	56
PD3a	Assist in developing a traffic flow and security plan for Pandemic vaccination sites	EMA Public Works Law Enforcement	Cnty/City Public Health Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	59
PD3c	Adopt/enforce Pandemic Flu legislation to cancel large public and private events	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/City Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	67
PD3d	Assist in developing procedures to prevent an outbreak of agriculture related hazards	EMA Dept Of Agriculture DNR	Cnty/DOA/DNR Budget	2,000 200,000	Ongoing	54
PD4a	Identify resources to combat the Emerald Ash Borer.	Public Works EMA Community Development	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	2,000 10,000	2010	57
PD4a	Obtain equipment for control and removal of infestation (i.e. chain saws, chippers, PPE, trucks).	Public Works EMA Community Development	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	500,000 1,000,000	2011 2012	55
PD4b	Identify and plan for other agriculture infestation located in Scott County.	Public Works EMA Community Development	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	25,000 200,000	Ongoing	54
TN4a	Develop a program for the hazards and boating safety of river usage. (To include all types of river flow from high to low.)	Lower Minnesota River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	5,000 50,000	2011	55



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions</b>						
<b>Hazard &amp; Action</b>	<b>Action/Project Description</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Cost/ Benefit</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
TN4b	Develop a maintenance plan and identify funding for maintenance of the 4 Foot Channel from River Mile 14.7 (Savage) to River Mile 25 (Shakopee).	Lower Minnesota River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	500,000 3,000,000	2011	51
TN4c	Develop a plan to provide for the safe coexistence of Commercial and Recreational Navigation.	Lower Minnesota River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	25,000 150,000	2011	54
TR1a	Distribute to schools and the public terrorism preparedness and awareness information	Police/Sheriff Dept EMA BOE	Cnty/Dept/BOE Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	66
TR1b	Educate government officials, special needs and schools on procedures for handling suspicious mail	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA Post Office	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	67
TR1c	Post terrorism and bomb identification information in buildings and schools	EMA Education Officials Law Enforcement	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	67
TR1d	Identify/distribute to appropriate officials potential terrorism targets information	EMA, Police Dept Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	66
TR2a	Train/equip all terrorism 1 <sup>st</sup> responders in terrorism attack techniques	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	22,000 200,000	2011 2012	59
TR2b	Train/equip 1st responders on CBRNE agents, responding to a CBRNE event and exercise response	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	12,000 50,000	2011 2012	61
TR2d	Fund/maintain a trained bomb dog and handler to serve the entire county	Law Enforcement Agencies, EMA	Cnty/City Budget Grants	102,000 200,000	2010 2015	58
TR3a	Assist schools in developing terrorism preparedness and response plans	EMA, BOE Police Dept/Sheriff	Cnty/City/BOE Budget Grants	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	70
TR3c	Develop evacuation plans for identified terrorism targets	Police/Sheriff Dept EMA, Public Works	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 200,000	2011	65
UF1a	Distribute to schools, special needs and the public fire safety and response information	Fire Svcs, BOE	Cnty/Dept/BOE Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	74
UF1b	Educate school, special needs and citizens on fire extinguisher use	Fire Departments	Cnty/City/Dept Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	75
UF1c	Assist in obtaining a fire education-training trailer for the jurisdiction.	Fire Svcs, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	52,000 200,000	2012	61
UF2a	Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to fire incidents and exercise response	Fire Svcs, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	22,000 100,000	Ongoing	71
UF2b	Obtain/maintain fire fighting supplies at all fire departments	Fire Svcs, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	25,000 100,000	Annually	72
UF2c	Obtain fire equipment to combat fires in high rise buildings	Fire Agencies, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	500,000 2,000,000	2012 2013	66
UF2d	Train fire 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to at least the "Awareness and Operations level"	Fire Svcs	Cnty/Dept Budget	20,000 80,000	Ongoing	71



