

**APPENDIX IV-1 STAPLEE EVALUATION INFORMATION
AND INSTRUCTIONS**

STAPLEE Evaluation Criteria for Mitigation Actions

The STAPLEE evaluation method uses seven criteria for evaluating a mitigation action: Social, Technical, Administrative, Political, Legal, Economic, and Environmental. Within each of those criteria are additional considerations that may call upon the Risk Assessment and other sources of information for evaluation. A sample worksheet format at the end of this Appendix. An explanation of how each of the STAPLEE criteria may be applied to evaluation of mitigation actions follows:

Social: The public must support the overall implementation strategy and specific mitigation actions and the mitigation actions are evaluated in terms of community acceptance.

Considerations:

Community Acceptance: 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?

Effect on Segment of Population: Will the proposed action adversely affect one segment of the population?

Technical: It is important to determine if the proposed action is technically feasible, will help to reduce losses in the long term, and has minimal secondary impacts. This category evaluates whether the alternative action is a whole or partial solution, or not a solution at all.

Considerations:

Technical Feasibility: How effective is the action in avoiding or reducing future losses?

Long-Term Solution: Does the action solve the problem or only a symptom?

Secondary Impacts: Will the action create more problems than it solves?

Administrative: This category examines the anticipated staffing, funding, and maintenance requirements for the mitigation actions to determine if the jurisdiction has the personnel and administrative capabilities to implement the actions or whether outside help will be necessary.

Considerations:

Staffing (sufficient number of staff and training): Does the jurisdiction have the capability (staff, technical experts) to implement the action?

Funding allocated: Does the jurisdiction have the funding to implement the action or can it readily be obtained? Can it be accomplished in a timely manner?

Maintenance/Operations: Can the community provide the necessary maintenance?

Political: This considers the level of political support for the mitigation activities and programs.

Considerations:

Political Support: Is there political support to implement and maintain this action? Have political leaders participated in the planning process so far?

Local Champion or Plan Proponent (respected community member) Is there a local champion willing to help see the action to completion?

Public Support (stakeholders): Is there enough public support to ensure the success of the action? Have all the stakeholders been offered an opportunity to participate in the planning process?

Legal: Whether the jurisdiction has the legal authority to implement the actions, or whether the jurisdiction must pass new laws or regulations, is important in determining how the mitigation action can be best carried out.

Considerations:

State Authority: Does the state have authority to implement the action?

Existing Local Authority: Are proper laws, ordinances, and resolutions in place to implement the actions?

Potential Legal Challenge: Is there a technical, scientific, or legal basis for the mitigation action (i.e. does the mitigation actions “fit” the hazard setting)? Are there any potential legal consequences? Is the action likely to be challenged by stakeholders who may be negatively affected?

Economic: Economic considerations must include evaluation of the present economic base and projected growth. Cost-effective mitigation actions that can be funded in current or up-coming budget cycles are more likely to be implemented than actions requiring general obligation bonds or other instruments that would incur long-term debt to a community.

Considerations:

Benefit of Action: What benefits will the action provide?

Cost of Action: Does the cost seem reasonable for the size of the problem and the likely benefits? What burden will be places on the tax base or local economy to implement this action?

Contributes to Economic Goals: Does the action contribute to other community economic goals, such as capital improvements or economic development?

Outside Funding Required: Are there currently sources of funds that can be used to implement the action? What proposed actions should be considered by be “tabled” for implementation until outside sources of funding are available?

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

Considerations:

Affects Land/Water Bodies: How will this action affect land/water?

Affects Endangered Species: How will this action affect Endangered Species?

Affects Hazardous Materials and Waste Sites: How will this action affect Hazardous Materials and waste sites?

Consistent with Community’s Environmental Goals: Is this action consistent with community environmental goals?

Consistent with Federal Laws: Is the action consistent with Federal Laws, such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)?

STAPLEE Evaluation Process for Mitigation Actions

A worksheet for the STAPLEE evaluation process was provided in the FEMA mitigation planning guidance. A worksheet is completed for each chosen action. Scoring uses a plus (+) for favorable evaluation for each consideration, a negative (-) for less favorable evaluation, and N/A for considerations that do not apply. Space for comments, benefit of action, source of funding/ cost of action, responsible party, and timeframe for completion are also completed for each action.

Example of STAPLEE Worksheet

Action ID:

Action considered:

STAPLEE Criteria	S Social		T Technical			A Administrative			P Political			L Legal		E Economic			E Environment						
→ For Alternative Actions ↓	Community Acceptance	Effect on Population Segment	Technical Feasibility	Long-term Solution	Secondary Impacts	Staffing	Funding Allocated	Maintenance/Operations	Political Support	Local Champion	Public Support	State Authority	Existing Local Authority	Potential Legal Challenge	Benefit of Action	Cost of Action	Contributes to Economic Goals	Outside Funding Required	Effect on Land/Water	Effect on Endangered Species	Effect on HAZMAT Sites	Consistent w/ Community Environmental Goals	Consistent w/ Federal Laws

Comments:

Benefit:

Cost/Funding Source:

Responsible Party:

Timeframe for Completion:

