Summary of Comments: 32 respondents commented on this question. Most of the comments provided reasons for not evacuating including role as a first responder; concerns about leaving property; and having nowhere to go. Other comments stated that the decision would be made based upon the storm in question. Some respondents expressed concern over the timeframe in which UL Lafayette would be closed.

Figure 6.3.1-5
Survey Results to Question 5

5. If authorities order an evacuation of the area for a natural hazard (such as a hurricane), how likely are you to evacuate?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Very Likely	**61.5%**	**428**
Likely	20.8%	145
Somewhat Likely	10.8%	75
Not Likely	6.9%	48
Comment:		25
answered question		**696**
skipped question		**10**

Summary of Comments: 25 respondents commented on this question. Comments were similar to those provided for the previous question.

Figure 6.3.1-6

Student Survey Response for Question 6

6. How much of a threat do you think the following hazards pose to UL Lafayette:

	Low	Medium	High	Rating Average	Response Count
Drought	**74.4% (469)**	22.7% (143)	2.9% (18)	1.28	630
Earthquake	**94.3% (596)**	2.4% (15)	3.3% (21)	1.09	632
Extreme Temperature - Cold	**81.7% (510)**	15.5% (97)	2.7% (17)	1.21	624
Extreme Temperature – Heat	18.9% (117)	**43.4% (269)**	37.7% (234)	2.19	620
Flood	9.0% (57)	**49.9% (315)**	41.0% (259)	2.32	631
Hazardous Materials Release – Fixed Site	37.0% (228)	**48.0% (296)**	15.1% (93)	1.78	617
Hazardous Materials Release – Transportation	25.9% (159)	**49.3% (303)**	24.8% (152)	1.99	614
High Wind – Hurricane	1.5% (10)	17.5% (114)	**81.0% (529)**	2.79	653
High Wind – Tornado	10.1% (63)	**48.2% (300)**	41.6% (259)	2.32	622
Thunderstorms - Wind, Hail, & Lightning	5.7% (36)	32.1% (203)	**62.2% (394)**	2.57	633
Acts of Violence	26.8% (167)	**56.5% (352)**	16.7% (104)	1.90	623
Transportation Incidents	30.1% (188)	**48.7% (304)**	21.2% (132)	1.91	624
Terrorism	**59.6% (371)**	32.4% (202)	8.0% (50)	1.48	623
Communicable Diseases	20.5% (129)	**53.7% (338)**	25.9% (163)	2.05	630
Other (please indicate below)	**68.9% (102)**	15.5% (23)	15.5% (23)	1.47	148
				Other (please specify)	64
				answered question	**700**
				skipped question	**6**

Summary of Comments: There were 64 comments for this question, of which 16 related to an initial glitch which was corrected following 85 responses. The remaining comments, included widespread concern over guns on campus, concern regarding power failure, and clarifications for selections made.

Figure 6.3.1-7

Survey Results for Question 7

7. If you would like to be involved in a UL Lafayette effort to identify and understand its vulnerabilities, their corresponding likelihood, and prioritize the projects and strategies which can help lessen the potential damage and disruption they can cause, please enter your contact information here:	
	Response Count
	74
answered question	74
skipped question	632

Summary of Comments: These individuals provided contact information and were sent a memorandum highlighting ways in which they could participate in the process. They also received an invitation to Meetings 3 and 4. A copy of this memorandum can be found in Appendix D.

6.4 Current and Completed Hazard Mitigation Programs and Projects

This section provides a review of the completed hazard mitigation projects or programs and provides a description of potential or in-process projects or programs that the University worked with or is working with to complete the projects.

Table 6.4-1: Current and Completed Hazard Mitigation Programs And Projects

Program or Project	Description	Agency
Hazard Mitigation Plan	The University is currently in the process of developing a hazard mitigation plan.	
[Insert Additional Projects]	[Insert Additional Descriptions]	[Insert Additional Agencies]

6.5 Summary and Conclusions

In conclusion, there are several areas which may be investigated further to determine the relevance of developing hazard mitigation strategies to fill gaps or shortcomings. Particularly these areas include outreach to the 21% of respondents who responded “Don’t Know” regarding UL Lafayette’s preparedness and the 44% who reported being “Not Familiar” with the concept of mitigation.

Positive findings included the fact that only 10% of respondents were “Not Comfortable” with online classes. This indicates that the student body, as represented by this survey, would be willing to participate in a transition to an online learning environment following a long term campus closure. Also positive was the high percentage of students who reported that they would evacuate in the case of either a recommended or required evacuation order.