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions</b>						
<b>Hazard &amp; Action</b>	<b>Action/Project Description</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Cost/Benefit</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
UF3a	Ensure that NFPA standards and codes are followed and that fire codes are enforced with citations issued for violations.	Fire Departments, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	74
UF3b	Develop fire plans for all major businesses and critical facilities	Fire Departments	Cnty/City/Dept Budget	25,000 500,000	Ongoing	75
UF3c	Adopt/enforce sprinkler and smoke alarm legislation for all facilities	Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 100,000	Ongoing	71
UF3d	Obtain fire equipment to combat fires where water hydrants are non-existent	Fire Agencies, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	300,000 500,000	2012 2014	66
UF3e	Acquire and install six inch water mains and hydrants community wide	Fire Agencies, Public Works Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	2,000,000 5,000,000	2012 2014	62
UF3f	Adopt/enforce housing code legislation to limit number of citizens in housing	Cnty Commission	Cnty Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	68
UP1a	Assist power utilities in implementing a power outage public alerting program	Utilities, EMA	Cnty/Utility Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	65
UP2a	Train 1 <sup>st</sup> responders on dealing with downed power lines during a response	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA, Utilities	Cnty/Utility Budget Grants	12,000 200,000	Annually	64
UP3a	Identify special needs populations that rely on electricity for medical equipment	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	65
UW1a	Develop with the water utilities a process to alert the public of water contamination	Utility Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	2010	66
UW2a	Train/equip utility workers with water testing and monitoring processes and equipment	Utility Agencies, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	28,000 200,000	2010 2011	58
UW3a	Develop a wellhead protection program to upgrade wells in the 100-year flood plain.	Utility Agencies, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget	12,000 200,000	2012	60
UW4a	Continue well decommissioning through cost sharing incentive programs.	Lower Mn. River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$500,000 300,000	Ongoing	64
UW4b	Promote conservation and wise use of groundwater through education and public information.	Lower Mn. River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$10,000 50,000	Ongoing	63
UW4c	Support county area planning by using the Metro Councils model to assess ground water impact of continued development.	Lower Mn River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$100,000 200,000	2011	59
UW4d	Establish Stormwater infiltration criteria to protect the quality of groundwater.	Lower Mn. River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$10,000 50,000	2011	60
UW4e	Analyze data to document trends on issues such as water usage, contamination, quality, and availability.	Lower Minnesota River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$100,000 200,000	2011	57
UW4f	Determine fen and trout stream recharge areas.	Lower Mn. River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$50,000 150,000	2012	57



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

<b>Table 7.16 Scott County Mitigation Actions</b>						
<b>Hazard &amp; Action</b>	<b>Action/Project Description</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Estimated Cost/ Benefit</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Priority</b>
UW4g	Develop a channel lobby for funding to assess unregulated discharges in the MN River Basin.	Lower Minnesota River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	25,000 300,000	2012	57
UW4h	Work with the State and stakeholders to establish a Mn. River basin commission to coordinate Mgnt, implement projects and programs of common benefit, and monitor performance of local water Mgnt entities	Lower Minnesota River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	100,000 1,000,000	Ongoing	57
UW4i	Adopt infiltration standards within the watershed district based on Pepin Total Maximum Daily Load	Lower Minnesota River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$5000 50,000	2011	56
UW4j	Improve groundwater monitoring in the Watershed Mgnt Organization.	Lower Mn. River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$200,000 600,000	2011	52
UW4k	Work with the Metropolitan Council to complete a model of the metro region.	Lower Mn River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$200,000 400,000	Ongoing	60
UW4l	Support wellhead protection efforts by providing staff time and technical assistance.	Lower Mn. River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$50,000 200,000	Ongoing	61
UW4m	Adopt minimum, consistent runoff peak standards within the watershed district.	Lower Mn. River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$5000 60,000	2011	52
UW4n	Reduce/stop groundwater contamination of fens and trout streams (Eagle Creek and Savage Fen) by identifying sources and limiting/stopping contaminant release.	Lower Minnesota River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$50,00 150,000	2010 2012	52
UW4o	Identify ways to maintain supply of groundwater to fens and trout streams with the watershed district.	Lower Minnesota River Watershed District	Cnty/State Budget, Grants	\$25,000 100,000	2011	50
WF1a	Distribute Wildfire awareness, preparedness information to schools and the public	Fire Agencies, EMA, BOE	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	70
WF1b	Assist DNR in distributing USFS fuels reduction information (Firewise.)	Fire Svc Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept/DNR Budget	2,000 200,000	Annually	69
WF1c	Publish outdoor burn ban info in area newspapers during Wild-land fire seasons.	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 50,000	Annually	72
WF1d	Develop with the media and fire responders a public alerting process for the public	EMA, Media NWS Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 50,000	2010	72
WF2a	Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders on techniques to respond to wild-land fire events.	Fire Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	92,000 200,000	Annually	58
WF2b	Obtain specialized equipment to combat wildfires.(4-wheel drive brush fire truck)	Fire Agencies, Cnty Commission	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	202,000 2,000,000	2014	60
WF2c	Exercise fire response regularly for residences, businesses and industry	Fire Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget Grants	24,000 200,000	Ongoing	63
WF2d	Identify Private contractors to assist in wild-land fire response	1 <sup>st</sup> Responder Agencies, EMA	Cnty/Dept Budget	2,000 20,000	Ongoing	66
WF3a	Adopt/enforce wildfire legislation that includes burning bans	EMA, Cnty Commission	Cnty Budget	2,000 120,000	2010	66



