## **Section 1: Introduction**

Southwest Electric Cooperative (SWEC) was established in October of 1939 and has been providing electric service to the rural areas of west-central Missouri ever since. SWEC is headquartered in Bolivar, Missouri, and provides service to rural customers in eleven counties in Missouri. SWEC is a private, independent electric utility owned by the members it serves. The cooperative is organized under Rochdale principles and is comprised of nine board districts within its service area. The cooperative does not have a formal mission statement but operates under the following slogan as overarching policy:

"Southwest Electric Cooperative is dedicated to providing the best, most reliable service possible for our members."

SWEC's service are covers nearly the entirety of Polk and Hickory counties and extends portions of the into surrounding counties of Dade, Benton. Camden. Dallas. Laclede, Webster, Greene, Cedar and St. Clair. The cooperative owns 5,333 miles of service line within these counties. Figure 1 depicts the boundaries of the cooperative in relation to USGS local quadrangles within the state of Missouri. (Map sources: www.usgs.gov, Association of Missouri Electric *Cooperatives*, Southwest Electric Cooperative.)

The customer base of SWEC currently exceeds 39,435 members. Residential customers account for 92.9% (36,644) of its memberships while commercial customers make up the remaining 7.1% (2,791) Table 1.1 provides the summary of overhead meters by county.



Table 1.1   Meters by Missouri County						
County	Number of meters	County	Number of meters			
Hickory	6,355	Polk	7,964			
Dade	10	Camden	10,667			
Dallas	4,531	Laclede	13			
Benton	5,532	Cedar	58			
Webster	71	St. Clair	8			
Greene	4,531	Total	39,435			

The average monthly customer usage for SWEC is 1,233 kilowatt-hours (kWh). Annual total usage of SWEC customers in 2010 was 582,000,000 kWh of service. Population density for the cooperative service area is depicted in Figure 2 (*Map source: U.S. Census 2010*).



Figure 2: Population Density in SWEC Service Area by Census

#### Section 2: Planning process:

Through a partnership between the Association of Missouri Electric Cooperatives and the Missouri Association of Councils of Government, the Southwest Missouri Council of Governments was contracted to facilitate a hazard mitigation planning process for SWEC. The initial meeting between the two entities was held on January 18, 2011 as part of a regional kick-off meeting for Southwest Missouri. This informational meeting provided the basic responsibilities for each agency and allowed for initial discussion concerning the project timelines, data collection and other pertinent topics.

Three additional planning meetings were held at the SWEC offices in Bolivar, Missouri or the Ozark Electric headquarters in Mt. Vernon, Missouri during the period from July through October. Table 1.2 summarizes the attendees and topics of each meeting. Meeting minutes are available in the chapter appendix.

Table 1.2	SWEC Planning Meeting Synopsis		
Meeting Date	Attendees, Title, Organization	Topics of discussion	
July 27, 2011	Ken Raming, Ozark Electric	Coop business structure	
	Billy Hunt, Southwest Electric	Customer information	
	Gary Stiles, Southwest Electric	Critical facilities information	
	Brent Gamble, Southwest Electric	Asset inventory by type and	
	Bill Shiveley, Southwest Electric	location	
	Garry Lee, Southwest Electric	Data collection assignments	
	Jim Chadd, Southwest Electric		
	Bill Cheek, SMCOG		
	Dave Faucett, Community Planner, SMCOG		
	Jane Hood, Associate Director, SMCOG		
August 24, 2011	Billy Hunt, Southwest Electric	Data collection review	
_	Brent Gamble, Southwest Electric	Current mitigation strategies	
	Dave Faucett, Community Planner, SMCOG	Establishment of goals, actions,	
		and objectives	
October 10, 2011	Ken Raming, Ozark Electric	Method of prioritization	
	Billy Hunt, Southwest Electric	Prioritization of goals, actions,	
	Brent Gamble, Southwest Electric	and objectives	
	Garry Lee, Barry Electric		
	Jim Chadd, Barry Electric		
	Tom Houston, Webster Electric		
	Dave Faucett, Community Planner, SMCOG		

## Public Involvement

All public hazard mitigation plans require measures to include public involvement in the planning process. Public involvement in the SWEC hazard mitigation plan was encouraged through a variety of methods. SWEC posted their local chapter on the company's website, inviting both cooperative members and the general public to provide comment. Print copies of the chapter were also made available upon request through the local office. Comments from neighboring jurisdictions were also solicited using the standardized AMEC letter which was mailed to the appropriate contacts, including:

- Benton County Commission,
- Camden County Commission,
- Cedar County Commission,
- Dade County Commission,
- Dallas County Commission,
- Hickory County Commission,
- Greene County Commission,
- Laclede County Commission,
- Polk County Commission,
- St. Clair County Commission,
- Webster County Commission,
- Local emergency management directors, and
- Local Red Cross chapter.

SWEC does not provide service to any critical facilities (hospitals, emergency services, etc.), higher education institutions, or large industrial centers. Additionally, SWEC's mitigation plan was included in the public comment period for the combined AMEC plan.

#### **Section 3:** Asset inventory

Southwest Electric Cooperative has a wide variety of assets by type. Real estate owned by the company includes office buildings, warehouses, garages, and other outbuildings throughout the service area. Thirty-nine vehicles provide access to customers and infrastructure. SWEC does not own any electric generation or transmission infrastructure. Table 1.3 provides information concerning total asset valuation.

4

Table 1.3	Southwest Electric A	sset Inventory Valuation Summary
Asset	Total Replacement	Cost Breakdown
	Cost	
Total SWEC Assets	\$344,307,549.62	Buildings and vehicles - \$8,911,497
		Overhead assets - \$316,809,216
		Underground assets - \$9,384,587
		Substation assets - \$2,670,000
Distribution Lines	\$89,417,057 OH	OH Single-phase lines - \$37,356,617
	\$1,077,726 UG	OH Three-phase lines - \$52,060,441
		UG Primary lines - \$1,077,726
Supporting	\$227,392,158 OH	OH Meters - \$20,236,313
Infrastructure	\$8,306,861UG	UG Meters - \$195,287
		Poles - \$144,011,333
		OH Transformers - \$36,440,707
		UG Transformers - \$8,111,575
		Guys/Anchors - \$9,451,160
		Regulators - \$2,575,664Oil-Circuit
		Reclosures - \$2,451,371
		Capacitors - \$199,123
		SecServ - \$6,930,689
		Fiber - \$643,861Lights - \$4,451,936
Substation Assets	\$2,670,000	Breakdown of Substation Equipment:
	27 substations	Transformer - \$12,000
	(3 subs have two	Outbound Modulation Unit - \$10,000
	transformers each)	Control Receiving Unit - \$10,000
		Inbound Pickup Unit - \$3,000
		CT (feeder level detection) - \$5,000
		OCR - \$18,000
Office Buildings	\$4,479,000.00	
Warehouses	\$768,400	
Vehicles	\$3,664,097	Includes trailers and miscellaneous
		equipment
Source: Internal SWEC	Accounting and Insurance re	cords, 2011

Ensuring quality distribution to its customers, Southwest maintains not only distribution lines, but also the supporting infrastructure as well. Table 1.4 includes a list of asset types, emergency replacement cost per unit or mile, the asset inventory by county of service, and total infrastructure numbers.

