APPENDIX D. MITIGATION ACTION WORKSHEETS

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

D-1 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

Click here to enter text.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Click here to enter text.

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☐ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		
Could it be implemented quickly?		
	STAPLEE Score Total	
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)		

10. Date: Click here to enter text.

11. Contact Information:

Name: Click here to enter text. **Phone:** Click here to enter text. **E-Mail:** Click here to enter text.

D-2 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet Instructions

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – Mitigation Action Worksheet INSTRUCTIONS

The following instructions are designed to assist City of Seattle departments and community partners in identifying and prioritizing mitigation actions for the 2014 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update. The instructions supplement the 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet and are meant to provide additional information for each of the worksheet elements.

1. Mitigation Action

Describe your action in a manner detailed enough to be understood by the plan's readers. Consider using the SMART method of describing objectives to develop your actions:

- **Specific** – target a specific area for improvement.
- **Measurable** – quantify or at least suggest an indicator of progress.
- **Assignable** – specify who will do it.
- **Realistic** – state what results can realistically be achieved, given available resources.
- **Time-related** – specify when the result(s) can be achieved.

2. Action Status

Identify the status of the action:

- **New –** The action is new and will be included for the first time in the 2014 plan update.
- **Existing –** The action was implemented prior to the 2014 plan update but is ongoing, and additional or ongoing action is required for completion.
- **Complete –** The action has been completed.

3. Type of Action

Identify the type of action:

- **Plans and Regulations –** Regulatory actions or planning processes that result in reducing vulnerability to hazards.
- **Infrastructure/Capital Projects –** Actions taken to modify existing buildings or structures to protect them from a hazard, or remove them from the hazard area.
- **Natural Systems Protection –** Actions that, in addition to minimizing hazard losses, also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems.
- **Education and Awareness –** Actions taken to inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about hazards and potential ways to mitigate them.
- **Preparedness and Response –** Actions that protect people and property during and immediately after a disaster or hazard event.

Type of Action	Description	Examples
Plans and Regulations	These actions include government authorities, policies, or codes that influence the way land and buildings are developed and built.	▪ Comprehensive plans ▪ Director's Rules ▪ Department Standard Operating Procedures ▪ Land Use Plans ▪ Subdivision regulations ▪ Building codes and enforcement ▪ NFIP Community Rating System ▪ Capital improvement programs ▪ Open Space Preservation ▪ Stormwater management regulations and master plan
Infrastructure/Capital Project	These actions involve modifying existing structures and infrastructure to protect them from a hazard or remove them from a hazard area. This could apply to public or private structures as well as critical facilities and infrastructure. This type of action also involves projects to construct manmade structures to reduce the impact of hazards.	▪ Utility undergrounding ▪ Structural retrofits ▪ Non-structural measures ▪ Sea walls and retaining walls ▪ Detention and retention structures ▪ Culverts
Natural Systems Protection	These actions minimize damage and losses and also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems and cultural and historic resources.	▪ Sediment and erosion control ▪ Stream corridor restoration ▪ Green space management ▪ Conservation easements ▪ Wetland restoration and preservation ▪ Identification of historic and cultural resources in high hazard areas
Education and Awareness	These actions inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about hazards and potential ways to mitigate them. Although this type of mitigation reduces risk less directly than structural projects or regulation, it is an important foundation. A greater understanding and awareness of hazards and risk among local officials, stakeholders, and the public is more likely to lead to direct actions.	▪ Radio or television spots ▪ Websites with maps and information ▪ Real estate disclosure ▪ Presentations to school groups or neighborhood organizations ▪ Mailings to residents in hazard-prone areas ▪ StormReady ▪ Firewise Communities
Preparedness and Response	These actions protect people and property during and immediately after a disaster or hazard event. Services include warning systems, emergency response services, and protection of critical facilities.	▪ Identify resources and supplies that may be required in an emergency ▪ Designate facilities for emergency use ▪ Restore critical infrastructure ▪ Enhance warning and communications systems

4. Goals Supported

Identify which of the 2014 Hazard Mitigation Goals the action supports (you may select more than one):

- **Life and Safety –** Action protects life and safety and promotes community preparedness.
- **Critical Infrastructure Protection –** Action safeguards critical infrastructure and ensures continuity of service.
- **Property Protection –** Action protects public and private property.
- **Natural Resource Protection –** Action protects the natural environment and/or cultural and historic resources.
- **Resilient Economy –** Action ensures a resilient economy.
- **Integrated Planning –** Action promotes a collaborative and integrated mitigation program.