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table**

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal Law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Obtain and/or expand audible warning units to all uncovered community areas	3	9	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	3	69
Distribute safe room/shelter in place information to schools, special needs and community populations	3	9	0	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	67
Assist citizens to develop emergency preparedness, response and recovery plans.	3	9	6	6	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	85
Obtain/install an automated community wide rapid notification system.	3	9	6	6	3	3	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	2	1	3	2	3	3	3	72
Develop a media warning program to warn the community of a potential hazard event	3	9	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	80
Add hazard preparedness and response Information to a community web site	3	9	6	6	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	82
Obtain/distribute interoperable radios for all 1 <sup>st</sup> responders	2	6	4	4	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	70
Train and equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders for search and rescue missions	2	6	0	0	3	3	3	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	60
Train and equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to Mass causality events and exercise response	2	9	0	2	3	3	3	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	62
Recruit/train and equip volunteers for CERT, a Medical Reserve Corps, SAFCOM, etc	2	6	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	71
Train 1 <sup>st</sup> responders and community officials on the National Incident Management System	2	6	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	73
Train 1 <sup>st</sup> responders and community officials on EOC Operations and the EOP	2	6	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	73
Obtain and continually update 911 technology and capabilities	3	9	6	6	3	3	3	1	1	1	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	77
Obtain Crisis Management Software and Equipment for primary and secondary EOC's	2	6	4	4	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	65
Obtain/install emergency generators or “pigtails” for critical government facilities and fuel depots.	2	0	0	4	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	3	3	54



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table**

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Assist non-governmental critical facilities to obtain emergency generators and/or pigtails	2	3	0	4	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	53
Develop EOP ESF's/annexes for all hazards that may impact the community	1	6	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	70
Review/revise the Emergency Operations Plan annually and after each disaster	1	6	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	70
Obtain funding to add disaster shelters as necessary	3	6	0	0	3	3	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	58
Coordinate a shelter program with the Red Cross and volunteers	3	6	0	0	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	66
Assist schools to implement a disaster phone line	3	9	6	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	84
Assist utilities in developing restoration and mitigation plans	2	4	0	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	66
Assist businesses, schools, special needs and public facilities to post evacuation routes	3	4	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	66
Obtain signage to direct the public evacuation during hazard events	2	4	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	63
Develop/implement/maintain the community's Mitigation Action Plan	2	9	6	6	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	81
Develop a process to ensure that all damages resulting from a disaster event is reported to the National Weather Service	1	0	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	62
Obtain funds for critical government departments to develop Continuity of Operations Plans	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	69
Assist businesses to develop Business Continuity Plans	1	3	4	6	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	67
Assist communities in developing strategies to prevent loss of public records	2	0	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	65
Annually review and update hazard related legislation	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	65
Ensure mutual aid, shelter, response, mass casualty & recovery agreements are current	2	6	6	6	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	72



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table**

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Assist critical sites to develop and provide to EMA an emergency plan	2	6	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	74
Insure building code compliance Inspections are conducted on construction projects	2	3	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	64
Identify/deliver CPR, First Aid, Search and Rescue, NIMS, etc. disaster training to volunteers	2	6	4	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	71
Improve/upgrade training facilities & equip at the Scott County Regional Training Facility	2	6	4	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	66
Identify/reserve county land as a staging area to store and process storm debris.	2	0	0	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	43
Identify/obtain resources needed to process storm debris. (I.e., chippers, backhoes, etc.)	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	48
Develop plan to trim and clear trees in county owned parkland.	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	56
Modify zoning ordinances allowing temporary debris staging areas	2	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	3	51
Distribute drought awareness and response to the public	2	0	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	65
Support the DNR’s pending rules for water use conservation plans for all cities applying for new high-capacity municipal wells.	2	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	58
Distribute earthquake preparedness and response information to special needs, schools and the community	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	70
Distribute Extreme Temperature preparation/response information to school, special needs and the community	2	3	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	64
Identify citizens subject to suffering from extreme temperatures	3	3	0	0	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	65
Distribute flood preparedness and response information to schools, special needs and the community	3	6	6	6	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	82