Table 1.4	SWEC Asset Inventory by Service County				
Asset	Emergency	Number of	Number of	Number of	Number of
	Replacement	units or	units or	units or	units or
	mile	HICKORY	DADE	DALLAS	BENTON
Meter OH	\$429.09/unit	7,722 OH	9 OH	5,605 OH	7,090 OH
Meter UG	\$867.94/unit	0 UG	0 UG	15 UG	0 UG
Pole	\$1,285.54/unit	18,295	51	18,545	14,309
OH SP line	\$9,926.40/mile	624.80 mile	2 mile	667.2/mile	441.6 mile
OH TP line	\$55,334/mile	156.20 mile	0.5 mile	166.8 mile	110.4 mile
UG Primary	\$46,675/mile	857 ft	0	1,754 ft	1,430 ft
Transformers	\$1,069.05 OH	5,296 OH	9 OH	4,710 OH	4,473 OH
	\$2,502.80 UG	113 UG	0 UG	128 UG	295 UG
Guys/anchors	\$141.10/unit	10,975	34	11,770	10,444
SecServ	\$17,265/mile	61 mile	512 ft	55.6 mile	56.3 mile
Regulators	\$9,264.98/unit	44	0	50	29
OCR	\$1,313/unit	357	0	327	267
Fiber	\$6,198.72/mile	46 miles	0	4.6 mile	0
Lights	\$372.36/unit	1,884	4	1,634	1,510
Capacitors	\$465.24/unit	76	0	59	39
Total		OH	OH	OH	OH
Replacement		\$51,839,425	\$134,579	\$51,310,900	\$40,356,604
Value by		UG	UG	UG	UG
county		\$290,384	\$0	\$348,780	\$750,928
Asset	Emergency Replacement	Number of	Number of	Number of	Number of
	Cost per unit or	miles/feet:	miles/feet:	miles/feet:	miles/feet:
	mile	POLK	CAMDEN	LACLEDE	GREENE
Meter OH	\$429.09/unit	9,504 OH	12,222 OH	19 OH	4,831
Meter UG	\$867.94/unit	176 UG	0 UG	0 UG	33 UG
Pole	\$1,285.54/unit	29,643	18,192	124	12,374
OH SP line	\$21,120/mile	1,060.8 mile	539.2 mile	5.2 mile	405.6 mile
OH TP line	\$55,334/mile	265.2 mile	134.8 mile	1.3 mile	101.4 mile
UG Primary	\$46,675/mile	11.85 mile	6.34 mile	0	4.09 mile
Transformers	\$1,069.05 OH	7,933 OH	6,617 OH	822 OH	4,097 OH
- / /	\$2,502.80 UG	881 UG	1,097 UG	0 UG	727 UG
Guys/anchors	\$141.10/unit	17,934	14,535	64	869
SecServ	\$17,265/mile	84.7 mile	99.3 mile	728 ft	43 mile
Regulators	\$9,264.98/unit	78	41	0	36
OCR	\$1,313/unit	98	448	1	364
Fiber	\$6,198.72/mile	43 mile	10 mile	0	1,426 ft
Lights	\$372.36/unit	2,926	2,522	2	1,421
Capacitors	\$465.24/unit	110	81	0	63
Total		OH	OH	OH	OH
Replacement		\$82,122,031	\$54,288,278	\$1,183,375	\$34,233,709
Value by		UG	UG	UG	UG
county		\$2,910,823	\$3,041,491	\$0	\$2,039,078
OF	I = overhead UG	G = underground OCR= Oil Circ	SP = Single phas cuit Re-closure	se TP = Three pl	nase
*AN	AR Modules and m	eter loops include	d in the replaceme	ent cost of OH M	eters
Source: Internal SWEC Accounting and Maintenance records					

Table 1.4	SWEC Asset Inventory by Service County (Continued)					
Asset	Emergency Replacement Cost per unit or mile	Number of units or miles/feet: WEBSTER	Number of units or miles/feet: CEDAR	Number of units or miles/feet: ST. CLAIR	Total number of units or miles:	
Meter OH	\$429.09/unit	78 OH	69 OH	12 OH	47,161 OH	
Meter UG	\$867.94/unit	1 UG	0 UG	0 UG	225 UG	
Pole	\$1,285.54/unit	170	273	48	112,024	
OH SP line	\$21,120/mile	4.8 mile	10.4 mile	1.76 mile	3,763.36 mile	
OH TP line	\$55,334/mile	1.2 mile	2.6 mile	.44 mile	940.84 mile	
UG Primary	\$46,675/mile	0	284 ft	0	23.09 mile	
Transformers	\$1,069.05 OH	61 OH	60 OH	9 OH	34,087 OH	
	\$2,502.80 UG	0 UG	0 UG	0 UG	3,241 UG	
Guys/anchors	\$141.10/unit	153	173	31	66,982	
SecServ	\$17,265/mile	3,296 ft	2,597 ft	952 ft	401.42 mile	
Regulators	\$9,264.98/unit	0	0	0	278	
OCR	\$1,313/unit	2	3	0	1,867	
Fiber	\$6,198.72/mile	0	0	0	103.87 mile	
Lights	\$372.36/unit	29	22	2	11,956	
Capacitors	\$465.24/unit	0	0	0	428	
Total		OH	OH	OH	OH	
Replacement		\$476,987	\$736,807	\$126,520	\$316,809,216	
Value by		UG	UG	UG	UG	
county		\$867.94	\$2,334	\$0	\$9,384,587	
OH	OH = overhead UG = underground SP = Single phase TP = Three phase					
	OCR= Oil Circuit Re-closure					
*AN	IR Modules and m	eter loops include	d in the replacem	ent cost of OH M	eters	
	Source: In	ternal SWEC Acco	unting and Maintend	ance records		

## Section 4: Identified Hazards and Risk Assessment Methodology

Natural hazards in southwest Missouri vary dramatically with regard to intensity, frequency, and the scope of impact. Some hazards, like earthquakes, happen without warning and do not provide any opportunity to prepare for the threat. Other hazards, such as tornadoes, flooding, or severe winter storms, provide a period of warning which allows for public preparation prior to their occurrence. Regardless, hazard mitigation planning can lessen the negative of any natural disaster regardless of onset time. The following natural hazards have been identified as potential threats for the service region of the Southwest Electric Cooperative:

- Tornadoes
- Severe Thunderstorms, Hail, and High Winds
- Flood
- Severe Winter Weather
- Earthquakes
- Dam Failure
- Wildfire
- Severe land subsidence (Sinkholes)

Likewise, a number of hazards may be eliminated from consideration in this local plan due to the state's geographic location including tsunamis, hurricanes, coastal storms, volcanic activity, avalanche, and tropical storms. Additionally, a number of hazards may be eliminated specifically for SWEC because of asset types and geographic location in the state of Missouri. Those hazards eliminated for the SWEC service region include:

- Drought
- Heat Wave
- Landslides
- Levee Failure

Although drought can potentially impact northwest Missouri, water availability does not directly impact the delivery of electric service to SWEC customers. Similarly, heat wave has been eliminated. Though it may result in additional usage and potentially tax the system, heat waves do not usually cause infrastructure damage to cooperative assets. The results of a heat wave in the SWEC service area may be considered cascading events rather than damage caused directly by the hazard itself. Landslides have been eliminated based upon local soil structure categorization by the USGS. In addition levee failure has been excluded due to the fact that there are no levees in the SWEC service area.

For the purpose of this risk assessment, the identified hazards for the SWEC service area have been divided into two categories: **historical and non-historical hazards**.