Finally, the results of the hazard rankings, as provided by the student respondents, largely matched the findings of the Advisory Committee. Disparities included

Section 7
Mitigation Action Plan

Contents of this Section

7.1 IFR Requirement for the Mitigation Action Plan
7.2 Hazard Mitigation Goals
7.3 Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions
7.4 Prioritization and Implementation of Mitigation Actions

7.1 IFR Requirement for the Mitigation Action Plan

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy shall include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): [The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure. [The mitigation strategy] must also address the jurisdiction's participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate.

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

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): For multi-jurisdictional plans, there must be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.

7.2 Hazard Mitigation Goals

This section contains goals, objectives and action items for the UL Lafayette Disaster Resistant University Plan. For the purposes of this Plan, the following definitions are proposed:

- Goals are general guidelines that explain what the University wants to achieve. Goals are expressed as broad policy statements representing desired long-term results.
- Objectives (or strategies) describe strategies to attain an identified Goal. Objectives are more specific statements than goals; objectives are also usually measurable and can have a defined completion date.
- Mitigation Actions are the specific steps (projects, policies, and programs) that advance a given Objective. They are highly focused, specific and measurable.

The hazard identification and risk assessment in Sections 4 and 5 consisted of identifying the hazards that affect UL Lafayette and the potential for damage to university assets that are vulnerable to the hazards. Section 6 identified the strengths and weaknesses of state, county and local capabilities. The goals and

objectives described below, in Table 7.3.2-1 and following, were established by the Advisory Committee in response to these assessment results.

The broad goals of the UL Lafayette Disaster Resistant University Plan are as follows:

- Goal 1: Improve EDUCATION AND OUTREACH efforts regarding potential impacts of hazards and the identification of specific measures that can be taken to reduce their impact.
- Goal 2: Improve DATA COLLECTION, USE, AND SHARING to reduce the impact of hazards
- Goal 3: Improve CAPABILITIES, COORDINATION, AND OPPORTUNITIES to plan and implement hazard mitigation projects, programs and activities
- Goal 4: Pursue OPPORTUNITIES TO MITIGATE campus facilities and other appropriate hazard mitigation projects, programs and activities
- Goal 5: Maintain CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS during and after natural hazard events, including transition to an on-line environment when facilities are inaccessible

Specific objectives and actions to support these goals are described below in Table 7.3.2-1. Additionally, actions related to enhanced data collection are described in Table 7.3.2-2.

For additional information related to state and federal programs and funding sources to support the below actions, please refer to Appendix E; in particular, for detail regarding limitations related to FEMA mitigation grant programs, see Appendix E.

7.3 Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

7.3.1 Potential Mitigation Actions

UL Lafayette has identified several hazard mitigation actions that would benefit the university. These were identified in the Advisory Committee meetings, which included input from staff, faculty, students, representatives of local governmental organizations, local businesses, and private citizens. This was based in part on consideration of the range of potential mitigation actions for hazards faced by UL Lafayette which are described below.

UL Lafayette Community

Insurance industry and emergency management research has demonstrated that awareness of hazards is not enough. People must know how to prepare for, respond to, and take preventive measures against threats from natural hazards. This research has also shown that a properly run local information program is more effective than national advertising or public campaigns.

Although concerted local, county, and statewide efforts to inform the public exist, lives and property continue to be threatened when segments of the population remain uninformed or chose to ignore the information available. Public education serves to assist the communities with problems experienced from floods, high winds, extreme temperatures, drought, severe storms, acts of violence, transportation incidents, terrorism, and communicable diseases as well as other lower priority hazards. Educating the public of these life and

property saving techniques must remain a high priority item at the local, state, and federal level and is consistent with Goal 1.

Projects identified by the Advisory Committee are as follows:

- Develop "All Hazards" public education and outreach program for hazard mitigation and preparedness
- Conduct yearly workshops for University staff related to FEMA hazard mitigation grant programs, including FMA, HMGP, and PDM.

National Flood Insurance Program, Floodplain Management, and Building Codes

Improved floodplain management, including land use planning, zoning, and enforcement at the local level can reduce flood related damages for both existing buildings and new development and are consistent with Goal 3. The use of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) is critical to the reduction of future flood damage costs to the taxpayer.

About 2.4% of UL Lafayette is located in the 100 year floodplain. All developments, regardless of the location, require a permit to include buildings, fill, and any other type development.