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table**

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Train and equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to flood events and exercise response	3	6	6	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	75	
Train and equip a swift water rescue team	2	6	0	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	1	1	2	3	3	3	55	
Adopt/enforce an NFIP flood plain management plan	2	3	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	67	
Adopt/enforce floodplain legislation requiring new structures be elevated above the BSE	2	3	6	4	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	70	
Obtain and maintain NFIP FIRMS to identify community flood plains	2	3	6	6	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	72	
Obtain funding to retrofit, elevate or relocate repetitive flooding structures in flood plains	2	3	6	6	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	65	
Adopt/enforce flood plain wetlands and watershed land use zoning	2	3	4	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	68	
Assist in developing storm water management plans for the communities	2	3	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	66	
Install/replace/maintain culverts and bridges to reduce flooding	2	3	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	3	61	
Obtain equipment to mitigate street bridge, culverts, and road flooding	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	62	
Update Land Use Plans to identify areas where development should be restrictive	1	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	63	
Perform a study of the feasibility of community waterways flood control	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	67	
Obtain equipment to build water flow and water retention areas to mitigate flooding	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	63	
Develop a Dam/Levee hazard identification and inspection program with DNR	2	6	6	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	74	
Identify the communities vulnerability to a Dam/Levee failure	2	9	6	6	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	78	
Complete flood damage study for downtown Jordan	2	6	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	73	
Obtain grant funding to study for Markley Lake and O'Dowd Lake outlet improvements	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	61	



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Complete updated floodplain maps for staff and public use	1	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	64
Reconstruct outlet structure on Prior Lake	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	55
Clean out drainage channel from Prior Lake to Minnesota River.	2	3	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	59
Acquire/prepare property to increase storm water storage capacity for Spring Lake TWP	2	3	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	58
Conduct a study to identify hillside erosion cost/benefit on Scott Cnty Rd 51 and 6.	2	0	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	63
Develop solutions If hillside erosion studies has a cost/benefit and achievable methods	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	56
Obtain additional temporary road closure supplies (i.e. signs, cones barrels, and concrete barriers.	2	3	0	0	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	57
Require floodplain and shoreline ordinances to comply with MN Department of Natural Resources requirements	1	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	61
Assist each local government to Adopt Elevation standards legislation for new structures	1	3	4	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	63
Require a floodplain capacity standard.	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	63
Require peak runoff rate control standards for new developments.	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	61
Require an analysis of landlocked areas prior to the installation of outlets	1	0	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	1	1	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	58
Require analysis for major drainage alterations.	2	0	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	61
Coordinate between Scott Watershed Mgmt Organization and Local Governments storm water discharges to ensure sufficient downstream capacity	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	66
Promote disconnected storm water management and low impact development.	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	62
Work with Scott County Public Works to plan and discuss future public ditch operations.	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	60



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table**

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Coordinate with other local units of government with maintenance of outlet structures.	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	60
Coordinate with Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems permit requirements.	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	60
Promote and facilitate regional storm water management.	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	60
Conduct a feasibility study on the need for a new outlet on O’Dowd/Thole lake.	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	58
Work on a Hwy 169 area drainage feasibility assessment in Louisville Township.	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	60
Work with the City of Jordan on flood damage reduction efforts.	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	58
Work with local units of government to insure completion of local flooding risk projects.	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	58
Communicate with local governments to understand local flooding risks.	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	60
Use digital terrain modeling to identify potential flooding areas.	1	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	65
Distribute Hazard Materials event preparedness and response information to schools, special needs and the community	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	67
Educate the public on common hazardous materials in home	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	66
Educate schools special needs, and the community on chemical hazards in the area and evacuation routes.	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	70
Train and equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to hazmat incidents and exercise response	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	59
Maintain inventories of Mark I packs to respond to chemical agents	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	64
Obtain and equip a hazardous materials response vehicle	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	59
Develop evacuation perimeters and routes for high risk hazmat sites	2	3	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	63