**Historical Hazards** are those hazards with a measurable previous impact upon the service area. Damage costs per event and a chronology of occurrences are available. The associated vulnerability assessments utilize the number of events and cost of each event to establish an average cost per incident. For SWEC, hazards with historical data include tornadoes, severe thunderstorms/high wind/hail, flood, severe winter weather, wildfire and sinkholes.

**Non-historical Hazards** are hazards with no previous record of impact upon the local service area. As such, the associated vulnerability assessments for each of these hazards will have an occurrence probability of less than 1% in any given year, but the extent of damage will vary considerably. For SWEC, hazards without historical data include earthquakes and dam failure.

## Probability of Occurrence

In determining the potential frequency of occurrences, a simple formula was used. For historical events, the number of recorded events for the service area was divided by the number of years of record. This number was then multiplied by 100 to provide a percentage. This formula was used to determine future probability for each hazard. For events that have not occurred, a probability of less than 1% was automatically assigned as the hazard cannot be excluded from the possibility of occurrence. Likewise, when discussing the probable risk of each hazard based upon historical occurrences, the following scale was utilized:

- Less than 1% chance of an event occurrence in any given year.
- 1-10% chance of an event occurrence in any given year
- 10-99% chance of an event occurrence in any given year
- Near 100% chance of an event occurrence in any given year

The number of occurrences was further refined to focus on damage-causing events. Those occasions which had reported damages were divided by the total number of recorded events to obtain a percentage of total storms which result in infrastructure damage. (Formula: Number of damage-causing events / total number of events = Percentage of occurrences which cause damage.)

## Potential Extent of Damage

Vulnerability Assessment matrices for each hazard are included on the following pages. These worksheets detail loss estimates for each hazard affecting the cooperative's service area. Loss estimates were calculated using the asset summary created by internal SWEC accounting records. Each hazard has a unique impact upon the service area, requiring each hazard to utilize a different valuation amount depending upon the level of impact. Non-historical hazards assume damage to all general assets. For Historical Hazards, assets were divided into two groups based upon historical impact which were utilized in the hazard damage analysis:

- Overhead infrastructure assets and buildings
  - Used for Tornado damage assessments
  - Valued at \$322,056,611
- Overhead infrastructure assets only
  - $\circ~$  Used for:
    - Severe Thunderstorm / High Wind / Hail
    - Flood
    - Severe Winter Weather
  - Valued at \$316,809,216

In addition, historical hazards with recorded damages were used to identify an average cost per event. (Formula: Total cost of damages / total number of events = Average damage cost per event.) When discussing the extent of potential damages for all hazards, the following scale was utilized:

- Less than 10% potential damages to total cooperative infrastructure
- 10-25% potential damages to total cooperative infrastructure
- 25-50% potential damages to total cooperative infrastructure
- More than 50% potential damages to total cooperative infrastructure

Regardless of hazard categorization, the following matrix (Table 1.5) will be utilized to identify the potential damage extent and likelihood of occurrence for each natural hazard type.

Table 1	5	Probability of	Hazard Occurrenc	e	
Sample Southwest Electric Cooperative Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard:		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	Near 100% probability in any given year
of Damage	Less than 10% of damage to system 10-25% damage of system				
l Extent	26-50% damage of system				
Potentia	More than 50% damage of system				

In many instances, natural hazard events occur without causing significant damage to the cooperative's infrastructure. The more significant impact of natural hazard episodes comes in the form of reported customer outages. The infrastructure may not be significantly harmed by an ice storm, but may result in prolonged and widespread outages in the cooperative's service area. In considering the potential impact of a hazard, loss of function provides a more concise picture for comparison of events and geographic regions of the state. In addition to system damage, each hazard will be evaluated on the average number of reported or estimated outages per event occurrence. (Formula: Average number of outages reported / Total number of customers = Average percentage of outages reported per event).

Table 1.6		Probability of Damage-causing Hazard Occurrence			
Sample Cooper Vulnera Hazard	e Southwest Electric rative Service Interruption ability Assessment Matrix l:	Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	> Near 100% probability in any given year
	Less than 10% of customers report outages				
ll Extent of Impact	10-25% of customers report outages				
	26-50% of customers report outages				
Potentis	More than 50% of customers report outages				

#### Section 5: Risk Assessment

#### A) Historical Hazards:

#### Tornadoes

In the last 60 years, 59 tornadoes have been reported within the Southwest cooperative boundaries. Figure 3 provides a pictorial representation of all recorded tornado touchdown sites and (Data for map recorded path. collected from NOAA.)

Historical hazard records contain tornado occurrences from 1951 – 2010, however there is a data insufficiency in cooperative records concerning damage estimates for specific tornado events prior to 2000. For the purpose of this assessment, the years for which records exist for both data sets have been used.

From 2000-2010, SWEC's service area within the state of Missouri has experienced a total of fourteen tornado outbreaks. Ten of those fourteen outbreaks resulted in outages or damages. Using the previously described methodology,

Figure 3: Tornadoes in the SWEC Service Area, 1951-2010



the probability of a tornado event in the SWEC service area in any given year is 100% (14 events / 10 years = 140%). Estimated cooperative material damages associated with each of these events were compiled by SWEC staff. Ten of the fourteen outbreaks impacted cooperative assets or service, resulting in a 71.4% probability that any given tornado outbreak will produce an impact (10 / 14 = 71.4%). Table 1.7 provides a summary of event dates, EF-scale ratings, damage cost estimates and outages reported.

Table 1.7	SWEC Tornadic Event	Summary				
Date of event	EF Scale rating Damage		Outages			
		estimates	Reported			
2/25/2000	F-0	0	120			
10/10/2001	F-1	0	45			
5/4/2003	7 Tornadoes, F-0 to F-3	\$307,727	109			
3/12/2006	6 Tornadoes, F-0 to F-3	\$82,575.65	0			
10/17/2007	F-0	0	379			
1/7/2008	5 Tornadoes, F-0 to F-3	0	1,013			
1/8/2008	F-0	0	2			
5/8/2009	F-1/F-2	\$606,313	0			
11/24/2010	F-0/F-1	0	222			
12/31/2010	F-0	0	159			
Data provided based on internal SWEC records which reflect cost from the referenced event						
year.		-				

Based upon the last ten years of historical event records, the average tornado to affect the cooperative will include an EF-0 to EF-1 rating, causing an average damage cost of \$99,662 per event (\$996,615/10 events = \$99,662). This averaged amount accounts for less than 1% of SWEC's total overhead assets and building valuation (\$99,662 / \$322,056,611 = 0.03%). Table 1.8 demonstrates the probability of occurrence in conjunction with the potential extent of damage.

Table 1	1.8	Probability of Hazard Occurrence			
Southwest Electric Cooperative Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Tornado</u>		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	Near 100% probability in any given year
t of	Less than 10% of damage to system				
Extent age	10-25% damage of system				
ential Dan	26-50% damage of system				
Pot	More than 50% damage of system				

An average of 205 customers reported outages during recorded tornadoes since 2000. When compared with the total number of customers served by SWEC, it can be projected that 0.52% of all customers may report outages during any given tornado event. Table 1.9 demonstrates the probability of occurrence in conjunction with the potent extent of impact upon local customers.

