Section 5: Capability Assessment

This section discusses the capability of the Eno-Haw Region to implement hazard mitigation activities. It consists of the following four subsections:

5.1 Overview
5.2 Conducting the Capability Assessment
5.3 Capability Assessment Findings
5.4 Conclusions on Local Capability

5.1 Overview

The purpose of conducting a *Capability Assessment* is to determine the ability of a local jurisdiction to implement a comprehensive *Mitigation Strategy*, and to identify potential opportunities for establishing or enhancing specific mitigation policies, programs, or projects. As in any planning process, it is important to try to establish which goals and actions are feasible, based on an understanding of the organizational capacity of those agencies or departments tasked with their implementation. A *Capability Assessment* helps to determine which mitigation actions are practical and likely to be implemented over time given a local government's planning and regulatory framework, level of administrative and technical support, amount of fiscal resources, and current political climate.

A *Capability Assessment* has two primary components: (1) an inventory of a local jurisdiction's relevant plans, ordinances, and programs already in place; and (2) an analysis of its capacity to carry them out. Careful examination of local capabilities will detect any existing gaps, shortfalls, or weaknesses with ongoing government activities that could hinder proposed mitigation activities and possibly exacerbate community hazard vulnerability. A *Capability Assessment* also highlights the positive mitigation measures already in place or being implemented at the local government level, which should continue to be supported and enhanced through future mitigation efforts.

The *Capability Assessment* completed for the Eno-Haw Region serves as a critical planning step and an integral part of the foundation for designing an effective *Mitigation Strategy*. Coupled with the *Risk Assessment*, the *Capability Assessment* helps identify and target meaningful mitigation actions for incorporation into the *Mitigation Strategy* portion of the Plan. It not only helps establish the goals for the Region to pursue under this Plan, but also ensures that those goals are realistically achievable under given local conditions.

5.2 Conducting the Capability Assessment

In order to facilitate the inventory and analysis of local government capabilities within the Eno-Haw counties, a detailed *Local Capability Assessment Survey* was distributed to members of the Eno-Haw Hazard Mitigation Planning Team (HMPT) at the second planning committee meeting. The survey questionnaire requested information on a variety of "capability indicators" such as existing local plans, policies, programs, or ordinances that contribute to and/or hinder the Region's ability to implement hazard mitigation actions. Other indicators included information related to the Region's fiscal, administrative, and technical capabilities, such as access to local budgetary and personnel resources for mitigation purposes, as well as any existing education and outreach programs that can be used to promote mitigation. Survey respondents were also asked to comment

on the current political climate with respect to hazard mitigation, an important consideration for any local planning or decision making process.

At a minimum, the survey results provide an extensive and consolidated inventory of existing local plans, ordinances, programs, and resources in place or under development, in addition to their overall effect on hazard loss reduction. In completing the survey, local officials were also required to conduct a self assessment of their jurisdiction's specific capabilities. The survey instrument thereby not only helps accurately assess the degree of local capability, but it also serves as a good source of introspection for counties and local jurisdictions that want to improve their capabilities as identified gaps, weaknesses, or conflicts can be recast as opportunities for specific actions to be proposed as part of the *Mitigation Strategy*.

The information provided in response to the survey questionnaire was incorporated into a database for further analysis. A general scoring methodology was then applied to quantify each jurisdiction's overall capability. According to the scoring system, each capability indicator was assigned a point value based on its relevance to hazard mitigation. Additional points were added based on the jurisdiction's self assessment of their own planning and regulatory capability, administrative and technical capability, fiscal capability, education and outreach capability, and political capability.

Using this scoring methodology, a total score and an overall capability rating of "High," "Moderate," or "Limited" could be determined according to the total number of points received. These classifications are designed to provide nothing more than a general assessment of local government capability. In combination with the narrative responses provided by local officials, the results of this *Capability Assessment* provide critical information for developing an effective and meaningful mitigation strategy.

5.3 Capability Assessment Findings

The findings of the *Capability Assessment* are summarized in this Plan to provide insight into the relevant capacity of the Eno-Haw Region to implement hazard mitigation activities. All information is based upon the input provided by local government officials through the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* and during meetings of the HMPT.