5. Lead Department/Organization

Identify what City department(s), or community partner(s), would be primarily responsible for implementing the action.

6. Timeline for Implementation

Indicate the expected timeline for completion of the action.

7. Life of Action

Identify how long the mitigation action is intended to remain in effect.

- **Temporary –** Action is a time-limited, one-time activity.
- **Short-Term (Interim) –** Generally defined as an action that can be accomplished within one year of the plan adoption.
- **Long-Term –** Generally defined as an action that takes longer than a year or is ongoing throughout several years.

8. Hazards Addressed

This section lists all of the hazards identified in the 2014 update of the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis (SHIVA). Hazards in bold are the top five hazards as ranked in the SHIVA, however a comprehensive mitigation plan must identify actions that address all 18 hazards. Check all hazards that will be mitigated by the action. If it is a general action, then check "All Hazards." Your department may have a specific responsibility for reducing the risk of certain hazards. If so, you may wish to focus your actions on those key hazards.

Examples:

- Seattle City Light should develop actions to reduce the effects of power outages.
- The Seattle Fire Department and Department of Transportation may develop actions to address hazardous materials.

- Seattle Public Schools should develop actions, in coordination with the Seattle Police Department, to address active shooter incidents.

9. Anticipated Cost (if known)

If possible, identify the estimated cost of the action based on best available data. If the cost is unknown, you may make a more qualitative assessment of the cost impact based on the following considerations:

- **High –** Existing funding levels are not adequate to cover the costs for the proposed action, and implementation would require an increase in revenue through alternate sources.
- **Medium –** The action could be implemented with existing funding but would require a reapportionment of the budget or a budget amendment, or the cost of the action would have to be spread out over time.
- **Low –** The action could be funded under the existing budget. The action is part of or can be part of an existing or ongoing program.

10. Funding Available?

Identify whether funding for the action is currently or is anticipated to be available.

11. Funding Source

If funding is available, please identify the anticipated funding source (e.g., existing budget, grants, bond/levy). The cost of some actions may consist only of staff time and administrative resources.

12. Prioritization Criteria

A key element of the City's mitigation strategy is prioritizing mitigation actions. The City has opted to utilize the STAPLEE criteria as described below.

S: Is it Socially acceptable?

The public must support the overall implementation strategy and specific mitigation actions. Therefore, the actions will have to be evaluated in terms of community acceptance by asking questions such as:

- Will the proposed action adversely affect one segment of the population?
- Will the action disrupt established neighborhoods, break up voting districts, or cause the relocation of lower income people?
- Is the action compatible with present and future community values?
- If the community is a tribal entity, will the actions adversely affect cultural values or resources?

T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?

It is important to determine whether the proposed action is technically feasible, will help to reduce losses in the long term, and has minimal secondary impacts. Here, you will determine whether the alternative action is a whole or partial solution, or not a solution at all, by considering the following types of issues:

- How effective is the action in avoiding or reducing future losses?
  For example, if the proposed action involves upgrading culverts and storm drains to handle a 10-year storm event, and the objective is to reduce the potential impacts of a catastrophic flood, the proposed mitigation cannot be considered effective. Conversely, if the objective were to reduce the adverse impacts of frequent flooding events, the same action would certainly meet the technical feasibility criterion.
- Will it create more problems than it solves?
- Does it solve the problem or only a symptom?

A: Does the responsible agency have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?

Under this part of the evaluation criteria, you will examine the anticipated staffing, funding, and maintenance requirements for the mitigation action to determine if the jurisdiction has the personnel and administrative capabilities necessary to implement the action or whether outside help will be necessary.

- Does the jurisdiction have the capability (staff, technical experts, and/or funding) to implement the action, or can it be readily obtained?
- Can the community provide the necessary maintenance?
- Can it be accomplished in a timely manner?

P: Is it Politically acceptable?

Understanding how your current community and state political leadership feel about issues related to the environment, economic development, safety, and emergency management will provide valuable insight into the level of political support you are likely to have for mitigation activities and programs.

Proposed mitigation objectives sometimes fail because of a lack of political acceptability. This can be avoided by considering the following questions:

- Is there political support to implement and maintain this action?
- Have political leaders participated in the planning process so far?
- Is there a local champion willing to help see the action to completion?
- Who are the stakeholders in this proposed action?
- Is there enough public support to ensure the success of the action?
- Have all stakeholders been offered an opportunity to participate in the planning process?
- How can the mitigation objectives be accomplished at the lowest “cost” to the public?