Table 1	.9	Probability of Damage-causing Hazard Occurrence					
Southw	est Electric Cooperative	Less than	1-10% chance	10-99%	> Near 100%		
Service	Interruption Vulnerability	1% in any	in any given	chance in any	probability in		
Assess	ment Matrix			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · ·		
Hazard	l: Tornado	given year	year	given year	any given year		
	Less than 10% of						
	customers report outages						
act	10-25% of customers						
du	report outages						
fΙτ	report outages						
to	26-50% of customers						
en	20-5070 Of customers						
TX1	report outages						
all							
nti	More than 50% of						
ote	customers report outages						
$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{C}}$	1 0						
Poten	customers report outages						

Severe Thunderstorms, High Wind, and Hail

From 2000 - 2010, Southwest Electric's service area has experienced a total 169 hail events and 98 thunderstorm/high wind events. Therefore, the probability of a hail event in the SWEC service area in any given year is near 100% (169 events / 10 years = 1,690%) while the probability of a thunderstorm/high wind event in any given year is also near to 100% (98 events / 10 years = 980%). Estimated material damages associated with each of these events were compiled by SWEC staff.

A data insufficiency exists between historical records and cooperative records for hail events. It may be possible that hail events have caused damages to the system and outages; however, the SWEC records do not contain any records associated with hail events. For the purpose of the risk assessment for hail events, the probability of damages and outages due to hail are difficult to assess.

Based upon historical records, the probability of a hail event occurrence is at least equal to or greater than 100% and it is safe to assume that damages and outages have resulted from the impact of hail. However, it is unlikely that average damage costs resulting from hail would equal 10% or greater of the total overhead value of Southwest Electric assets. It would be equally unlikely that average reported outages due to hail from 2000 – 2010 would total 10% or greater of total Southwest Electric customers.

Table 1.10 provides information for thunderstorm/high wind events, including date, damages, and outages from 2000 - 2010. Sixty-two of the ninety-eight Thunderstorm/High Wind events resulted in damage to cooperative assets, resulting in a 63.2% probability that any given thunderstorm/high wind occurrence will produce damage. (62 / 98 = 63.2%)

Table 1.10	Table 1.10       SWEC Thunderstorm/High Wind Event Summary				
Event date	Damage	Outages	Event date	Damage	Outages
	estimates	reported		estimates	reported
4/20/2000	\$15,000	2,207	11/5/2005	\$35,500	1,257
6/4/2000	\$750	180	4/2/2006	\$750	421
8/7/2000	\$1,500	95	4/22/2006	\$0	1
9/11/2000	\$300	3	5/3/2006	\$550	112
11/1/2000	\$750	37	6/22/2006	\$0	1
4/11/2001	\$5,000	242	7/19/2006	\$0	1
5/20/2001	\$1,250	599	8/6/2006	\$300	97
6/1/2001	\$300	5	8/11/2006	\$250	120
6/3/2001	\$10,000	2,137	3/1/2007	\$600	143
6/14/2001	\$3,000	843	4/24/2007	\$0	1
7/10/2001	\$75,000	3,017	6/7/2007	\$8,000	976
7/12/2001	\$36,000	1,186	6/18/2007	\$0	2
8/9/2001	\$5,000	277	9/30/2007	\$11,000	730
8/29/2001	\$1,800	775	5/24/2008	\$0	1
5/7/2002	\$4,000	600	5/25/2008	\$250	10
5/8/2002	\$1,050	400	5/30/2008	\$8,500	1,453
7/10/2002	\$0	2	6/2/2008	\$1,000	43
7/22/2002	\$750	385	6/6/2008	\$15,000	1,006
8/24/2002	\$0	4	6/15/2008	\$250	8
3/13/2003	\$0	82	6/19/2008	\$0	1
3/19/2003	\$0	2	7/22/2008	\$0	2
7/9/2003	\$300	971	8/5/2008	\$0	1
7/12/2003	\$250	617	11/6/2008	\$475	263
7/28/2003	\$0	17	3/8/2009	\$800	348
8/1/2003	\$300	5	4/9/2009	\$750	56
8/2/2003	\$750	232	5/8/2009	\$35,000	10,100
8/27/2003	\$0	1	5/13/2009	\$10,000	284
9/26/2003	\$2,250	95	6/10/2009	\$10,050	2,391
11/18/2003	\$300	4	6/16/2009	\$9,500	1,439
5/30/2004	\$1,000	365	8/19/2009	\$1,500	114
6/12/2004	\$300	5	4/23/2010	\$1,750	162
10/29/2004	\$1,500	261	4/24/2010	\$1,070	371
6/9/2005	\$300	586	5/12/2010	\$2,140	536
6/10/2005	\$4,000	538	6/16/2010	\$7,000	663
6/13/2005	\$10,000	654	6/19/2010	\$500	226
7/10/2005	\$2,550	196	7/11/2010	\$11,000	2,708
7/23/2005	\$0	393	9/2/2010	\$650	343
8/31/2005	\$2,250	919	10/26/2010	\$2,340	679
9/13/2005	\$2,250	825			
Data provided be	ased on internal .	SWEC records	which reflect cost fr	om the referenced	event year.

Based upon historical records, the average thunderstorm/high wind event to affect the cooperative will cause an average damage cost of 5,907 (366,225 / 62 events = 5,907). This averaged amount accounts for less than 1% of SWEC's overhead asset valuation (5,907 / 316,809,216 = .0018%). Table 1.11 demonstrates the probability of occurrence in conjunction with the potential extent of damage for both hail and thunderstorm wind events.

Table	1.11 Probability of Hazard Occurrence				
			,		
Southwest Electric Cooperative Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Thunderstorm/High</u> Wind (Hail		Less than 1% in any	1-10% chance	10- 99% chance in any	Near 100% probability in
		given year	year	given year	any given year
Potential Extent of Damage	Less than 10% of damage to system 10-25% damage of system 26-50% damage of system More than 50% damage of system				

An average of 755 customers reported outages during recorded thunderstorm and high wind events since 2000. When compared with the total number of customers served by SWEC, it can be projected that 1.9% of all customers may report outages during any given thunderstorm or high wind event. Table 1.12 demonstrates the probability of occurrence in conjunction with the potent extent of impact upon local customers for both hail and thunderstorm wind events.

Table 1	.12	Probability of	Damage-causing H	lazard Occurrence	
Southwest Electric Cooperative Service Interruption Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Thunderstorm/High</u> <u>Winds/Hail</u>		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	> Near 100% probability in any given year
f Impact	Less than 10% of customers report outages 10-25% of customers report outages				
Potential Extent o	26-50%ofcustomersreport outagesMorethan50%customersreport outages				

#### Flood

Riverine and flash flooding is a potential threat to the existing infrastructure of the Electric Cooperative. Southwest Approximately 7.5% of the SWEC service area is located in the 100 year floodplain. Figure 4 below depicts the 100 year floodplain in relation to the cooperative's boundaries. Much of what is depicted as the 100 year floodplain in Figure 4 is actually lake area. Portions of the Lake of the Ozarks, Truman Lake, Stockton Lake and the entirety of the Pomme De Terre Lake are located in the SWEC service area. (Map FEMA HAZUS-MH; FEMA sources: National Flood Hazard Layer; Missouri Office of Administration, and Association of Missouri Electric Cooperatives.)

From 2000-2010, SWEC's service area has experienced 123 flooding events. Therefore, the probability of a flood/ event affecting SWEC's service area is near 100% (123 events / 10 years = 1,230%). Estimated



material damages associated with each of these events were compiled by SWEC staff. Table 1.13 summarizes flood event dates by month, damage cost estimates, and reported outages. Two of the 123 occurrences caused damage to cooperative assets, resulting in a 1.6% probability that any given flood occurrence will produce damage. (2 / 123 = 1.6%)

Table 1.13	SWEC Flood Event Summary				
Event date	Damage Outages				
	estimates	reported			
9/2/2010	\$650	343			
11/24/2010	\$5,000	222			
Data provided based on internal SWEC records which					
reflect cost from t	he referenced event year				

Flood events vary widely based upon numerous factors including, but not limited to, rate and duration of precipitation. Based upon historical records, the average flood event to affect the cooperative will cause an average damage cost of \$2,825 (\$5,650 / 2 events = \$2,825). This averaged amount accounts for less than 1% of SWEC's overhead asset valuation (\$2,825 / \$316,809,216 = 0.00089%). Table 1.14 demonstrates the probability of occurrence in conjunction with the potential extent of damage.

Figure 4: SWEC 100 Year Floodplain

Table 1.14		Probability of Hazard Occurrence			
6. 1	El ci Comuni		-		
Southw	ructure Vulnerability	Less than	1-10% chance	10-99%	<u>&gt;100%</u>
Assess	ment Matrix	1% in any	in any given	chance in any	probability in
Hazard: <u>Flood</u>		given year	year	given year	any given year
	Less than 10% of damage				
ential Extent of Damage	to system				
	10-25% damage of system				
	26-50% damage of system				
Pot	More than 50% damage of				
	system				

An average of 282.5 customers reported outages during recorded flooding events since 2000. When compared with the total number of customers served by SWEC, it can be projected that 0.72% of all customers may report outages during any given flooding event. Table 1.15 demonstrates the probability of occurrence in conjunction with the potent extent of impact upon local customers.

Table 1	.15	Probability of Damage-causing Hazard Occurrence			
Southwest Electric Cooperative Service Interruption Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Flood</u>		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	> Near 100% probability in any given year
	Less than 10% of customers report outages				
ll Extent of Impact	10-25% of customers report outages				
	26-50% of customers report outages				
Potentis	More than 50% of customers report outages				

## Severe Winter Weather

From 2000-2010, Southwest's service area has experienced a total of twenty-three severe winter weather events, including significant snowfall and ice storms. Therefore, the probability of a severe winter weather event in the Southwest service area in any given year is near 100% (23 events / 10 years = 230%). Thirteen of the twenty-three events resulted in either outages or damages. Estimated material damages associated with each of these events were compiled by SWEC staff. Table 1.16 provides a summary of event

dates, types, associated damage estimates, and reported outages. Three of the twentythree occurrences caused damage to cooperative assets, resulting in a 13.0% probability that any given severe winter weather occurrence will produce material damage. (3 / 23 = 13.0%)

Table 1.16	SWEC Severe Winter Weather Event					
	Summary	Summary				
Event date	Event type	Damage	Outages			
		estimates	reported			
3/2/2002	Winter Storm	0	1			
1/2/2003	Winter Storm	0	47			
3/4/2003	Winter Storm	0	1			
12/10/2003	Heavy Snow	0	1			
1/25/2004	Ice Storm	0	448			
11/30/2006	Winter Storm	0	643			
1/12/2007	Ice Storm	\$5,010,982	18,175			
12/9/2007	Ice Storm	0	641			
12/10/2007	Ice Storm	\$361,970	5,000			
2/21/2008	Ice Storm	\$41,707	208			
1/26/2009	Winter Storm	0	2			
12/24/2009	Winter Storm	0	8			
3/20/2010	Winter Storm	0	105			
Data provided based on	internal SWEC reco	rds which reflect c	ost from the			
referenced event year.						

Based upon these historical records, the average severe winter weather event to affect the cooperative will cause an average damage cost of 1,804,886 (5,414,658/3 events = 1,804,886). This averaged amount accounts for less than 1% of SWEC's total overhead asset valuation (1,804,886/ 316,809,216 = 0.56%). Table 1.17 demonstrates the probability of occurrence in conjunction with the potential extent of damage.

Table 1.17		Probability of Hazard Occurrence			
0 1					
Southw	vest Electric Cooperative	Less than	1-10% chance	10-99%	Near 100%
Assess	ment Matrix	1% in any	in any given	chance in any	probability in
Hazard: Severe Winter Weather		given year	year	given year	any given year
	Less than 10% of damage				
ential Extent of Damage	to system				
	10-25% damage of system				
	26-50% damage of system				
Pot	More than 50% damage of				
	system				

An average of 1,945 customers reported outages during recorded severe winter weather events since 2000. When compared with the total number of customers served by SWEC, it can be projected that 4.9% of all customers may report outages during any

given severe winter weather event. Table 1.18 demonstrates the probability of occurrence in conjunction with the potent extent of impact upon local customers.

Table 1	.18	Probability of	Damage-causing H	lazard Occurrence	
Southwest Electric Cooperative Service Interruption Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Severe Winter Weather</u>		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	> Near 100% probability in any given year
	Less than 10% of customers report outages				
ll Extent of Impact	10-25% of customers report outages				
	26-50% of customers report outages				
Potentia	More than 50% of customers report outages				

#### Wildfire

The incidence of wildfire in the SWEC service area presents a unique risk assessment. Wildfire events have occurred in each of the eleven counties. According to the Missouri Department of Conservation, Benton, Camden, Cedar, Dade, Dallas, Greene, Hickory, Laclede, Polk, Webster and St. Clair counties have experienced wildfires between 2004 and 2008. Table 1.19 summarizes the incidences of wildfire within the eleven counties. The SWEC service boundary covers no county of service in its entirety and very small portions of several.

Table 1.19	Wildfire summary by county						
		Average			Average		
	# of	Annual #			Annual	Total	
	Wildfires,	of	Likelihood	Acres	Acres	Buildings	
County	2004-08	Wildfires	(1-5)	Burned	Burned	Damaged	Vulnerability
Benton	352	70.4	3	8,333.11	1,667	20	Medium-high
Camden	739	147.8	5	18,454.31	3,691	19	High
Cedar	132	26.4	1	1,358.5	272	2	Medium-low
Dade	165	33	2	1,617.8	324	3	Medium
Dallas	178	35.6	2	10,055	2,011	0	Medium-high
Greene	211	42.2	2	920.31	184	8	Medium-low
Hickory	86	17.2	1	1,842.5	369	0	Medium-low
Laclede	250	50	2	6,777.54	1,356	6	Medium-high
Polk	145	29	1	882.75	177	3	Medium-low
Webster	203	40.6	2	2,238.07	448	3	Medium
St. Clair	217	43.4	2	6,634.7	1,327	4	Medium-high
Totals	2,678	535.6	1-5	59,114.59	11,826	68	Medium-high
Source: Misso	ouri State Hazar	d Mitigation Pla	ın, 2010				

It is not realistic to assume that the total number of wildfires in Table 1.20 occurred within the SWEC service area. In order to calculate the probability of a wildfire event in the SWEC service area, the proportions of SWEC service area out of the total square miles in each county were applied as weights to the total number of fires in each county and then summed producing a value of 862.67 total fires from 2004-2008 (352(.406) + 739(.397) + 132(.011) + 165(.008) + 178(.776) + 211(.249) + 86(.979) + 250(.005) + 145(.991) + 203(.006) + 217(.007) = 862.67). This formula begs caution as it is based on the simple assumption that all wildfires are evenly distributed throughout each county. Using this value, the probability of wildfire occurrence in any given year is near 100% (862.67events / 4 years = 21,566.75\%).