5.3.1 Planning and Regulatory Capability

Planning and regulatory capability is based on the implementation of plans, ordinances, and programs that demonstrate a local jurisdiction's commitment to guiding and managing growth, development, and redevelopment in a responsible manner, while maintaining the general welfare of the community. It includes emergency response and mitigation planning, comprehensive land use planning, and transportation planning, in addition to the enforcement of zoning or subdivision ordinances and building codes that regulate how land is developed and structures are built, as well as protecting environmental, historic, and cultural resources in the community. Although some conflicts can arise, these planning initiatives generally present significant opportunities to integrate hazard mitigation principles and practices into the local decision making process.

This assessment is designed to provide a general overview of the key planning and regulatory tools or programs in place or under development for the Eno-Haw Region, along with their potential effect on loss reduction. This information will help identify opportunities to address existing gaps,

weaknesses, or conflicts with other initiatives in addition to integrating the implementation of this Plan with existing planning mechanisms where appropriate.

Table 5.1 provides a summary of the relevant local plans, ordinances, and programs already in place or under development for the Eno-Haw Region. A checkmark (✓) indicates that the given item is currently in place and being implemented. An asterisk (*) indicates that the given item is currently being developed for future implementation. Each of these local plans, ordinances, and programs should be considered available mechanisms for incorporating the requirements of the Eno-Haw Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Table 5.1: Relevant Plans, Ordinances, and Programs

Jurisdiction	Hazard Mitigation Plan	Comprehensive Land Use Plan	Floodplain Management Plan	Open Space Management Plan	Stormwater Management Plan	Emergency Operations Plan	SARA Title III Plan	Radiological Emergency Plan	Continuity of Operations Plan	Evacuation Plan	Disaster Recovery Plan	Capital Improvements Plan	Economic Development Plan	Historic Preservation Plan	Transportation Plan	Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	Zoning Ordinance	Subdivision Ordinance	Site Plan Review Requirements	Unified Development Ordinance	Post-Disaster Redevelopment Ordinance	Building Code	Fire Code	Community Wildfire Protection Plan	National Flood Insurance Program	Community Rating System
Alamance County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Alamance	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	*	*	*	*	*	✓	*	✓	*	*	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	
Burlington	✓	*				✓	✓	*	*	*	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓		*			✓		✓	
Elon	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	✓	✓	✓	*			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Graham	✓	✓		✓	✓							*		✓	✓	✓				✓		✓	✓		✓	
Green Level	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	*	*	*	✓	✓	*	*	*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Haw River	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	✓	*	*	*		✓	✓	✓	✓	*	*	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Mebane	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Ossipee	✓	*				✓	✓	*	✓	✓	✓						✓	✓		*		✓	✓	✓		
Swepsonville	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	✓	*	*	*		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Orange County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	*	*		*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Carrboro	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	*
Chapel Hill	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	
Hillsborough	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	*	*	✓	*	*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	✓	✓	*	✓	
Durham County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Durham	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey.

A more detailed discussion on the Region's planning and regulatory capability follows, along with the incorporation of additional information based on the narrative comments provided by local officials in response to the survey questionnaire.

5.3.1.1 Emergency Management

Hazard mitigation is widely recognized as one of the four primary phases of emergency management. The three other phases are preparedness, response, and recovery. In reality each phase is interconnected with hazard mitigation, as **Figure 5.1** suggests. Opportunities to reduce potential losses through mitigation practices are most often implemented before a disaster event, such as elevation of flood-prone structures or through the continuous enforcement of policies that prevent and regulate development that is vulnerable to hazards because of its location, design, or other characteristics. Mitigation opportunities can also be identified during immediate preparedness or response activities (such as installing storm shutters in advance of a hurricane), and in many instances during the long-term recovery and redevelopment process following a disaster event.

Figure 5.1: The Four Phases of Emergency Management

Planning for each phase is a critical part of a comprehensive emergency management program and a key to the successful implementation of hazard mitigation actions. As a result, the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* asked several questions across a range of emergency management plans in order to assess the Eno-Haw Region's willingness to plan and their level of technical planning proficiency.