The NFIP requires that when the cost of reconstruction, rehabilitation, addition, or other improvements to a building equals or exceeds 50% of the fair market value, then the building must meet the same construction requirements as a new building. Substantially damaged buildings must be brought up to new construction standards. A residence or building damaged so that the cost of repairs equals or exceeds 50% of the structure's fair market value must also be elevated above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) in flood zones where BFE's are available.

The city of Lafayette joined the NFIP in [year]. As a result, the City has a Floodplain Manager to enforce municipal floodplain ordinances. These ordinances are intended to addresses methods and practices to minimize flood damage to new and substantial home improvement projects, as well as addressing zoning and sub-division ordinances and state regulations as enforced through the Board of Codes and Floodplain Adjustment.

Within floodplain management as a whole, the education process must play an important role. As noted above, an effective education program should be implemented to show citizens the importance of building codes and ordinances and how cost effective they could be in reducing future damages.

Established through the NFIP, the Community Rating System (CRS) is a program that counties and municipalities can elect to join. Once a county has joined, participants receive a discount on their flood insurance premiums. As a result of being part of the CRS, the county would have to actively pursue public outreach programs. One of the requirements of CRS is an annual outreach project, such as a Repetitive Loss Outreach Program. This program would focus on repetitive loss areas within the county and consists of three main components. The first is to advise the homeowners that they live in a repetitive loss area and could be subject to flooding. The second is to give the homeowner appropriate property protection measure guidelines. The third is to make the homeowner aware of the basic facts about Flood Insurance.

Floodplain management and building codes serve to assist the communities with problems experienced from floods, high winds, severe storms, and earthquakes as other lower priority hazards.

Flood Mitigation Actions

Retrofitting structures prone to periodic flooding is an effective mitigation technique to reduce the flood loss of property and is consistent with Goal 4. Techniques include the elevation of structures, acquisition, mitigation reconstruction, dry flood proofing, wet flood proofing, and drainage improvements and installation of generators.

Elevation: involves raising a structure on a new foundation so that the lowest floor is above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE). Almost any type and size of structure can be elevated.

Acquisition of structures: or "buyout" option is the most effective mitigation technique to reduce the loss of property due to flooding. The owners of repetitive flood loss structures sell their structure to the community on a cost share basis for the fair market value of the structure prior to the last flood event. The structure is removed/demolished and a deed restriction is placed on the property for perpetuity, thus eliminating the structure from future flood damage. This approach is most effective when flood prone structures located within the same vicinity are grouped together and acquired. The remaining property can be converted into usable recreational space with minor structure restrictions.

Mitigation Reconstruction: is a component of the Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) grant program that allows demolition and reconstruction of structures when traditional elevation cannot be implemented. This activity can be used for structures that were substantially damaged or destroyed. Currently this is a pilot program utilized mainly on the gulf coast but can be considered a potential approach to mitigation activities.

Dry flood proofing: techniques include the building of floodwalls adjacent to existing walls, the installation of special doors to seal out floodwaters, and special backflow valves for water and sewer lines. Wet flood proofing includes low cost mitigation measures such as raising air conditioners, heat pumps, and hot water heaters on platforms above the BFE.

Wet flood proofing: includes measures applied to a structure that prevent or provide resistance to damage from flooding while allowing floodwaters to enter the structure or area. Generally, this includes properly anchoring the structure, using flood resistant materials below the BFE, protection of mechanical and utility equipment, and use of openings or breakaway walls. Application of wet flood proofing as a flood protection technique under the NFIP is limited to enclosures below elevated residential and non-residential structures and to accessory and agricultural structures that have been issued variances by the community.

Drainage: Improving the drainage capacity around roads and low-lying areas is a time-tested technique to mitigate flood damage. Maintenance of drainage canals and laterals is essential to maximize their efficiency and continued long term effectiveness. Actions in general to reduce the effects of flooding are widening and deepening the earthen canals, cleaning of existing ditches, and replacing existing culverts, upgrading pumps, and installing check valves and inverts in certain culverts. Maintaining and improving drainage serves to assist the communities with problems experienced from floods, high winds, and severe storms.

Generators: Another cost effective retrofitting technique includes the installation of generators. By providing power with generators during and after severe storms many critical facilities may continue to provide necessary services to the community. The installation of generators serves to assist the communities with problems experienced from floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, thunderstorms, and hazardous materials incidents.