Like earthquakes and dam failure, wildfires have had no measurable impact upon the SWEC service area. To date, the estimated 862.67 fires have burned a total of 21,569 acres, for an average of 25 acres affected per event. The total acres burned were calculated using proportions as weights applied to acres burned in each county. SWEC sustained no damage related to wildfires in its service area during this time period. Cooperative assets are located throughout the service area rather than being located at a single central site. With an average of 25 acres per fire in the service area, it is unlikely that infrastructure damage would exceed 5% based upon asset location and unlikeliness of an uncontrollable wildfire. This initial assessment assumes a limited impact upon electric distribution infrastructure of less than 10% (Table 1.20). Further study will be required to create a model for damage assessments related to wildfire.

Table 1.20		Probability of Hazard Occurrence			
Southwest Electric Cooperative Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Wildfire</u>		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	Near 100% probability in any given year
t of	Less than 10% of damage to system				
ential Extent Damage	10-25% damage of system				
	26-50% damage of system				
Pot	More than 50% damage of system				

No customers have reported outages during recorded wildfires between 2004 and 2008. When compared with the total number of customers served by SWEC, it can be projected that less than 10% of all customers may report outages during any given wildfire event. Table 1.21 demonstrates the probability of occurrence in conjunction with the potent extent of impact upon local customers.

## [SOUTHWEST ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE] October 2011

-		T			
Table 1.21		Probability of Damage-causing Hazard Occurrence			
Southwest Electric Cooperative Service Interruption Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Wildfire</u>		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	> Near 100% probability in any given year
	Less than 10% of customers report outages				
ll Extent of Impact	10-25% of customers report outages				
	26-50% of customers report outages				
Potentia	More than 50% of customers report outages				

Severe Land Subsidence (Sinkholes)

Southwest Electric service area is underlain primarily by carbonate rocks containing mainly limestone and some dolomite bedrock. These types of bedrock are extremely sensitive to water dissolution along joints and fractures within the rock. Areas along natural drainage paths tend to be more susceptible to sinkhole formation as well, due to increased water flow into the subsurface. There are 206 known sinkholes within the Southwest Electric service area. Figure 5 shows the location of the sinkholes within Southwest Electric's service area. (Map sources: SWEC GIS data www.msdis.missouri.edu.)

Formation of sinkholes can and will affect Southwest Electric. However, there are no documented instances of sinkhole impact in cooperative records. Since sinkhole formation occurs on a localized scale, property

Figure 5: SWEC Region Sinkholes



damage is negligible depending on structures immediately within or adjacent to the sinkhole area. However, for the purposes of this assessment, sinkholes and their associated impacts cannot be eliminated from the realm of possibility. In order to allow

for a risk assessment, the probability of this event has been included as less than 1%. Table 1.22 depicts the vulnerability of Southwest Electric assets to the hazard of sinkholes based on probability of occurrence and extent of damage. Due to the localized nature of sinkhole impacts it is estimated that less than 1% damage will occur to the system due in the event of sinkhole formation.

Table 1.22			Probability of Hazard Occurrence			
Southwest Electric Cooperative Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Sinkhole</u>		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	Near 100% probability in any given year	
t of	Less than 10% of damage to system					
ential Extent Damage	10-25% damage of system					
	26-50% damage of system					
Pot	More than 50% damage of system					

Determining the potential extent of impact in terms of reported outages due to sinkhole formation is difficult to pinpoint; however, is very unlikely such an event would result in more than 10% of customers in the system reporting outages. Table 1.23 depicts the impact measured in reported outages combined with the probability of occurrence.

Table 1.23Southwest Electric Cooperative Service Interruption Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: Sinkhole		Probability of Damage-causing Hazard Occurrence			
		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	> Near 100% probability in any given year
	Less than 10% of customers report outages				
ıl Extent of Impact	10-25% of customers report outages				
	26-50% of customers report outages				
Potentia	More than 50% of customers report outages				

## **B.** Non-historical Hazards

#### Earthquakes

The closest source of earthquake risk in southwest Missouri is the NeMaha Fault, which runs roughly from Oklahoma City, Oklahoma north to Lincoln, Nebraska. In 1993, the NeMaha fault produced an earthquake rating a 2.9 on the Richter Scale of Earthquake Intensity. Additional quakes took place February 11, 1995 (3.1 rating); July 16, 2004 (3.5 rating); March 23, 2003 (3.1 rating). More recently, an earthquake rating 3.6 was recorded on December 17, 2009. Although a relatively quiet fault system, the NeMaha fault has the potential to produce a damaging earthquake, impacting the Southwest Electric Cooperative.

The region is also subject to effects of the New Madrid Fault located in extreme southeast Missouri, which has, according to many experts, the potential to produce the largest earthquakes in North America. Undoubtedly, this fault has the potential to affect the SWEC service area in its entirety. In addition, there have been several small, virtually undetectable earth movements in the region in recent history, which may or may not be attributed to the aforementioned fault lines or other, very small faults located nearby.

While the NeMaha fault is geographically closer and geologically active, C.E.R.I. records demonstrate the limited impact of said earthquakes, with no quakes to date exceeding a 5.5 on the Modified Mercalli Scale. Its cascading effects have been largely restricted to more localized regions, but even then the damage caused has been minimal. By contrast, the New Madrid fault has the potential to cause damage throughout the state of Missouri, including the SWEC service area. Scientists from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and the Center for Earthquake Research and Information (CERI) at the University of Memphis have estimated the probability of a magnitude 6.0 or greater earthquake from the New Madrid Fault is 25-40 percent through the year 2053. The probability of an earthquake increases with each passing day.

The projected earthquake intensity ratings for the cooperative region changes based upon the Modified Mercalli Scale. Given a New Madrid earthquake with a 6.7 rating, the region would experience Level V intensity characteristics. In the event of an earthquake with a 7.6 rating, the region would experiences Level VI intensity characteristic while an earthquake with an 8.6 rating would most likely cause Level VII intensity characteristics.

In the event of an earthquake with a 7.6 rating, the SWEC service area would most likely experience minor building damage as well as damage to the electrical distribution system. This damage, however, would most likely be relatively minimal and localized when compared with the southeast corner of the state. Distribution lines overhead and underground could become disconnected or severed, and transformers could be damaged. Though the probability of occurrence is very small, the potential extent of damage could significantly impact both the cooperative and its customers as demonstrated in Table 1.24.

Table 1.24		Probability of Hazard Occurrence			
Southwest Electric Cooperative Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Earthquake</u>			2		
		Less than	1-10% chance	10-99%	Near 100%
		1% in any	in any given	chance in any	probability in
		given year	year	given year	any given year
	Less than 10% of damage				
of	to system				
nt c	40.050/ 1				
xte. Ige	10-25% damage of system				
al E ama	26-50% damage of system				
Ds	20-3070 damage of system				
Pote	More than 50% damage of				
, .	system				

Based upon information from CERI, FEMA, and SEMA, it may be estimated that 3,943 customers could report outages related to an earthquake event. When compared with the total number of customers served by SWEC, it can be projected that 10% of all customers may report outages during any given seismic event. Table 1.25 demonstrates the probability of occurrence in conjunction with the potent extent of impact upon local customers.