Hazard Mitigation Plan

A hazard mitigation plan represents a community's blueprint for how it intends to reduce the impact of natural, and in some cases human-caused, hazards on people and the built environment. The essential elements of a hazard mitigation plan include a risk assessment, capability assessment, and mitigation strategy.

- All of the jurisdictions participating in this regional planning effort have previously been covered by their county's multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan.

Disaster Recovery Plan
A disaster recovery plan serves to guide the physical, social, environmental, and economic recovery and reconstruction process following a disaster event. In many instances, hazard mitigation principles and practices are incorporated into local disaster recovery plans with the intent of capitalizing on opportunities to break the cycle of repetitive disaster losses. Disaster recovery plans can also lead to the preparation of disaster redevelopment policies and ordinances to be enacted following a hazard event.

- 14 of the participating jurisdictions have a disaster recovery plan either in place or under development. (10 jurisdictions have one in place; 4 have one under development.)

Emergency Operations Plan
An emergency operations plan outlines responsibilities and the means by which resources are deployed during and following an emergency or disaster.

- 14 of the participating jurisdictions have an emergency operations plan in place.

Continuity of Operations Plan
A continuity of operations plan establishes a chain of command, line of succession, and plans for backup or alternate emergency facilities in case of an extreme emergency or disaster event.

- 13 of the participating jurisdictions have a continuity of operations plan either in place or under development. (9 jurisdictions have one in place; 4 have one under development.)

5.3.1.2 General Planning

The implementation of hazard mitigation activities often involves agencies and individuals beyond the emergency management profession. Stakeholders may include local planners, public works officials, economic development specialists, and others. In many instances, concurrent local planning efforts will help to achieve or complement hazard mitigation goals, even though they are not designed as such. Therefore, the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* also asked questions regarding general planning capabilities and the degree to which hazard mitigation is integrated into other ongoing planning efforts in the Eno-Haw Region.

Comprehensive/General Plan
A comprehensive land use plan, or general plan, establishes the overall vision for what a community wants to be and serves as a guide for future governmental decision making. Typically a comprehensive plan contains sections on demographic conditions, land use, transportation elements, and community facilities. Given the broad nature of the plan and its regulatory standing in many communities, the integration of hazard mitigation measures into the comprehensive plan can enhance the likelihood of achieving risk reduction goals, objectives, and actions.

- 14 of the participating jurisdictions have a comprehensive land use plan either in place or under development (12 have one in place; 2 have one under development.)

Capital Improvements Plan
A capital improvements plan guides the scheduling of spending on public improvements. A capital improvements plan can serve as an important mechanism for guiding future development away

from identified hazard areas. Limiting public spending in hazardous areas is one of the most effective long-term mitigation actions available to local governments.

- 13 of the participating jurisdictions have a capital improvements plan in place or under development.

Historic Preservation Plan
A historic preservation plan is intended to preserve historic structures or districts within a community. An often overlooked aspect of the historic preservation plan is the assessment of buildings and sites located in areas subject to natural hazards, and the identification of ways to reduce future damages. This may involve retrofitting or relocation techniques that account for the need to protect buildings that do not meet current building standards, or are within a historic district that cannot easily be relocated out of harm's way.

- 12 of the participating jurisdictions have an historic preservation plan in place or under development.

Zoning Ordinance
Zoning represents the primary means by which land use is controlled by local governments. As part of a community's police power, zoning is used to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of those in a given jurisdiction that maintains zoning authority. A zoning ordinance is the mechanism through which zoning is typically implemented. Since zoning regulations enable municipal governments to limit the type and density of development, a zoning ordinance can serve as a powerful tool when applied in identified hazard areas.

- 13 of the participating jurisdictions have a zoning ordinance in place or under development.

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

- 14 of the participating jurisdictions have a subdivision ordinance in place or under development.

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

- 13 of the participating jurisdictions have building codes in place.

The adoption and enforcement of building codes by local jurisdictions is routinely assessed through the Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS) program, developed by the Insurance Services Office, Inc. (ISO). In North Carolina, the North Carolina Department of Insurance assesses the building codes in effect in a particular community and how the community enforces its building codes, with special emphasis on mitigation of losses from natural hazards. The results of BCEGS assessments are routinely provided to ISO's member private insurance companies, which in turn

may offer ratings credits for new buildings constructed in communities with strong BCEGS classifications. The concept is that communities with well-enforced, up-to-date codes should experience fewer disaster-related losses, and as a result should have lower insurance rates.

In conducting the assessment, ISO collects information related to personnel qualification and continuing education, as well as number of inspections performed per day. This type of information combined with local building codes is used to determine a grade for that jurisdiction. The grades range from 1 to 10, with a BCEGS grade of 1 representing exemplary commitment to building code enforcement, and a grade of 10 indicating less than minimum recognized protection.

5.3.1.3 Floodplain Management

Flooding represents the greatest natural hazard facing the nation. At the same time, the tools available to reduce the impacts associated with flooding are among the most developed when compared to other hazard-specific mitigation techniques. In addition to approaches that cut across hazards such as education, outreach, and the training of local officials, the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) contains specific regulatory measures that enable government officials to determine where and how growth occurs relative to flood hazards. Participation in the NFIP is voluntary for local governments; however, program participation is strongly encouraged by FEMA as a first step for implementing and sustaining an effective hazard mitigation program. It is therefore used as part of this *Capability Assessment* as a key indicator for measuring local capability.

In order for a county or municipality to participate in the NFIP, they must adopt a local flood damage prevention ordinance that requires jurisdictions to follow established minimum building standards in the floodplain. These standards require that all new buildings and substantial improvements to existing buildings will be protected from damage by a 100-year flood event, and that new development in the floodplain will not exacerbate existing flood problems or increase damage to other properties.

A key service provided by the NFIP is the mapping of identified flood hazard areas. Once completed, the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) are used to assess flood hazard risk, regulate construction practices, and set flood insurance rates. FIRMs are an important source of information to educate residents, government officials, and the private sector about the likelihood of flooding in their community.

Table 5.2 provides NFIP policy and claim information for each participating jurisdiction in the Eno-Haw Region. The Town of Ossipee is not currently participating in the NFIP because there is very minimal Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) identified within its boundary, and there is no development in or near that area.

Table 5.2: NFIP Policy and Claim Information

Jurisdiction	Date Joined NFIP	Current Effective Map Date	NFIP Policies In Force	Total Premiums	Insurance In Force	Closed Paid Losses	Total Payments
Alamance County	12/01/81	01/02/08	50	$73,394	$13,224,100	29	$824,802
Alamance	08/15/90	01/02/08	2	$874	$700,000	0	$0
Burlington	04/01/81	01/02/08	145	$126,096	$32,199,800	26	$251,614
Elon	06/05/89	01/02/08	24	$14,052	$5,075,300	2	$12,790
Graham	11/19/80	01/02/08	43	$25,007	$8,339,500	8	$63,753
Green Level	12/22/98	01/02/08	0	$0	$0	0	$0
Haw River	11/05/80	01/02/08	6	$6,597	$1,278,100	1	$60,000
Mebane	11/05/80	01/02/08	44	$22,905	$10,948,100	2	$4,622
Ossipee	-	-	0	$0	$0	0	$0
Swepsonville	12/01/81	01/02/08	3	$1,467	$531,400	0	$0
Subtotal Alamance	-	-	*317*	*$270,392*	*$72,296,300*	*68*	*$1,217,581*
Orange County	03/16/81	05/16/08	85	$38,931	$22,903,400	8	$179,620
Carrboro	06/30/76	05/16/08	106	$56,325	$27,308,100	7	$62,338
Chapel Hill	04/17/78	05/16/08	644	$567,744	$141,166,700	170	$7,713,132
Hillsborough	05/15/80	05/16/08	16	$13,731	$3,826,500	3	$9,032
Subtotal Orange	-	-	*851*	*$676,731*	*$195,204,700*	*188*	*$7,964,122*
Durham County	02/15/79	05/16/08	223	$146,331	$54,636,000	40	$505,362
Durham	01/03/79	05/16/08	1,129	$936,955	$256,244,000	123	$1,568,822
Subtotal Durham	-	-	*1,352*	*$1,083,286*	*$310,880,000*	*163*	*$2,074,184*
TOTAL ENO-HAW	**-**	**-**	**2,520**	**$2,030,409**	**$578,381,000**	**419**	**$11,255,887**

Source: FEMA NFIP Policy Statistics (10/31/2014).