L: Is there Legal authority to implement?

Without the appropriate legal authority, the action cannot lawfully be undertaken. When considering this criterion, you will determine whether your jurisdiction has the legal authority to implement the action, or whether the jurisdiction must pass new laws or regulations.

You should identify the unit of government undertaking the mitigation action and include an analysis of the interrelationships among local, regional, state, and federal governments. Legal authority is likely to have a

significant role later in the process when your community will have to determine how mitigation activities can best be carried out and to what extent mitigation policies and programs can be enforced.

- Does the community have the authority to implement the proposed action?
- Is there a technical, scientific, or legal basis for the mitigation action (i.e., does the mitigation action "fit" the hazard setting)?
- Are the proper laws, ordinances, and resolutions in place to implement the action?
- Are there any potential legal consequences?
- Will the action, or lack of action, result in legal liability for the community?
- Is the action likely to be challenged by stakeholders who may be negatively affected?

E: Is it Economically beneficial?

Everyone experiences budget constraints at one time or another. Cost-effective mitigation actions that can be funded in current or upcoming budget cycles are much more likely to be implemented than mitigation actions requiring general obligation bonds or other instruments that would incur long-term debt to a community. A community with tight budgets or budget shortfalls may be more willing to undertake a mitigation initiative if it can be funded, at least in part, by outside sources. "Big ticket" mitigation actions, such as large-scale acquisition and relocation, are often considered for implementation in a post-disaster scenario when additional federal and state funding for mitigation is available.

Economic considerations must include the present economic base and projected growth and should be based on answers to questions such as:

- Are there currently sources of funds that can be used to implement the action?
- What benefits will the action provide?
- Does the cost seem reasonable for the size of the problem and likely benefits?
- What burden will be placed on the tax base or local economy to implement this action?
- Does the action contribute to other community economic goals, such as capital improvements or economic development?
- What proposed actions should be considered but be "tabled" for implementation until outside sources of funding are available?

E: Will the action have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment?

Impact on the environment is an important consideration because of public desire for sustainable and environmentally healthy communities and the many statutory considerations, such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to keep in mind when using federal funds.

You will need to evaluate whether a mitigation action would have negative consequences for environmental assets such as threatened and endangered species, wetlands, and other protected natural resources, by considering questions such as:

- How will this action affect the environment (land, water, endangered species)?
- Will this action comply with local, state, and federal environmental laws or regulations?

- Is the action consistent with community environmental goals?

Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?

Impacts on historic or key cultural resources are important to your community. You will need to evaluate whether a mitigation action would result in negative consequence or impact to historic structures or important cultural resources.

Can the action be implemented quickly?

The ability of the City to quickly and effectively implement a mitigation action may impact how it is prioritized. Consider questions such as:

- Could this action be started fairly easily and within a reasonable timeframe?
- Could the action be implemented immediately?
- Would this action require other actions to be completed before it could be implemented?

Will the implemented action result in lives saved or a reduction in disaster damage?

Protecting lives and property is the fundamental goal of the mitigation actions. You will need to evaluate whether the action would prevent loss of life in future events. Please rank these based on the following considerations:

- **High –** The action will have an immediate impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property.
- **Medium –** The action will have a long-term impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property or will provide an immediate reduction in risk exposure to property.
- **Low –** Long-term benefits of the action are difficult to quantify in the short term.

D-3 2014 Department Mitigation Action Worksheets

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DoIT-1. Upgrade essential network routers, firewalls, and switches for City of Seattle information technology systems.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: DoIT

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible CIty agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	31	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DoIT-2. Add upgrades to SONET as necessary to improve capacity of existing fiber optic network.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: DoIT

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	31	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DoIT-3. Upgrade telecommunications systems: Time Division Multiplexing (TDM network) to VoIP/Multimedia Communications in City's systems.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: DoIT

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	31	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DoIT-4. Creation of citywide next generation data center site and a secondary alternate data center site for the City of Seattle. The new data centers will be designed for redundancy and resiliency. These data center sites are to be used during times of emergencies or disasters.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: DoIT

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	31	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DoIT-5. Implement controls on City owned desktop systems that enforce policy and prohibit installation of non-approved applications.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: DoIT

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	31	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DoIT-6. Implement technology for the detection of command and control computer traffic for compromised desktop systems.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: DoIT

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☒ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	31	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DoIT-7. Implement technology to routinely inventory installed, non-Microsoft applications to determine to the extent to which upgrade or patching is required. Transition the information to operations for patch/upgrade of the systems.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: DoIT