Table 1.25		Probability of Damage-causing Hazard Occurrence			
Southwest Electric Cooperative Service Interruption Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Earthquake</u>		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	> Near 100% probability in any given year
npact	Less than 10% of customers report outages 10-25% of customers report outages				
al Extent of Ir	26-50% of customers report outages				
Potenti	More than 50% of customers report outages				

## Dam Failure

Like earthquakes, dam failures have had no measurable impact upon the SWEC service area to date. According to Missouri DNR's Dam Safety Division, 40 dams currently exist within the cooperative boundaries: 4 in Benton County, 4 in Camden County, 3 in Dallas County, 9 in Greene County, 7 in Hickory County and 13 in Polk County. Of these dams, one in Benton County, one in Camden County, two in Greene County, and one in Polk County are regulated by the state due to the fact that they are non-agricultural, non-federal dams which exceed 35 feet in height. Figure 6 shows the locations of all known dams located within Southwest's service area. (Map sources: www.msdis.missouri.edu; www.dnr.mo.gov/env/wrc.)

26 dam failures have occurred within the state of Missouri over the past 100

years. However, no such event has occurred within or near the cooperative's boundaries. However, for the purposes of this assessment, dam failure and its associated impacts cannot be eliminated from the realm of possibility. In order to allow for a risk assessment, the probability of this event has been included as less than 1%. (Table 1.26)

Table 1.26		Probability of Hazard Occurrence			
Southwest Electric Cooperative Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Dam Failure</u>		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	Near 100% probability in any given year
nt of	Less than 10% of damage to system				
ential Exte Damage	26-50% damage of system				
Pot	More than 50% damage of system				



Figure 6: SWEC Region Dam Network

Determining the potential extent of dam failure is currently impossible due to a lack of data concerning inundation zones. Further study concerning existing dams and their impact is required to make a more comprehensive assessment of potential damages. This initial assessment assumes a limited impact upon downstream electric distribution infrastructure of less than 10% for both infrastructure damage and service interruption. (Tables 1.27).

Table 1.27		Probability of Hazard Occurrence			
Southwest Electric Cooperative Service Interruption Vulnerability Assessment Matrix Hazard: <u>Dam Failure</u>		Less than 1% in any given year	1-10% chance in any given year	10- 99% chance in any given year	> Near 100% probability in any given year
	Less than 10% of customers report outages				
Potential Extent of Impact	10-25% of customers report outages				
	26-50% of customers report outages				
	More than 50% of customers report outages				

## Section 6: Mitigation strategies

#### Previous efforts at mitigation

For organizations like SWEC, mitigation is considered to be part of prudent business operations. In order to ensure the delivery of a quality product and minimize service interruptions, a number of mitigation strategies are continually utilized. Routine maintenance and upgrades to existing equipment are completed as part of daily tasks. Vegetation management is utilized to limit the cascading effects of natural hazards. Safety and reporting information are disseminated to the public through various types of media. Mutual aid agreements and partnerships create relationships which provide for future support in the event of a natural disaster.

Additionally, mitigation is considered prior to any expansion of service into special hazard areas. Before any service is build, it is first "staked out" in coordination with local builders and property owners. This process, completed by the Line Superintendent and contracted engineers, identifies and addresses foreseeable hazards and safety issues before any new service lines area constructed. USDA-RUS specifications regarding operation and safety are utilized in every step of the process. Steps are taken to practically minimize the exposure of equipment to loss due to foreseeable hazards, particularly flooding. Customers who reside in the floodplain are not charged for repairs or losses associated with flooding unless they purposefully destroy or restrict the cooperative from protecting their distribution system assets.

## Existing and potential resources

As stated above, mitigation is a key component of good business practices. Southwest Electric Cooperative includes mitigation strategies as part of regular work activities to ensure service with minimal interruptions. Funding for these activities is provided through the cooperative's normal budgetary process for maintenance.

In order to expand mitigation efforts beyond normal maintenance, it is likely that SWEC will need to seek outside funding sources. These may include private, state, or federal programs which provide grant and loan funding. Upon passage of this plan, SWEC will be eligible for funding through FEMA in the following categories:

- Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
- Flood Mitigation Assistance Program
- Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program
- 406 Stafford Act

## Development of goals, objectives, and actions

Establishing mitigation goals, objectives, and actions for a business entity requires a slightly different approach than public agencies. Certainly, a number of similarities exist; both entities must consider which hazards most commonly occur and have the greatest potential for causing disruption to members or residents. They must also consider which types of actions will maximize benefits and minimize costs, how mitigation strategies will be implemented, who will enforce implementation, and how the overall plan will be maintained and updated.

The SWEC mitigation planning committee, with assistance from SMCOG staff, worked to identify goals, actions, and objectives which addressed hazard mitigation issues. The committee first identified ongoing mitigation strategies as well as potential strategies which seek to improve service and limit disruptions resulting from natural hazards. Action items were then analyzed for common characteristics and summarized to create seven objectives. Likewise, these seven objectives were grouped into similar categories and used as the basis for the three overarching goals. Table 1.28 provides a simple synopsis of the goals and objectives before prioritization.

Traditionally, the STAPLEE (Social, Technical, Administrative, Political, Legal, Environmental, and Economic) method is used to prioritize mitigation actions. These categories, however, do not necessarily align with the private sector in the same way they are applicable to governmental agencies. A number of action items could be included with multiple goals and objectives, for example. As a result, the committee chose to use a different method to prioritize their mitigation strategy.

Table 1.28	SWEC goals and objectives		
Identified Goals	Identified Objectives		
<b>Goal 1:</b> Minimize the number and length of service	<b>Objective 1:</b> Continue with an aggressive vegetation management program within right of way		
interruptions due to the impact of natural hazards	<b>Objective 2:</b> Continue regular maintenance and inspection programs		
<b>Goal 2:</b> Protect the health and safety of the public	<b>Objective 1:</b> Continue to provide safety information to the general public through webpage newspapers, and public presentations <b>Objective 2:</b> Develop and Improve lines of		
<b>Goal 3</b> : Minimize future infrastructure losses due to natural hazard events	Objective 1: Continue existing inspection and maintenance programs       Objective 2: Research and develop plans for future infrastructure improvements       Objective 3: Determine expected wind and ice loading		
	on system and plan accordingly		

After identifying ongoing and potential action items, the committee created three priority tiers:

- **First tier** actions focus on physical infrastructure protection and improvements which ensure continued, quality service and seek to reduce power outages. These types of actions are the highest priority of SWEC.
- Second tier actions create and maintain working relationships to reduce and prevent the impact of power outages. These include improvements to safety and reporting information, mutual aid agreements, and other efforts which seek to expand and improve both customer service and disaster planning.
- **Third tier** actions identify potential projects for other system improvements. These include mapping efforts, technological improvements, and research related to the expansion of mitigation efforts.

Actions within each tier may be funded through regular budgetary methods or identified outside sources. Tables 1.29, 1.30, and 1.31 provide lists of action items by tier as well as the goals and objectives identified with each.