Community Rating System

An additional indicator of floodplain management capability is the active participation of local jurisdictions in the Community Rating System (CRS). The CRS is an incentive-based program that encourages counties and municipalities to undertake defined flood mitigation activities that go beyond the minimum requirements of the NFIP, adding extra local measures to provide protection from flooding. All of the 18 creditable CRS mitigation activities are assigned a range of point values. As points are accumulated and reach identified thresholds, communities can apply for an improved CRS class. Class ratings, which range from 10 to 1, are tied to flood insurance premium reductions as shown in **Table 5.3**. As class ratings improve (the lower the number, the better), the percent reduction in flood insurance premiums for NFIP policyholders in that community increases.

Table 5.3: CRS Premium Discounts, By Class

CRS Class	Premium Reduction
1	45%
2	40%
3	35%
4	30%
5	25%
6	20%
7	15%
8	10%
9	5%
10	0%

Source: NFIP Community Rating System.

Community participation in the CRS is voluntary. Any community that is in full compliance with the rules and regulations of the NFIP may apply to FEMA for a CRS classification better than class 10. The CRS application process has been greatly simplified over the past several years, based on community comments intended to make the CRS more user friendly, and extensive technical assistance available for communities who request it.

- Orange County, Durham County, and the City of Durham participate in the CRS, each with a class of 8.

Floodplain Management Plan
A floodplain management plan (or a flood mitigation plan) provides a framework for action regarding corrective and preventative measures to reduce flood-related impacts.

- 12 of the participating jurisdictions have a floodplain management plan in place.

Open Space Management Plan
An open space management plan is designed to preserve, protect, and restore largely undeveloped lands in their natural state, and to expand or connect areas in the public domain such as parks, greenways, and other outdoor recreation areas. In many instances open space management practices are consistent with the goals of reducing hazard losses, such as the preservation of wetlands or other flood-prone areas in their natural state in perpetuity.

- 8 of the participating jurisdictions have an open space management plan in place.

Stormwater Management Plan
A stormwater management plan is designed to address flooding associated with stormwater runoff. The stormwater management plan is typically focused on design and construction measures that are intended to reduce the impact of more frequently occurring minor urban flooding.

- 13 of the participating jurisdictions have a stormwater management plan in place.

5.3.2 Administrative and Technical Capability

The ability of a local government to develop and implement mitigation projects, policies, and programs is directly tied to its ability to direct staff time and resources for that purpose. Administrative capability can be evaluated by determining how mitigation-related activities are assigned to local departments and if there are adequate personnel resources to complete these activities. The degree of intergovernmental coordination among departments will also affect administrative capability for the implementation and success of proposed mitigation activities.

Technical capability can generally be evaluated by assessing the level of knowledge and technical expertise of local government employees, such as personnel skilled in using geographic information systems (GIS) to analyze and assess community hazard vulnerability. The *Local Capability Assessment Survey* was used to capture information on administrative and technical capability through the identification of available staff and personnel resources.

Table 5.4 provides a summary of the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* results for the Eno-Haw Region with regard to relevant staff and personnel resources. A checkmark (✓) indicates the presence of a staff member(s) in that jurisdiction with the specified knowledge or skill.

Table 5.4: Relevant Staff/Personnel Resources

Jurisdiction	Planners with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Engineers or professionals trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural and/or human-caused hazards	Building Official	Emergency manager	Floodplain manager	Land surveyors	Scientist familiar with the hazards of the community	Staff with education or expertise to assess the community's vulnerability to hazards	Personnel skilled in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and/or HAZUS	Resource development staff or grant writers	Maintenance programs to reduce risk	Warning systems/services	Mutual Aid Agreements
Alamance County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Alamance	✓					✓				✓		✓	✓	
Burlington	✓		✓		✓	✓			✓	✓			✓	
Elon	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓		✓
Graham	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓
Green Level	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Haw River	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓					✓		✓
Mebane	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓					✓	✓	✓
Ossipee					✓								✓	✓
Swepsonville						✓							✓	✓
Orange County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓			✓	✓
Carrboro	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chapel Hill	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hillsborough	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Durham County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Durham	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey.