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☒ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	31	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DON-1. Establishment of Community Emergency Hubs and training in 13 P-Patches

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☒ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☒ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Department of Neighborhoods

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☒ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☒ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): approx. $35,000

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible CIty agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		2
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		1
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	22
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	4
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	26	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DPD-1. Update Seattle structural codes to current standards

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Planning & Development

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☒ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☒ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☒ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☒ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☒ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): included in budget as regular cost of operating the Department

8b. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	8
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)		33

10. Date: August 8, 2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Maureen Traxler Phone: 206-233-3892 E-Mail: maureen.traxler@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DPD-2. Identify City-owned unreinforced masonry buildings.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☒ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Click here to enter text.

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): unknown

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		2
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	22
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	4
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	26	

10. Date: September 9, 2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Maureen Traxler Phone: 206-233-3892 E-Mail: maureen.traxler@yahoo.com

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

DPD-3. Compile comprehensive list of unreinforced masonry buildings

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☒ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Planning and Development

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Emergency Management, Neighborhoods

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): 1 FTE for 2 years + interns + DPD management & supervision

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: 2015-16 budget

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		2
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		2
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		2
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	22
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)		28

10. Date: August 8, 2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Maureen Traxler Phone: 206-233-3892 E-Mail: maureen.traxler@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

FAS-1. Develop analytical tools to support the asset planning program. Tools include, but are not limited to:1. Reconciliation between the previous critical facility index (CFI) and the newly developed facility mission criticality index (FMCI), 2. Analyses of risk-based prioritization for normal operations, seismic/hazard scenarios, and resource conservation projects, 3. Methodology to assess gaps in current facility data to identify areas that require additional studies and assessments.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Department of Finance and Administrative Services

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☒ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known):

8b. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	21
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	27	

10. Date: 7/15/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Julie Matsumoto Phone: 206-684-0357 E-Mail: Julie.matsumoto@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

FAS-2. Seismic upgrade of Charles Street – Fleets Vehicle Maintenance. The seismic risk assessment that was recently completed in January 2014 performed an ASCE 31-03 Tier 1 and Tier 2 study on the Charles Street – Fleets Vehicle Maintenance facility.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Department of Finance and Administrative Services

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Seattle Police Department

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): $3,600,000 (engineer's estimate in 2014 dollars)

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		2
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		2
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		0
	STAPLEE Score Total	17
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	10
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	27	

10. Date: 7/15/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Julie Matsumoto Phone: 206-684-0357 E-Mail: Julie.matsumoto@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

FAS-3. Emergency Generator Program. Supply and maintain emergency generators and fuel at critical FAS owned facilities. Inventory fixed emergency generators at FAS owned facilities, manage emergency generator preventative maintenance program, conduct annual testing, assess and mitigate gaps in critical facilities without fixed generators or with insufficient back-up power, maintain service contract for emergency generator support, repair and rolling stock.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Department of Finance and Administrative Services

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations:

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known):

8b. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		2
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		2
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	19
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	25	

10. Date: 7/15/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Julie Matsumoto Phone: 206-684-0357 E-Mail: Julie.matsumoto@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

FAS-4. Investigate and perform feasibility studies of new technologies for hazard mitigation. Example includes cost-benefit analysis of installing an early earthquake warning system into critical facilities as an investment by FAS to protect critical infrastructure, or by the tenant department to protect occupants and operations.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Department of Finance and Administrative Services

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☒ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known):

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	20
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	2
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	22	

10. Date: 7/15/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Julie Matsumoto Phone: 206-684-0357 E-Mail: Julie.matsumoto@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

FAS-5. Seismic upgrade of South Precinct. The seismic risk assessment that was recently completed in January 2014 performed an ASCE 31-03 Tier 1 and Tier 2 study on the South Precinct.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Department of Finance and Administrative Services

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Seattle Police Department

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): $1,550,000 (engineer's estimate in 2014 dollars)

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		2
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		2
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		0
	STAPLEE Score Total	17
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	10
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	27	

10. Date: 7/15/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Julie Matsumoto Phone: 206-684-0357 E-Mail: Julie.matsumoto@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