Wind Retrofitting Mitigation Actions

Structures can be retrofitted to withstand high winds by installing hurricane shutters, roof tie-downs and other storm protection features. The exterior integrity is maintained by protecting the interior of the structure and providing stability against wind hazards associated with hurricanes. These types of measures can be relatively inexpensive and simple to put in place.

Another retrofitting technique is to bury electric power lines to avoid tree limbs falling on them or from wind damage resulting in a break in service to the consumer. Burying electric power lines serves to assist the communities with problems experienced from floods, hurricanes, tornadoes and thunderstorms.

Early Warning Systems

With sufficient warning of a flood, a community and its residents can take protective measures such as moving personal property, cars, and people out of harm's way. When a flood threat recognition system is combined with an emergency response plan that addresses the community's flood problems, considerable flood damage can be prevented. This system must be coupled to warning the general public, carrying out appropriate tasks, and coordinating the flood response plan with operators of critical facilities. A comprehensive education and outreach program is critical to the success of early warning systems so that the general public, operators of critical facilities, and emergency response personnel will know what actions to take when warning is disseminated.

Early warning systems include siren systems, reverse 911 systems, and other technologies used to warn faculty and students of impending events.

Early warning systems serve to assist the communities with problems experienced from floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, thunderstorms, hazardous materials incidents, acts of violence, transportation hazards, communicable diseases, and terrorism.

Drought

In general, communities can have little influence or impact on mitigating the impact of droughts on the local government level except through ensuring adequate water supplies for normal circumstances and through implementation of water conservation measures when drought conditions are imminent. Undertaking drought impact studies, as well as searching for alternative water supplies can both set the foundation for future mitigation measures.

Extreme Heat and Extreme Cold

As with most natural hazards, public education about the effects of extreme heat and cold, as well as how to mitigate those effects is useful. Alerts and advising high-risk people to reduce physical activity and stay in air-conditioned and or heated buildings helped reduce fatalities and injuries.

Hazardous Material Release – Fixed facilities

Within the confines of the University exists a variety of hazardous materials at various densities. Some effect protective and mitigating measures are:

Educational Outreach: develop and conduct educational outreach programs on the associated risks that close proximity to these facilities presents. The development of personalized family or campus wide disaster plans in the event of release. These should be developed and conducted in partnership with the business community.

Evacuation Planning: This includes pre-identifying emergency evacuation routes and communicating that information to the public. In addition, people needing assistance, such as the elderly or those with special needs, should be identified and plans made to assist them if an evacuation were to occur.

Another component of evacuation planning is ensuring that shelter facilities will be available. Potential shelter locations must be identified and publicized and efforts must be made to ensure that the proper supplies and staff are available if the shelter is activated.

Hazardous Material Release – Transportation

While there are few hard and fast direct measures that may be taken, several that are available can be very effective.

Codes and Standards: Ensure that adequate training and enforcement of rules, regulations and standards for intermodal transportation carries are being carried out within the appropriate industries. This should include some public outreach as well.

Coordination of Hazard Expositions combined with demonstration exhibits dealing with a cross range of these potential hazards incorporating the business community and the public can be effective at reducing fears and concerns.

Terrorism

The effects of terrorism can vary significantly from loss of life and injuries to property damage and disruptions in services such as electricity, water supply, public transportation, and communications. In that respect, preparation for terrorist events is similar to any other disaster. Mitigation efforts for other hazards will also help to prevent damage from terrorist incidents as well. This "all-hazards" mitigation approach builds upon existing programs that mitigate other natural and technological hazards while focusing on security of the public. With this "all-hazards" approach in mind, institutions can and should:

- Recognize facility vulnerabilities and find structural mitigation strategies to reduce them.
- Assess and enhance security measures at critical facilities.
- Design and install vehicle barrier systems at critical facilities.
- Find mitigation strategies to increase the security and thus reduce the desirability of high-profile targets.
- Implement coordinated emergency management systems, enhance regional communication, and make regional situational awareness a priority, so that local and national law enforcement can effectively counter terrorist planning activities. ‘‘

7.3.2 Mitigation Actions

The Advisory Committee developed the following program of mitigation actions in response to the risk and capability assessments.