5.3.3 Fiscal Capability

The ability of a local government to take action is often closely associated with the amount of money available to implement policies and projects. This may take the form of outside grant funding awards or locally based revenue and financing. The costs associated with mitigation policy and project implementation vary widely. In some cases, policies are tied primarily to staff time or administrative costs associated with the creation and monitoring of a given program. In other cases, direct expenses are linked to an actual project such as the acquisition of flood-prone houses, which can require a substantial commitment from local, state, and federal funding sources.

The *Local Capability Assessment Survey* was used to capture information on the Region's fiscal capability through the identification of locally available financial resources.

Table 5.5 provides a summary of the results for the Eno-Haw Region with regard to relevant fiscal resources. A checkmark (✓) indicates that the given fiscal resource is locally available for hazard mitigation purposes (including match funds for state and federal mitigation grant funds).

Table 5.5: Relevant Fiscal Resources

Jurisdiction	Capital Improvement Programming	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	Special Purpose Taxes	Gas/Electric Utility Fees	Water/Sewer Fees	Stormwater Utility Fees	Development Impact Fees	General Obligation Bonds	Revenue Bonds	Special Tax Bonds	Other
Alamance County	✓	✓						✓			
Alamance	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Burlington											
Elon	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓		
Graham	✓				✓	✓					
Green Level	✓				✓	✓					
Haw River	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Mebane	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Ossipee			✓		✓						
Swepsonville	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Orange County	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓			
Carrboro	✓							✓			
Chapel Hill	✓	✓				✓		✓	✓		
Hillsborough	✓		✓		✓	✓					✓
Durham County	✓				✓	✓			✓		
Durham	✓				✓	✓			✓		

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey.

5.3.4 Education and Outreach Capability

This type of local capability refers to education and outreach programs and methods already in place that could be used to implement mitigation activities and communicate hazard-related information. Examples include natural disaster or safety related school programs; participation in community programs such as Firewise or StormReady; and activities conducted as part of hazard awareness campaigns such as a Tornado Awareness Month.

Table 5.6 provides a summary of the results for the Eno-Haw Region with regard to relevant education and outreach resources. A checkmark (✓) indicates that the given resource is locally available for hazard mitigation purposes.

Table 5.6: Education and Outreach Resources

Jurisdiction	Local citizen groups or non-profit organizations focused on environmental protection, emergency preparedness, access and functional needs populations, etc.	Ongoing public education or information program (e.g., responsible water use, fire safety, household preparedness, environmental education)	Natural disaster or safety related school programs	StormReady certification	Firewise Communities certification	Public-private partnership initiatives addressing disaster-related issues	Other
Alamance County	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Alamance		✓					
Burlington				✓			
Elon		✓	✓				
Graham		✓					
Green Level							
Haw River		✓					
Mebane		✓					
Ossipee							
Swepsonville		✓					
Orange County	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Carrboro	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Chapel Hill	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Hillsborough	✓	✓	✓				
Durham County	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Durham	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey.

5.3.5 Political Capability

One of the most difficult capabilities to evaluate involves the political will of a jurisdiction to enact meaningful policies and projects designed to reduce the impact of future hazard events. Hazard mitigation may not be a local priority, or may conflict with or be seen as an impediment to other goals of the community, such as growth and economic development. Therefore the local political climate must be considered in designing mitigation strategies, as it could be the most difficult hurdle to overcome in accomplishing their adoption and implementation.

The *Local Capability Assessment Survey* was used to capture information on political capability of the Eno-Haw Region. Survey respondents were asked to identify some general examples of local political capability, such as guiding development away from identified hazard areas, restricting public investments or capital improvements within hazard areas, or enforcing local development standards that go beyond minimum state or federal requirements (e.g., building codes, floodplain management, etc.). The comments provided by the participating jurisdictions are listed below:

- The Alamance County Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC), in conjunction with various businesses and industries, works with our local Board of Directors and Alamance County Commissioners to enact policies/procedures and ordinances that may go beyond State requirements (Chemical Planner position, assessing HazMat fees in the County to businesses who store, manufacture, or produce hazardous chemicals, wastes, etc.).
- The Town of Carrboro has participated in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) for nearly four decades. The Town has an outstanding commitment to development management and environmental protection; regulatory and policy measures exceed minimum state and federal requirements related to use of stream buffers and floodplains, including building construction. Regulations and policies have been framed to maximize the suitability of development in relation to natural constraints, minimize environmental degradation and reduce long-term costs and impacts of development on natural systems and owners of real property. The Town has invested heavily in the establishment and maintenance of base data that allows clear communication between residents, property owners, public officials, and the development community. The Town has pursued grant funds to provide relief in locations where nonconforming development preceded the establishment of more stringent flood protection measures, has requested special flood studies beyond the limits of those required by FEMA, and has carried out its own engineering investigations, outreach, and analyses to identify solutions to existing areas of concern.[1]
- The Town of Chapel Hill has significant political capability to enact policies and programs to reduce community hazards. Examples include considerations in the Unified Development Ordinance to include riparian buffers and storm water collection. In addition the fire prevention takes an aggressive approach in mitigating and preventing hazards.
- Along with the adoption of various planning and zoning ordinances, the Hillsborough Town Commissioners have seen fit to adopt a Fire Prevention Ordinance that includes a Hazardous Materials Control provision and a mandatory Fire Sprinkler provision.

[1] See https://carrboro.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=1492083&GUID=0C706CC1-1998-45D6-8C8C-2A3C1E537E41&Options=ID|Text|&Search=flooding and https://carrboro.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=1903520&GUID=69FDA95E-0247-41A3-8167-A3A4D2C6CA6B&Options=ID|Text|&Search=flooding for examples.

5.3.6 Local Self Assessment

In addition to the inventory and analysis of specific local capabilities, the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* asked counties and local jurisdictions within the Eno-Haw Region to conduct a self assessment of their perceived capability to implement hazard mitigation activities. As part of this process, local officials were encouraged to consider the barriers to implementing proposed mitigation strategies in addition to the mechanisms that could enhance or further such strategies. In response to the survey questionnaire, county officials classified each of the aforementioned capabilities as either "limited," "moderate," or "high."

Table 5.7 summarizes the results of the self assessment for the Eno-Haw Region.

Table 5.7: Self Assessment of Capability

Jurisdiction	Plans, Ordinances, Codes and Programs	Administrative and Technical Capability	Fiscal Capability	Education and Outreach Capability	Political Capability	OVERALL CAPABILITY
Alamance County	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE
Alamance	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH
Burlington	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE
Elon	LIMITED	LIMITED	LIMITED	LIMITED	MODERATE	LIMITED
Graham	MODERATE	MODERATE	LIMITED	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE
Green Level	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	LIMITED	LIMITED	MODERATE
Haw River	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE
Mebane	LIMITED	LIMITED	LIMITED	LIMITED	LIMITED	LIMITED
Ossipee						
Swepsonville	LIMITED	MODERATE	MODERATE	LIMITED	MODERATE	MODERATE
Orange County	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE
Carrboro	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH
Chapel Hill	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH
Hillsborough	HIGH	MODERATE	LIMITED	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE
Durham County	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE
Durham	HIGH	HIGH	MODERATE	HIGH	MODERATE	MODERATE

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey.

5.4 Conclusions on Local Capability

In order to form meaningful conclusions on the assessment of local capability, a scoring system was designed and applied to the results of the *Local Capability Assessment Survey*. This approach, further described below, assesses the level of capability for each jurisdiction in the Eno-Haw Region. It is important to note that the score received by each participating jurisdiction is not intended to compare one to the other. Rather, the scoring system is intended to assist each jurisdiction to develop mitigation actions that reflect their abilities and help to identify areas that can be improved through the adoption of specific mitigation actions addressing these weaknesses.