FAS-6. Complete ASCE 31-03 Tier 2 seismic studies on (10) critical FAS facilities: 1) Charles Street – Tire Shop, 2) Charles Street – Fire Garage, 3) Sunny Jim Warehouse, 4) Charles Street – SDOT Engineering, 5) Charles Street – Traffic Meter Shop, 6) Harbor Patrol Office, 7) Fire Headquarters, 8) Airport Way Ctr B, 9) Airport Way Ctr E, 10) HLF FAS Vehicle Maintenance Bldg. The seismic risk assessment that was recently completed in January 2014 performed ASCE 31-03 Tier 1 studies on (10) critical FAS facilities. A Tier 2 study should be completed prior to beginning the design and construction of a capital project.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Department of Finance and Administrative Services

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): ROM of $50-$100k

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		1
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	19
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	25	

10. Date: 7/15/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Julie Matsumoto Phone: 206-684-0357 E-Mail: Julie.matsumoto@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

FAS-7. Conduct a workshop to share methodology and lessons learned from the seismic risk assessment demonstration project with other departments and building owners. The seismic risk assessment that was recently completed in January 2014 was intended to be used as a demonstration project for a methodology that can be used by other departments and building owners. This can also be used as an education tool to clarify the scope included and excluded with a seismic assessment, e.g. superstructure but not building contents.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☒ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Department of Finance and Administrative Services & Office of Emergency Management

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations:

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☒ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☒ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☐ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		2
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	23
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	29	

10. Date: 7/15/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Julie Matsumoto Phone: 206-684-0357 E-Mail: Julie.matsumoto@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

HSD-1. Increase the quantity and quality of food available through the emergency food system for people at risk for food insecurity. Through the 3-year investment period work with selected agencies, increase coordination, efficiency, and resiliency of the food system.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Human Services Department

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☒ Floods	☒ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☒ HazMat Incidents	☒ Transportation Incident
☒ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☒ Tsunami/Seiches
☒ Disease Outbreaks	☒ Landslides	☒ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☒ Water Shortages
☒ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☒ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): $3.126 m / yr

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		2
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		NA
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		1
Could it be implemented quickly?		3
	STAPLEE Score Total	20
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	4
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	7
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	27	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

OEM-1. Identify opportunities for integration of community partners into the City's mitigation planning process

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☒ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: OEM

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: TBD

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☒ Short-Term (Interim) ☐ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☒ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known):

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		2
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	19
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	2
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	21	

10. Date: 11/17/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Erika Lund Phone: 206-233-5089 E-Mail: Erika.lund@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

OEM-2. Conduct a special public outreach campaign to hazard-prone areas of the city, such as liquefaction-prone areas.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☒ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: OEM

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: DPD and others TBD

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☒ Short-Term (Interim) ☐ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known):

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		2
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		2
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	19
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	25	

10. Date: Click here to enter text.

11. Contact Information:

Name: Erika Lund Phone: 206-233-5089 E-Mail: Erika.lund@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

OEM-3. Strengthen awareness of and focus on health systems/disease prevention in the mitigation program.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☒ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Public Health – Seattle/King County & Office of Economic Development (OED) & Office of Emergency Management (OEM)

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: N/A

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☒ Short-Term (Interim) ☐ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☒ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): Unknown

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Project not yet scoped by Public Health – Seattle/King County & OEM. Also referenced in CITY-WIDE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM MULTI-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN, 2015 - 2017

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		2
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		1
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	18
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	2
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	20	

10. Date: 11/17/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Erika Lund Phone: 206-233-5089 E-Mail: Erika.lund@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

OEM-4. Encourage the chambers of commerce and other business advocates to sponsor business efforts to prepare for and mitigate the impacts of hazards.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☒ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Office of Economic Development (OED) & Office of Emergency Management (OEM)

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: N/A

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☒ Short-Term (Interim) ☐ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☒ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): Unknown

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Project not yet scoped by OED & OEM. Also referenced in CITY-WIDE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM MULTI-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN, 2015 - 2017

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		1
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	18
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	2
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	3
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	21	

10. Date: 11/17/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Erika Lund Phone: 206-233-5089 E-Mail: Erika.lund@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

OSE-1. Develop a climate preparedness strategy.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☒ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: OSE

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☒ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☒ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☒ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☒ Disease Outbreaks	☒ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☒ Water Shortages
☒ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Unknown

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		3
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		2
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	0
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	5
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	30	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

P&R-1. Assessment and seismic retrofit and/or disposition and relocation of the North Shops (Densmore)

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Parks and Recreation

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: N/A

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): $2,000,000

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☒ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	2
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		2
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		1
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		1
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		1
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	17
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	4
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	7
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	24	

10. Date: 11/17/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Becky Rufin **Phone:** Click here to enter text. **E-Mail:** becky.rufin@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

P&R-2. Conduct an assessment of remaining Parks Community Centers and pools for seismic retrofit and other renovations needed for service as secondary emergency shelters.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Parks and Recreation

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: N/A

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☒ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☒ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): $80,000

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☒ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: CIP through General Fund and/or grant funding

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		1
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		3
	STAPLEE Score Total	21
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	2
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	23	

10. Date: 11/17/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Becky Rufin Phone: Becky Rufin **E-Mail:** becky.rufin@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

P&R-3. Identify illicit/improper drainage systems by private citizens, impacting steep slope areas (in conjunction with DPD and SPU).