Table 7.3.2-1
UL Lafayette Hazard Mitigation Goals, Objectives, and General Actions

GOAL 1: Improve **EDUCATION AND OUTREACH** efforts regarding potential impacts of hazards and the identification of specific measures that can be taken to reduce their impact.						
Objective	**Action**	**Priority**	**Responsible Department**	**Projected Timeline**	**Projected Resources**	**Rationale for Action and Priority**
Objective 1.A: Increase awareness of risks and understanding of the advantages of mitigation by staff and students.	1.A.1: Develop "All Hazards" public education and outreach program for hazard mitigation and preparedness			1 year		Better informed populace creates a greater willingness and expectation to participate in mitigation actions.
	1.A.2: Initiate a public awareness program on local radio station for hazard safety			6 months to 1 year		A better informed and involved population reduces risk and loss.
	1.A.3: Educate the public through GOHSEP and Lafayette Parish OEM outreach programs and hazard mitigation workshops.			Ongoing		Encourages the development of Pre-Disaster Mitigation plans and participation in mitigation grant programs.
	1.A.4: Design and initiate an employee training initiative using a web-based platform.					
	1.A.5: Educate students through the posting of information on the u-link system.					
	1.A.6: Utilize social networking sites such as facebook to provide effective outreach to the student population.					
Objective 1.B: Increase	1.B.1: Conduct yearly workshops			Ongoing		Making department

GOAL 1: Improve **EDUCATION AND OUTREACH** efforts regarding potential impacts of hazards and the identification of specific measures that can be taken to reduce their impact.						
Objective	**Action**	**Priority**	**Responsible Department**	**Projected Timeline**	**Projected Resources**	**Rationale for Action and Priority**
departmental awareness regarding funding opportunities for mitigation	related to FEMA hazard mitigation grant programs, including FMA, HMGP, and PDM.					heads aware of federal grants increases participation.
	1.B.2: Collaborate with University of Louisiana System (ULS) Ready Campus Compact on programs designed to increase hazard mitigation at the system level.			18 months		Minimizes duplication of efforts, ensures cooperation at the system level between universities for emergency planning and mitigation.

GOAL 2: Improve **DATA COLLECTION, USE, AND SHARING** to reduce the impact of hazards						
Objective	**Action**	**Priority**	**Responsible Agency**	**Projected Timeline**	**Projected Resources**	**Rationale for Action and Priority**
Objective 2.A: Improve availability to the University of data related to all relevant hazards for use in future planning efforts	2.A.1: Develop and maintain relationships with organizations that can provide technical information and/or assistance in the areas of hazard identification and risk assessment.			Ongoing		Provides the basis for making decisions about where to focus mitigation activities, including further study, and eventually mitigation projects.
	2.A.2: Undertake site-specific studies to better characterize flood risks to areas with a history of nuisance flooding			Starting within six months, then ongoing		This is an essential step in developing flood mitigation actions.
	2.A.3: Using a prioritized list of campus facilities, survey wind vulnerabilities, based on criteria such as age of the facility, value of operations, etc.			TBD		There are likely some critical facilities that are quite vulnerable to wind hazards, and where these

GOAL 2: Improve **DATA COLLECTION, USE, AND SHARING** to reduce the impact of hazards						
Objective	**Action**	**Priority**	**Responsible Agency**	**Projected Timeline**	**Projected Resources**	**Rationale for Action and Priority**
						vulnerabilities may be relatively inexpensive to mitigate.
	2.A.4: Conduct wind risk assessments on a limited number of high-priority facilities that appear to be vulnerable to high winds. Assessments will use standard FEMA guidelines, procedures and software, including the wind hazard database.			TBD		Quantifies risk to most important facilities.
	2.A.5: Expand data on hazardous material sites to include exact chemicals and quantities.		EH&S DEPT.	TBD		Provides a basis for prioritizing potential hazmat sites for further study and potential responses.
	2.A.6: Integrate data about hazardous materials with most current available information about other risk factors, e.g. population, climate, other site-specific characteristics.		EH&S DEPT	TBD		Potentially allows integration of hazardous materials information with data related to natural hazards.
	2.A.7: Work with appropriate agencies to identify specific areas that are vulnerable to storm effects, then inventory assets, populations in these areas as the basis for a risk calculation.			TBD		Provides a basis for determining if any further risk assessment action is warranted.
	Conduct a study to identify locations at high risk for acts of violence.		UNIVERSITY POLICE			Provides a basis for determining if any further risk assessment action is warranted.
	Conduct a building assessment to determine vulnerability to transportation hazards based on					Provides a basis for determining if any further risk