Table 1.29 Prioritized Mitigation Actions for Southwest Electric Cooperative – Tier 1						
Tier 1						
Action item:	Goal/Objective	Timeframe for completion	Cost-benefit score			
Research and employ when feasible the use of organic or ecologically neutral herbicides for use in vegetation management programs	Goal 1/Objective 1 Goal 1/Objective 2	Ongoing Effort	Low Cost Low Benefit Score: 3			
Install additional poles to support transformers, as mid-span poles or to shorten spans to no greater than 300 feet	Goal 1/Objective 2 Goal 3/Objective 2	Dependent on Additional Funding	High Cost High Benefit Score: 7			
Install large gauge guy-wires to improve structural support and prevent cascading failures from tension overload	Goal 3/Objective 2	Dependent on Additional Funding	High Cost Medium Benefit Score: 4			

# [SOUTHWEST ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE] October 2011

Table 1.29 Prioritized Mitigation Actions for Southwest Electric Cooperative – Tier 1						
Tier 1						
Action item:	Goal/Objective	Timeframe for completion	Cost-benefit score			
Provide looped distribution service or other redundancies to critical facilities and key communication infrastructure	Goal 3/Objective 2	Dependent on Additional Funding	High Cost High Benefit Score: 7			
Elevating pad-mounted transformers and other components above Base Flood Elevation (100 year floodplain)	Goal 3/Objective 2	Dependent on Additional Funding	High Cost Low Benefit Score: 1			
Replace damaged poles with higher-rated poles of the same or different material or laminated coatings	Goal 1/Objective 2 Goal 3/Objective 1 Goal 3/Objective 2	Dependent on Additional Funding	High Cost Medium Benefit Score: 4			
Upgrade conductor to Wind-Motion Resistant (e.g., T2 ACSR)	Goal 3/Objective 2 Goal 3/Objective 3	Dependent on Additional Funding	High Cost Low Benefit Score:1			
Continue to employ and develop GIS technology and application to identify system failures and reduce response times for outages	Goal 1/Objective 2 Goal 3/Objective 1 Goal 3/Objective 2	Ongoing Effort	Medium Cost Medium Benefit Score: 5			
Maintain looped distribution service and other redundancies to critical facilities and/or communications infrastructure	Goal 1/Objective 2 Goal 3/Objective 1	Dependent on Additional Funding	High Cost Medium Benefit Score: 4			
Examine options for burying power lines to/from remote sources as additional power backup	Goal 3/Objective 2 Goal 3/Objective 3	Dependent on Additional Funding	High Cost Medium Benefit Score: 4			
Continue work programs to create looped substations to mitigate outages when substations go off line	Goal 1/Objective 2 Goal 3/Objective 1 Goal 3/Objective 2	Completed as Funding Allows	High Cost Medium Benefit Score: 4			
Use Mechanical Breakaway systems for key areas	Goal 3/Objective 2	Dependent on Additional Funding	High Cost Low Benefit Score 1			
Elevate or bury interstate or major highway crossings spans	Goal 3/Objective 2	Dependent on Additional Funding	High Costs High Benefits Score 7			
Install vibration dampeners and air foils to prevent galloping of conductor spans during high wind events	Goal 3/Objective 2 Goal 3/Objective 3	Dependent on Additional Funding	Low Cost Low Benefit Score 3			
Improve inspection for discovering latent failures	Goal 1/Objective 2 Goal 3/Objective 1 Goal 3/Objective 2	Completed as Funding Allows	Medium Cost High Benefit Score: 8			
Install Load Control Devices	Goal 3/Objective 1	Completed as Funding Allows	High Cost Low Benefit Score: 1			

Table 1.30 Prioritized Mitigation Actions for Southwest Electric Cooperative – Tier 2					
Tier 2					
Action item:	Goal/Objective	Timeframe for completion	Cost-benefit Score		
Research and develop plans for streamlined communications for outage events resulting from natural hazards	Goal 2/Objective 1 Goal 3/Objective 1	Ongoing Events	Low Cost Medium Benefit Score: 6		
Ensure that critical and vulnerable facilities served are provide outreach and education on best practices for generation use alternate wiring, and transfer switching that are compatible with standard specifications and design and power transmission delivery	Goal 2/Objective 1 Goal 3/Objective 1	Complete as Funding Allows	Medium Costs Low Benefit Score 2		
Develop an automated outage reporting portal for emergency managers and public safety officials to improve communication and improve response capability to restore outages	Goal 3/Objective 2	Dependent on Additional Funding	Medium Cost Low Benefit Score: 2		
Coordinate with local emergency managers to be included in emergency stakeholder groups and exercise participation	Goal 2/Objective 1	Completed as Funding Allows	Low Cost Low Benefit Score: 3		
Create and keep a contact list available of important community and emergency management personnel	Goal 2/Objective 1	Ongoing Effort	Low Cost Medium Benefit Score: 6		
Provide safety and reporting information to the general public through company websites, social media, local newspapers, presentations and publications	Goal 2/Objective 1 Goal 2/Objective 2	Ongoing Effort	Low Cost High Benefit Score: 9		

Table 1.31 Prioritized Mitigation Actions for Southwest Electric Cooperative – Tier 3						
Tier 3						
Action item:	Goal/Objective	Timeframe for completion	Cost-benefit			
Develop improved data management	Goal 1/Objective 2	Dependent on	Medium Cost			
systems to track property damages and	Goal 3/Objective 1	Additional Funding	Low Benefit			
outage due to natural hazards	Goal 3/Objective 2		Score: 2			
Develop more robust data management	Goal 1/Objective 2	Completed as	Medium Costs			
systems to monitor and record outages	Goal 3/Objective 1	Funding Allows	Medium Benefits			
and damages directly related to natural	Goal 3/Objective 2		Score: 5			
hazards						
Review existing easement requirements	Goal 1/Objective 1	Ongoing Effort	Low Cost			
and laws	Goal 1/Objective 2		Medium Benefit			
	Goal 3/Objective 1		Score: 6			
Enforce existing easements and expand	Goal 1/Objective 1	Ongoing Effort	High Cost			
inferior easements through cooperative	Goal 1/Objective 2		Medium Benefit			
efforts and eminent domain	Goal 3/Objective 1		Score: 4			
Collect GPS data and attribute	Goal 1/Objective 2	Ongoing Effort	Medium Cost			
information for functionality and code	Goal 3/Objective 1		Medium Benefit			
standards for components of existing	Goal 3/Objective 2		Score: 5			
infrastructure						

#### Section 7 – Plan Implementation and Maintenance

#### Plan incorporation

The goals, objectives, and actions of the previous section identify both ongoing efforts at mitigation and potential methods for expanding efforts. The plan is in the process of being reviewed by the Board of Directors as part of the company's operations policy. This mitigation plan necessitates involvement from every SWEC employment level as the organization strives to ensure quality service to their customers.

#### Other Local Planning Mechanisms

Beyond the SWEC plan, few planning mechanisms exist at the local level. The Missouri counties of Greene, Webster, Benton and St. Clair each have a FEMA-approved Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan in place. County emergency management directors have Local Emergency Operations Plans which seek to mitigate the same hazards for residents. These same counties are also included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as well as a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). SWEC's plan can be easily incorporated into these local plans and allow for coordination across agencies in the event of an emergency.

SWEC is located within the rural portions of nine third-class counties which are prohibited from enforcing building codes and zoning by the state of Missouri. Greene and Camden counties are first-class counties have planning and zoning as well as comprehensive plans in place. SWEC does not provide service to any municipality within these counties. The only opportunity for coordinating the plan with Comprehensive Plans, Capital Improvement plans and Building Codes exist in only two counties of service.

#### Plan Maintenance

Southwest will conform to the requirements established by the Association of Missouri Electric Cooperatives (AMEC) for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the plan.

#### Continued Public Involvement Opportunities

Southwest will conform to the requirements established by the Association of Missouri Electric Cooperatives (AMEC) for continued public involvement. Opportunities for public comment will continue to be offered through various media outlets, the cooperative's website, and the physical office of SWEC.