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☒ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☒ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Parks and Recreation

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: DPD/SPU/SDOT

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☒ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☒ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): Program development costs ($50,000) + Additional enforcement staffing

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Grant for application and existing budget for enforcement

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3 1
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3 3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3 3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3 2
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3 3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2 3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		3 3
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		2 2
Could it be implemented quickly?		3 3
	STAPLEE Score Total	25 23
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1 3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1 5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	2 8
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	27 31	

10. Date: Click here to enter text.

11. Contact Information:

Name: Becky Rufin Phone: Click here to enter text. **E-Mail:** Click here to enter text.

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SC-1. Design and installation of dedicated power supply & emergency generator and transfer switch in Seattle Center Armory to support DoIT's MDF and critical Seattle Center management needs (up to 10 work stations) in a power outage.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle Center and DoIT are jointly proposing this project.

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: N/A

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☒ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): Unknown

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	8
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	33	

10. Date: 7/25/14

11. Contact Information:

Name: Jill Crary, Seattle Center Phone: 684-7107 E-Mail: Jill.Crary@Seattle.gov

Vicki Wills, DoIT, Phone: 684-3719 E-Mail: Vicki.Wills@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SC-2. Four important facilities at Seattle Center, each of which has been designated for use in a major emergency do not have generators for back-up power. These facilities are; 1) the Central Utility Plant which needs to be in operation to provide heating and cooling to add campus facilities, 2) the Fisher Pavilion, designated for sheltering, 3) the Exhibition Hall, designated for sheltering and emergency medical facility, and 4) the Seattle Center Pavilion, designated for sheltering and already in use as a cold weather shelter. We are proposing an electrical assessment/study be performed to determine the best options for installing diesel generators. From this study, specific implementation projects can be proposed at a later date.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle Center

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: N/A

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☒ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☒ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☒ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): Cost of study is estimated to be $60,000 ($15,000/facility).

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	31	

10. Date: 08/05/14

11. Contact Information:

Name: Jill Crary, Seattle Center Phone: 684-7107 E-Mail: Jill.Crary@Seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SC-3. Reroof and make minor electrical, plumbing and storage improvements to the Seattle Center Pavilion to allow it to be used for sheltering purposes in inclement weather and other hazard conditions. The facility previously used at Seattle Center for these purposes is no longer available so this facility is now in use, but the roof is currently leaking and a partial assessment by FAS identified these other needs.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection

☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection

☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle Center

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: N/A

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☒ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☒ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): Cost of new roof and other minor upgrades is estimated to be $517,000.

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		3
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	31	

10. Date: 08/05/14

11. Contact Information:

Name: Jill Crary, Seattle Center Phone: 684-7107 E-Mail: Jill.Crary@Seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-1. System Operations Center Seismic retrofit design

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): $200k for design - $2.5m for construction

10. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	22
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	28	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-2. Seismic review of vaults and substations to update 1993 study

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☒ Short-Term (Interim) ☐ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): $200k

10. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	21
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	4
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	25	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-3. Substation Seismic Upgrade

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Scalable – There are 14 substations to retrofit and the most recent cost about $600k. Some will cost more since they have more transformers to retrofit.

10. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?		3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		1
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	23
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	29	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-4. Hazard Tree Mitigation (Vegetation Management) near SCL Right-of-Way

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☒ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☒ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): $1m per year

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		3
	STAPLEE Score Total	23
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	4
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	27	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-5. Provide seismically designed storage racks for critical parts and supplies

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

11. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	22
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	4
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	26	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-6. Secure tall furniture at SCL facilities.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☐ Existing ☒ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☒ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): $100k

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☒ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		1
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	23
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	29	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-7. Map cell towers and identify feeders

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☒ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		2
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	21
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	2
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	23	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-8. Remove/sample PCB transformers

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☒ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☒ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		3
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	22
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	2
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	24	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-9. Preposition supplies needed for restoration efforts at secure locations

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☒ Short-Term (Interim) ☐ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

11. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	22
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	2
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	24	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-10. Install impact recorders at substations

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☒ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): Click here to enter text.

10. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

11. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	21
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	2
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	23	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-11. Conduct study of downstream consequences from dams to update and improve inundation maps

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☐ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☒ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☒ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): $500k

10. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

11. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		2
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	23
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	10
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	33	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SCL-12. Retrofit electrical transmission towers in Snohomish County against landslide damage.

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5. Lead Department/Organization: Seattle City Light

6. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

7. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

8. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☒ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☒ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

9. Anticipated Cost (if known): $450,000

10. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

11. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Intend to apply for grant funding.

12. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		1
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	22
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	28	

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SDOT-1. Bridge Seismic Retrofit Phase III

2. Action Status: ☐ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SDOT

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): ≈ $60 million

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☒ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Part of the next Bridging the Gap Levy

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		3
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	26
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	10
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	36	

10. Date: 9/17/14

11. Contact Information:

Name: Lawrence Eichhorn Phone: 206-684-7574 E-Mail: Lawrence.eichhorn@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SDOT-2. Transportation Operations Center implementation assessment to combine the Traffic Management Center (TMC), dispatch, construction coordination, customer inquiry and call center, and emergency operations functions into a 24/7 work center.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SDOT

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☒ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☒ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☒ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☒ HazMat Incidents	☒ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): ≈ $200,000

8b. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		3
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		3
	STAPLEE Score Total	24
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	10
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	34	

10. Date: 9/17/14

11. Contact Information:

Name: Lawrence Eichhorn Phone: 206-684-7574 E-Mail: Lawrence.eichhorn@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SDOT-3. Traffic Management Center (TMC) expansion to 24/7 operations (TMC expansion construction, FTE)

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SDOT

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☒ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☒ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☒ HazMat Incidents	☒ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): Unknown

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☒ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		3
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	23
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	5
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	10
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	33	

10. Date: 9/17/14

11. Contact Information:

Name: Lawrence Eichhorn Phone: 206-684-7574 E-Mail: Lawrence.eichhorn@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SDOT-4. Security threat assessment of Seattle rail corridor to identify risk associated with new volume of oil train movement

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☒ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SDOT

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: DHS, FRA, BNSF

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☒ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☒ HazMat Incidents	☒ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): ≈ $200,000

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		1
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		2
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		3
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	23
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	29	

10. Date: 9/17/14

11. Contact Information:

Name: Lawrence Eichhorn Phone: 206-684-7574 E-Mail: Lawrence.eichhorn@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SDOT-5. Seattle rail corridor access control measures (fencing, security cameras, improved right of way management)

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SDOT

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: DHS, FRA, BNSF

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☒ Terrorism
☒ Active Shooter	☒ HazMat Incidents	☒ Transportation Incident
☒ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☒ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): rough order of magnitude ≈ $10 million

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		1
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		1
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		3
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		3
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	21
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	27	

10. Date: 9/17/14

11. Contact Information:

Name: Lawrence Eichhorn Phone: 206-684-7574 E-Mail: Lawrence.eichhorn@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SDOT-6. Seattle earthquake damage spot arterial repair planning/exercise

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SDOT

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: SPU, SCL, Parks & Rec

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☒ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☒ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): $80,000 planning and exercise

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		3
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		2
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
	STAPLEE Score Total	25
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	2
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	27	

10. Date: 9/17/14

11. Contact Information:

Name: Lawrence Eichhorn Phone: 206-684-7574 E-Mail: Lawrence.eichhorn@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SDOT-7. S. Lander St Grade Separation of rail and arterial right of way

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☒ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SDOT

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☒ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☒ HazMat Incidents	☒ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): estimated design/build $180 - $200 million

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☒ No

8c. Funding Source: ☐ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☒ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	2
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible City agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		2
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		0
	STAPLEE Score Total	17
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	6
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	23	

10. Date: 9/17/14

11. Contact Information:

Name: Lawrence Eichhorn Phone: 206-684-7574 E-Mail: Lawrence.eichhorn@seattle.gov

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SPU-1. Develop a plan to protect drinking water system from earthquakes.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☒ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SPU

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: N/A

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☒ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): $934,000

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		2
A: Does the responsible agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		2
STAPLEE Score Total		20

Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	2
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total		5

Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	25

10. Date: 11/17/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Ned Worcester Phone: Click here to enter text. **E-Mail:** Click here to enter text.