GOAL 2: Improve **DATA COLLECTION, USE, AND SHARING** to reduce the impact of hazards						
Objective	**Action**	**Priority**	**Responsible Agency**	**Projected Timeline**	**Projected Resources**	**Rationale for Action and Priority**
	proximity to transportation routes.					assessment action is warranted.
Objective 2.B: Acquire and maintain detailed data regarding critical facilities such that these sites can be prioritized and risk-assessed for possible mitigation actions	2.B.1: Prioritize critical facilities and complete Phase 1 site surveys to identify vulnerabilities.			Commencing immediately, then ongoing.		This is an essential first step in understanding risks and developing mitigation actions.
	2.B.1: Prioritize facilities by potential to serve as terrorist targets based upon occupancy, historical significance, cultural significance, and other factors deemed important.					This is an essential first step in understanding risks and developing mitigation actions.
Objective 2.C: Utilize existing university infrastructure (departments, students, research) to gather pertinent data.	2.C.1: Develop risk modeling partnerships with the departments of Business and Finance.					
	2.C.2: Encourage graduate students to undertake thesis and dissertation projects related to hazard mitigation.					Provides meaningful learning for graduate students.

GOAL 3: Improve **CAPABILITIES, COORDINATION, AND OPPORTUNITIES** to plan and implement hazard mitigation projects, programs and activities						
Objective	**Action**	**Priority**	**Responsible Agency**	**Projected Timeline**	**Projected Resources**	**Rationale for Action and Priority**
Objective 3.A: Continue support of hazard mitigation planning, project identification and implementation	3.A.2: Provide grants information, planning tools, training and technical assistance to increase the number of hazard mitigation projects.			Ongoing		Expanding the number of hazard mitigation projects will improve the campus' resistance to hazards and reduce the impact of hazard events on its facilities and operations.
	3.A.3: Develop a Continuity of Operations Plan				Potential funding may be available from an application submitted 2 years ago.	
	3.A.4: Participate in all City and Parish planning efforts including hazard mitigation, emergency operations, and master planning.					
	3.A.5: Enhance and update existing pandemic plan.					
	3.A.6: Integrate hazard data into the 3D campus model as buildings become added.					
Objective 3.B: Provide for user-friendly hazard-data accessibility for mitigation and other planning efforts and for private citizens	3.B.1: Develop a simple GIS platform, or build upon an existing platform, to maintain and analyze critical facilities inventories and information about hazards.			TBD		Provides a basis for understanding risks and maintaining most current information; provides a good means of maintaining data needed for period updates to the hazard mitigation plan; and (potentially) helps to identify promising sites mitigation actions and grant proposals.

GOAL 4: Pursue **OPPORTUNITIES TO MITIGATE** campus facilities and other appropriate hazard mitigation projects, programs and activities						
Objective	**Action**	**Priority**	**Responsible Agency**	**Projected Timeline**	**Projected Resources**	**Rationale for Action and Priority**
Objective 4.A: Facilitate development and timely submittal of project applications meeting state and federal guidelines for funding for hardening/retrofitting infrastructure and critical facilities with highest vulnerability ratings	4.A.1: Implement mitigation projects and programs intended to reduce risk to critical facilities			Ongoing		Reduces exposure and risk to critical facilities
	4.A.2: Implement other mitigation projects and programs as appropriate			Ongoing		Varied
Objective 4.B: Protect facilities from damages due to extreme temperatures	4.B.1: Explore mitigation strategies for buildings with exposed piping.			Ongoing		Reduces exposure and risk to facilities from extreme cold
Objective 4.C: Protect faculty and students from all hazards.	4.C.1: Conduct a study to determine the best sites for safe room construction.					
	4.C.2: Place hand sanitizer dispensers at the entrances to all campus buildings.					
	4.C.3: Expand Emergency Notification System to include sirens and message boards.					
	4.C.4: Conduct training related to the Emergency Notification System.					