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table**

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Maintain and annually update an inventory of hazmat sites.	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	66
Develop/maintain a countywide hazard materials response plan	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	65
Obtain monitoring equipment for high risk hazmat sites	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	54
Obtain hazmat containment equipment for water, roads/railroads	2	3	4	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	56
Enforce SARA. Title III/Tier II facility hazardous materials reporting.	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	65
Adopt/enforce hazardous materials site building setback legislation	1	3	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	57
Obtain NOAA weather radios for schools, government and special needs facilities	3	6	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	69
Distribute High Wind preparedness and response information to special needs, schools and the community	3	9	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	80
Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to High Wind events and exercise response	2	3	0	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	58
Adopt/enforce comprehensive Building Code legislation	2	6	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	73
Develop a debris clearance program that can be utilized countywide	2	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	59
Obtain funding to build mobile home community storm shelters	2	6	0	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	58
Adopt/enforce mobile home tie down and skirting legislation	2	6	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	68
Identify storm shelters in the development of master plans for county parks	2	6	0	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	58
Research the feasibility of the burying of power lines in all new rural cluster subdivisions.	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	58
Distribute Meth Lab awareness information to schools and the community	3	3	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	68



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table**

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to Meth Lab incidents	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	58
Join/participate in local state and federal drug task forces	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	69
Distribute Ice/Snow preparedness and response information to schools, special needs and the community	3	6	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	75
Establish with the media and NWS an Ice and snow community alert system	3	6	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	72
Train and equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to an Ice/Snow event and exercise response	2	3	0	2	3	3	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	55
Identify and purchase appropriate equipment needed to help remove large amounts of snow. (Large snow blowers for use on front-end loaders, or other heavy equipment.)	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	56
Assist communities to establish an Ice/snow removal program for roadways	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	63
Distribute to the community information on areas of potential landslides or mudslides	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	60
Develop with the DOT and media a process to alert the public on landslide/mudslide locations	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	60
Assist in obtaining equipment to respond to landslide/mudslide events	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	50
Develop a map of potential landslide and mudslide areas	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	53
Adopt/enforce landslide/mudslide legislation to restrict development in hazard areas	1	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	58
Distribute land subsidence (sinkhole) awareness information to the public	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	58
Develop with the appropriate agencies an alerting process to alert the public of sinkhole locations	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	57
Assist in obtaining equipment to respond to Land subsidence events	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	48



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table**

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Distribute lightning awareness information to the public	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	62
Develop with media and the NWS a lightning alerting process for the public	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	62
Distribute Pandemic awareness and response information schools, special needs and the community	3	6	0	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	70
Develop a program to direct citizens to the Department of Public Health and CDC Web-page for Pandemic Event preparedness	3	6	0	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	70
Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to a Pandemic/Epidemic event and exercise response	2	3	0	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	55
Assist in developing a 1 <sup>st</sup> responder infectious disease early vaccination program	2	3	0	0	3	3	2	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	63
Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders on agriculture and vector disease and infection response	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	56
Assist in developing a traffic flow and security plan for Pandemic vaccination sites	2	3	0	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	59
Adopt/enforce Pandemic Flu legislation to cancel large public and private events	2	6	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	67
Assist in developing procedures to prevent an outbreak of agriculture related hazards	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	54
Identify resources to combat the Emerald Ash Borer.	1	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	57
Obtain equipment for control and removal of agriculture infestation	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	55
Identify and plan for combating other agriculture infestation located in Scott County.	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	54
Develop a program for the hazards and boating safety of river usage during both low and hi river flow	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	55



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table**

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Develop a plan and identify funding for maintenance of the 4' Channel from River Mile 14.7 (Savage) to River Mile 25 (Shakopee).	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	51
Develop a plan to provide for the safe coexistence of Commercial and Recreational Navigation.	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	54
Distribute to schools and the public terrorism preparedness and awareness information	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	66
Educate government officials, special needs and schools on procedures for handling suspicious mail	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	67
Post terrorism and bomb identification information in buildings and schools	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	67
Identify/distribute to appropriate officials potential terrorism targets information	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	66
Train/equip all terrorism 1 <sup>st</sup> responders in terrorism attack techniques	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	59
Train/equip 1st responders on CBRNE agents, responding to a CBRNE event and exercise response	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	61
Fund/maintain a trained bomb dog and handler to serve the entire county	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	58
Assist schools and medical entities in developing terrorism/CBRNE preparedness and response plans	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	70
Develop evacuation plans for identified terrorism targets	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	65
Distribute to schools, special needs and the public fire safety and response information	2	6	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	74
Educate school, special needs and citizens on fire extinguisher use	3	6	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	75
Assist in obtaining a fire education-training trailer for the jurisdiction.	1	6	4	2	3	3	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	61