Points System for Capability Ranking

Scoring:

0-24 points = Limited overall capability
25-55 points = Moderate overall capability
56-103 points = High overall capability

I. Planning and Regulatory Capability (Up to 55 points)

Yes=3 points Under Development or Under County Jurisdiction=1 No=0 points

- Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Comprehensive Land Use Plan
- Floodplain Management Plan
- Participate in the NFIP
- Participate in CRS Program
- BCEGS Grade of 1 to 5

Yes=2 points Under Development or County Jurisdiction=1 No=0 points

- Open Space Management / Parks & Rec. Plan
- Stormwater Management Plan
- Emergency Operations Plan
- SARA Title III
- Radiological Emergency Plan
- Continuity of Operations Plan
- Evacuation Plan
- Disaster Recovery Plan
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance
- Post-disaster Redevelopment/Recovery Ordinance
- Community Wildfire Protection Plan
- BCEGS Grade of 6 to 9

Yes=1 point No=0 points

- Capital Improvements Plan
- Economic Development Plan
- Historic Preservation Plan
- Transportation Plan
- Zoning Ordinance
- Subdivision Ordinance
- Site Plan Review Requirements
- Unified Development Ordinance
- Building Code
- Fire Code
- Participate in NFIP Program

II. Administrative and Technical Capability (Up to 18 points)

Yes=2 points No=0 points

- Planners with knowledge of land development and land management practices
- Engineers or professionals trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure
- Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural and/or human-caused hazards
- Emergency manager
- Floodplain manager

Yes=1 point No=0 points

- Land surveyors
- Scientist familiar with the hazards of the community
- Staff with education or expertise to assess the community's vulnerability to hazards
- Personnel skilled in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and/or HAZUS
- Resource development staff or grant writers
- Maintenance programs to reduce risk
- Warning systems/services
- Mutual Aid Agreements

III. Fiscal Capability (Up to 11 points)

Yes=1 point No=0 points

- Capital Improvement Programming
- Community Development Block Grants
- Special Purpose Taxes
- Gas / Electric Utility Fees
- Water / Sewer Fees
- Stormwater Utility Fees
- Development Impact Fees
- General Obligation Bonds
- Revenue Bonds
- Special Tax Bonds
- Other

IV. Education and Outreach Capability (Up to 7 points)

Yes=1 point No=0 points

- Local citizen groups or non-profit organizations focused on environmental protection, emergency preparedness, access and functional needs populations, etc.
- Ongoing public education or information program (e.g., responsible water use, fire safety, household preparedness, environmental education)
- Natural disaster or safety related school programs
- StormReady certification
- Firewise Communities certification
- Public-private partnership initiatives addressing disaster-related issues
- Other

V. Self-Assessment of Overall Capability (Up to 12 points)

High=2 points Moderate=1 points Low=0 points (Self-ranked by jurisdiction)

- Technical Capability
- Fiscal Capability
- Administrative Capability
- Education and Outreach Capability
- Political Capability
- Overall Capability

Note: This methodology is based on best available information. If a jurisdiction did not provide information on one of the above items, a point value of zero (0) was assigned for that item.

Table 5.8 shows the results of the *Capability Assessment* using the designed scoring methodology. The capability score is based solely on the information provided by local officials in response to the *Local Capability Assessment Survey*. According to the assessment, the average local capability score for all responding jurisdictions is 59, which falls into the "High" capability ranking.

Table 5.8: Capability Assessment Results

Jurisdiction	Overall Capability Score	Overall Capability Rating
Alamance County	69	HIGH
Alamance	58	HIGH
Burlington	40	MODERATE
Elon	54	MODERATE
Graham	41	MODERATE
Green Level	62	HIGH
Haw River	66	HIGH
Mebane	60	HIGH
Ossipee	26	LIMITED
Swepsonville	57	HIGH
Orange County	62	HIGH
Carrboro	63	HIGH
Chapel Hill	77	HIGH
Hillsborough	66	HIGH
Durham County	80	HIGH
Durham	80	HIGH

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey.

As previously discussed, one of the reasons for conducting a *Capability Assessment* is to examine local capabilities to detect any existing gaps or weaknesses within ongoing government activities that could hinder proposed mitigation activities and possibly exacerbate community hazard vulnerability. These gaps or weaknesses have been identified, for each jurisdiction, in the tables found throughout this section. The participating jurisdictions used the *Capability Assessment* as part of the basis for the mitigation actions that are identified in Section 7; therefore, each jurisdiction addresses their ability to expand on and improve their existing capabilities through the identification of their mitigation actions.

This page intentionally left blank.