GOAL 5: Maintain CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS during and after natural hazard events, including transition to an on-line environment when facilities are inaccessible						
Objective	**Action**	**Priority**	**Responsible Agency**	**Projected Timeline**	**Projected Resources**	**Rationale for Action and Priority**
Objective 5.A: Facilitate transition to an online environment in the event of a long term campus shut down.	5.A.1: Provide training to faculty and staff regarding the use of online learning platforms..					
	5.A.2: Encourage faculty to utilize online systems in the course of traditional courses in order to increase student familiarity with the programs.					
Objective 5.B: Ensure continuity of operations in the event of temporary power loss	5.B.1: Ensure that all critical facilities have generators.					
	5.B.2: Ensure that all facilities housing equipment which can be damaged by extreme temperatures have generators.					
Objective 5.C: Ensure continuity of utility service to campus facilities.	5.C.1: Research alternative water sources for the main campus in the event of aquifer depletion.					
	5.C.2: Explore the possibility of co-generation of power on campus.					
Objective 5.D: Ensure continuity of administrative services.	5.D.1: Conduct a telework exercise to identify emergent challenges to operations from working off-site.					
Objective 5.E: Ensure continuity of IT services.	5.E.1: Prioritize servers to ensure that critical data remains available.					
Objective 5.F: Ensure continuity of research activities.	5.F.1: Ensure access to software, tools, and licenses in the event that off-site research becomes necessary.					

Table 7.3.2-1
Site Specific Mitigation Actions

Mitigation action, program or project	Hazard(s) addressed	Applies to existing or new structures	Existing local planning/ implementation mechanism	Responsible Party	Target Date	Estimated cost ($)	Funding Source	Priority
MAIN CAMPUS								
MAIN CAMPUS 1: Engineering feasibility to study floodproofing alternatives for the Maintenance Building	Flooding	Existing	Hazard Mitigation Plan		1 year		Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) or Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM)	
MAIN CAMPUS 2: Construct a Campus EOC	All Hazards	New	Hazard Mitigation Plan	EH&S Director and University Police	2 years			High
MAIN CAMPUS 3: Evaluate alternatives to eliminate flash flooding on the main campus.	Flooding	Existing	Coordinate with Lafayette consolidated government to upgrade underground city drainage.	Physical Plant	5 years			
MAIN CAMPUS 4: Eliminate flooding at Angelle Hall Auditorium.	Flooding	Existing		Physical Plant				

Mitigation action, program or project	Hazard(s) addressed	Applies to existing or new structures	Existing local planning/ implementation mechanism	Responsible Party	Target Date	Estimated cost ($)	Funding Source	Priority
MAIN CAMPUS 5: Evaluate alternatives to eliminate flooding at Wharton Hall Lobby such as floodproofing, floodwalls, and elevation.	Flooding	Existing						
MAIN CAMPUS 6: Eliminate flooding at Wharton Hall Lobby.	Flooding	Existing						
MAIN CAMPUS 7: Evaluate alternatives to eliminate flooding at Broussard Hall basement such as floodproofing, floodwalls, and elevation.	Flooding	Existing						
MAIN CAMPUS 8: Eliminate flooding at Broussard Hall basement.	Flooding	Existing						

Mitigation action, program or project	Hazard(s) addressed	Applies to existing or new structures	Existing local planning/ implementation mechanism	Responsible Party	Target Date	Estimated cost ($)	Funding Source	Priority
MAIN CAMPUS 9: Add insulation or heating mechanisms to protect exposed piping at Randolph Hall.	Extreme Cold							
MAIN CAMPUS 10: Add insulation or heating mechanisms to protect exposed piping at Harris Hall.	Extreme Cold							
MAIN CAMPUS 11: Add insulation or heating mechanisms to protect exposed piping at Evangeline Hall.	Extreme Cold							
MAIN CAMPUS 12: Conduct drainage study to identify areas at high risk of flash flooding.	Flood							
MAIN CAMPUS 13: Eliminate flooding on Hebrard Boulevard.	Flood							

Mitigation action, program or project	Hazard(s) addressed	Applies to existing or new structures	Existing local planning/ implementation mechanism	Responsible Party	Target Date	Estimated cost ($)	Funding Source	Priority
MAIN CAMPUS 14: Eliminate flooding on St. Mary Street.	Flood							
MAIN CAMPUS 15: Eliminate flooding on Boucher Street.	Flood							
NEW IBERIA RESEARCH CENTER								
NEW IBERIA 1: [action]								
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH PARK								
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH PARK 1: Provide generators for NIMSAT servers.	All	Existing	Hazard Mitigation Plan				Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) 5 %	
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH PARK 2: Construct a Business EOC.								
CENTER FOR ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL TEHCNOLOGY								

Mitigation action, program or project	Hazard(s) addressed	Applies to existing or new structures	Existing local planning/ implementation mechanism	Responsible Party	Target Date	Estimated cost ($)	Funding Source	Priority
CEET 1: [insert action]								
MODEL SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL COMPLEX								
AGRICULTURAL COMPLEX 1: [action]								
OTHER								
OTHER 1: Harden equipment shed at Duson to protect Transmitter for public radio site.								