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

Table 7.17 "STAPLEE" Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to respond to fire incidents and exercise response	3	6	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	71
Obtain/maintain fire fighting supplies at all fire departments	3	6	4	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	72
Obtain fire equipment to combat fires in high rise buildings	2	6	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	66
Train fire 1 <sup>st</sup> responders to at least the "Awareness and Operations level"	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	71
Ensure that NFPA standards and codes are followed and that fire codes are enforced with citations issued for violations.	3	6	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	74
Develop fire plans for all major businesses and critical facilities	3	6	4	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	75
Adopt/enforce sprinkler and smoke alarm legislation for all facilities	2	6	4	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	71
Obtain fire equipment to combat fires where water hydrants are non-existent	3	6	4	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	66
Acquire and install six inch water mains and hydrants community wide	2	6	4	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	62
Adopt/enforce housing code legislation to limit number of citizens in housing	2	6	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	68
Assist power utilities in implementing a power outage public alerting program	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	65
Train 1 <sup>st</sup> responders on dealing with downed power lines during a response	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	64
Identify special needs populations that rely on electricity for medical equipment	3	3	0	0	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	65
Develop with the water utilities a process to alert the public of water contamination	3	3	0	0	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	66
Train/equip utility workers with water testing and monitoring processes and equipment	2	3	0	2	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	58
Develop a wellhead protection program to upgrade wells in the 100-year flood plain.	2	3	0	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	60



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Adopt infiltration standards within the watershed district based on Pepin Total Maximum Daily Load	2	0	0	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	56	
Adopt minimum, consistent runoff peak standards within the watershed district.	2	0	0	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	52	
Reduce/stop groundwater contamination of fens and trout streams (Eagle Creek and Savage Fen) by identifying sources and limiting/stopping contaminant release.	2	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	52
Identify ways to maintain supply of groundwater to fens and trout streams with the watershed district.	2	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	50
Analyze data to document trends on issues such as water usage, contamination, quality, and availability.	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	57
Determine fen and trout stream recharge areas.	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	57
Develop a channel lobby for funding to assess unregulated discharges in the MN River Basin.	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	57
Work with the State and stakeholders to establish a Mn. River basin commission to coordinate Mgmt, implement projects and programs of common benefit, and monitor performance of water management entities	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	57
Promote conservation and wise use of groundwater through education and public information.	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	63
Establish Stormwater infiltration criteria to protect the quality of groundwater.	2	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	60
Continue well decommissioning through cost sharing incentive programs.	2	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	64
Improve groundwater monitoring in the Watershed Management Organization.	2	0	0	2	3	3	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	52



Scott County, Minnesota  
Multi-jurisdictional, All Hazards  
2009 Mitigation Plan

**Table 7.17 “STAPLEE” Mitigation Actions Prioritization Table**

Action/Project Description	High Community Acceptance	High effect on Loss of Life-WF=3	High Effect on Property Loss WF=2	High Effect on Economic Loss WF=2	is Technical Feasibility	is a Long-Term Solution	No Secondary Impacts	Little Staffing required	Funding Potential is High	Low Maintenance/Operations	High Political Support	Has a Local Champion	Has Public Support	State Authorized	Local Authority Exists	Potential Legal Challenge is High	Action Benefit is High	Action Cost is Low WF	High Economic Goal Contribution	Outside Funding Not Required	Land/Water Effect is Low	Low Endangered Species Effect	HAZMAT Waste Site Effect is Low	Environmental Effect is low	Federal law Compliant is High	Total Priority Score
Work with the Metropolitan Council to complete a model of the metro region.	2	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	60
Support wellhead protection efforts by providing staff time and technical assistance.	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	61
Support county area planning by using the Metro Councils model to assess ground water impact of continued development.	2	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	59
Distribute Wildfire awareness, preparedness information to schools and the public	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	70
Assist DNR in distributing USFS fuels reduction information (Firewise.)	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	69
Publish outdoor burn ban info in area newspapers during Wild-land fire seasons.	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	72
Develop with the media and fire responders a public alerting process for the public	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	72
Train/equip 1 <sup>st</sup> responders on techniques to respond to wild-land fire events.	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	1	2	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	58
Obtain specialized equipment to combat wildfires. (4-wheel drive brush fire truck)	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	60
Exercise fire response regularly for residences, businesses and industry	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	63
Identify Private contractors to assist in wild-land fire response	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	66
Adopt/enforce wildfire legislation that includes burning bans	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	66