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SPU-2. Improve Thornton Creek Confluence to reduce upstream flooding and downstream flows.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☒ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☒ Property Protection
☒ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☐ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SPU

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: N/A

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☒ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): Unknown

8b. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		2.5
A: Does the responsible agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2.5
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		2
Could it be implemented quickly?		3
	STAPLEE Score Total	24
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	2
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	3
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	27	

10. Date: Click here to enter text.

11. Contact Information:

Name: Ned Worcester Phone: Click here to enter text. **E-Mail:** Click here to enter text.

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SPU-3. Accelerate flooding and sewer backup prevention projects in the Broadview and South Park neighborhoods

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☒ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☐ Plans and Regulations ☒ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☒ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SPU

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: N/A

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☒ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): $20,000,000

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		2
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	22
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	4
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	26	

10. Date: Click here to enter text.

11. Contact Information:

Name: Ned Worcester Phone: Click here to enter text. **E-Mail:** Click here to enter text.

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SPU-4. Create a comprehensive emergency plan for maintaining and restoring essential services in emergencies

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☐ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☒ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☐ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SPU

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: Click here to enter text.

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☒ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☒ All Hazards	☐ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☐ Water Shortages
☐ Excessive Heat	☐ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☐ **Wind Storms**
☐ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): $482,000

8b. Funding Available?: ☒ Yes ☐ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☐ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible state agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		2
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		2
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		0
Could it be implemented quickly?		3
	STAPLEE Score Total	22
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	1
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	4
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	26	

10. Date: Click here to enter text.

11. Contact Information:

Name: Ned Worcester Phone: Click here to enter text. **E-Mail:** Click here to enter text.

City of Seattle Hazard Mitigation Plan – 2014 Mitigation Action Worksheet

1. Mitigation Action

SPU-5. Prepare for water supply and utility system threats that may occur from climate change.

2. Action Status: ☒ New ☐ Existing ☐ Complete

3. Type of Action:

☒ Plans and Regulations ☐ Infrastructure/Capital Project ☒ Natural Systems Protection
☐ Education and Awareness ☒ Preparedness and Response

4. Goals Supported:

☐ Life and Safety ☒ Critical Infrastructure Protection ☐ Property Protection
☒ Natural Resource Protection ☐ Resilient Economy ☒ Integrated Planning

5a. Lead Department/Organization: SPU

5b. Supporting Departments/Organizations: OSE

6a. Timeline: ☐ Immediate ☐ < 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☒ 3 – 5 years

6b. Life of Action: ☐ Temporary ☐ Short-Term (Interim) ☒ Long-Term

7. Hazards Addressed (Check all that apply):

☐ All Hazards	☒ Floods	☐ Terrorism
☐ Active Shooter	☐ HazMat Incidents	☐ Transportation Incident
☐ Civil Disorder	☐ **Infrastructure/Cyber**	☐ Tsunami/Seiches
☐ Disease Outbreaks	☐ Landslides	☐ Volcanic Eruption/Lahars
☐ **Earthquakes**	☐ **Power Outages**	☒ Water Shortages
☒ Excessive Heat	☒ **Snow and Ice Storms**	☒ **Wind Storms**
☒ Fires		

NOTE: Hazards in bold are ranked as the highest risk in the Seattle Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Analysis

8a. Anticipated Cost (if known): $5,218,000

8b. Funding Available?: ☐ Yes ☒ Anticipated ☐ No

8c. Funding Source: ☒ Existing Budget ☒ Grant ☐ Bond/Levy ☐ No/minimal cost

Other: Click here to enter text.

9. Prioritization Criteria

STAPLEE Criteria	Evaluation Rating	Score
S: Is it Socially acceptable?	Definitely YES = 3 Maybe YES = 2 Probably NO = 1 Definitely NO = 0	3
T: Is it Technically feasible and potentially successful?		3
A: Does the responsible agency/department have the Administrative capacity to execute this action?		3
P: Is it Politically acceptable?		3
L: Is there Legal authority to implement?		3
E: Is it Economically beneficial?		3
E: Will the project have either a neutral or positive impact on the natural Environment? (score a 3 if positive impact, 2 if neutral impact)		3
Will historic structures or key cultural resources be saved or protected?		2
Could it be implemented quickly?		1
	STAPLEE Score Total	24
Mitigation Effectiveness Criteria	**Evaluation Rating**	**Score**
Will the implemented action result in lives saved?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	3
Will the implemented action result in a reduction of disaster damage?	High = 5 Medium = 3 Low = 1	4
	Mitigation Effectiveness Score Total	7
Total Score (STAPLEE + Mitigation Effectiveness)	31	

10. Date: 11/17/2014

11. Contact Information:

Name: Ned Worcester Phone: Click here to enter text. **E-Mail:** Click here to enter text.