7.4 Prioritization and Implementation of Mitigation Actions

The preceding sections identify specific actions to achieve identified goals, an appropriate responsible party for each action, and a schedule for accomplishment and suggested funding sources. These tables also indicate an initial prioritization of the actions.

In the case of the University-wide actions, priorities were initially determined on a qualitative basis by the Advisory Committee. The considerations were general feasibility and anticipated effectiveness in reducing risk. Detailed benefit cost analyses were not performed (see notes below) but general cost effectiveness of the types of actions being considered was taken into account.

For the campus specific mitigation actions, initial priorities were set in a similar manner.

Staffing, resources, and coordination of effort are at a premium with little chance of significant change to these issues in the foreseeable future. Therefore, the inclusion of any specific action item in this document does not commit the University to implementation. Each item will be considered for implementation in terms of the available staff and funding resources on a periodic basis. In addition, certain items may require regulatory changes or other decisions that must be implemented through standard processes, such as changing regulations.

It is anticipated that the majority of the actions in the Plan will be implemented as funds become available through various federal mitigation grant programs.

The method that the Advisory Committee will use to help them consider and prioritize potential action items for funding applications at that time in a systematic way is called the "Social, Technical, Administrative, Political, Legal, Economic, and Environmental" (STAPLEE) method. This method will help the Advisory Committee to weigh the pros and cons of different alternatives for each of the identified actions and objectives. Table 7.4-1 describes the basic steps in the STAPLEE methodology.

Table 7.4-1
STAPLEE Methodology

STAPLEE	Criteria Explanation
S – Social	Mitigation actions are acceptable to the community if they do not adversely affect a particular segment of the population, do not cause relocation of lower income people, and if they are compatible with the community's social and cultural values.
T – Technical	Mitigation actions are technically most effective if they provide long- term reduction of losses and have minimal secondary adverse impacts.
A – Administrative	Mitigation actions are easier to implement if the jurisdiction has the necessary staffing and funding.
P – Political	Mitigation actions can truly be successful if all stakeholders have been offered an opportunity to participate in the planning process and if there is public support for the action.
L – Legal	It is critical that the jurisdiction or implementing agency have the legal authority to implement and enforce a mitigation action.
E – Economic	Budget constraints can significantly deter the implementation of mitigation actions. Hence, it is important to evaluate whether an action is cost-effective, as determined by a cost benefit review, and possible to fund.

STAPLEE	Criteria Explanation
E – Environmental	Sustainable mitigation actions that do not have an adverse effect on the environment, that comply with Federal, State, and local environmental regulations, and that are consistent with the community's environmental goals, have mitigation benefits while being environmentally sound.

Once funding sources are identified (e.g., via grant announcements from GOHSEP or FEMA) the list of mitigation actions will be reviewed to select actions that meet the particular grant criteria. Then, the Advisory Committee will determine priority rankings for the short list of projects. Tentatively, the Advisory Committee has defined High, Medium, and Low priorities to be assigned in this process as follows:

- High: Meets five of the seven STAPLEE criteria
- Medium: Meets four of the seven STAPLEE criteria
- Low: Meets three of the seven STAPLEE criteria

Depending on the available grant funding, the Advisory Committee will determine how many of the selected and prioritized projects should be submitted for funding starting with the highest priority projects as determined at the time.

Benefit-Cost Analysis

Per the IFR, communities are required to use benefit cost analysis to prioritize projects for implementation. At this stage, the analysis of costs and benefits has been done at a general level. However, as project funding becomes available, the county and municipalities will undertake a more extensive process.

Benefit-cost analysis (BCA) compares the benefits of mitigation measures to the costs, and is a technique used for evaluating the cost-effectiveness of mitigation measures. FEMA requires a BCA for all mitigation projects that receive FEMA funding.

The Advisory Committee discussed the potential costs associated with each type of mitigation measure and decided that any project could be cost effective if its scope were properly tailored to the situation.

After discussing the possible costs of the various mitigation measures, the Advisory Committee decided that instead of working on developing a very generic BCA at this time for projects that may not ever be authorized, they would wait until specific funding sources are identified and available. However, at the time that grants become available [Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) after disasters or Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) and Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) grants annually], the County will collect detailed information on each structure that is interested in participating in the grant program and perform a BCA to help rank the structures as part of the STAPLEE process to determine which should receive funding first.