Section 2: Planning Process

This section of the Plan describes the mitigation planning process undertaken by the Eno-Haw Region in preparing the Hazard Mitigation Plan. It consists of the following eight subsections:

2.1 Overview of Hazard Mitigation Planning
2.2 History of Hazard Mitigation Planning in the Eno-Haw Region
2.3 Preparing the Regional Plan
2.4 Eno-Haw Hazard Mitigation Planning Team
2.5 Meetings and Workshops
2.6 Involving the Public
2.7 Involving Stakeholders
2.8 Documentation of Plan Progress

2.1 Overview of Hazard Mitigation Planning

Local hazard mitigation planning is the process of organizing community resources, identifying and assessing hazard risks, and determining how to best minimize or manage those risks. This process results in a hazard mitigation plan that identifies specific mitigation actions, each designed to achieve short-term planning objectives as well as a long-term community vision. To ensure the functionality of each mitigation action, responsibility is assigned to a specific individual, department, or agency along with a schedule for its implementation. Plan Maintenance Procedures (found in Section 8) are established for the routine monitoring of implementation progress, as well as the evaluation and enhancement of the mitigation plan itself. These Plan Maintenance Procedures ensure that the Plan remains a current, dynamic, and effective planning document over time.

Mitigation planning offers many benefits, including:

- Saving lives and property;
- Saving money;
- Speeding recovery following disasters;
- Reducing future vulnerability through wise development and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction;
- Expediting the receipt of pre-disaster and post-disaster grant funding; and
- Demonstrating a firm commitment to improving community health and safety.

Typically, mitigation planning is described as having the potential to produce long-term and recurring benefits by breaking the repetitive cycle of disaster loss. A core assumption of hazard mitigation is that pre-disaster investments will significantly reduce the demand for post-disaster assistance by lessening the need for emergency response, repair, recovery, and reconstruction. Furthermore, mitigation practices will enable local residents, businesses, and industries to re-establish themselves in the wake of a disaster, getting the community economy back on track more quickly and with less interruption.

The benefits of mitigation planning go beyond solely reducing hazard vulnerability. Measures such as the acquisition or regulation of land in known hazard areas can help achieve multiple community goals, such as preserving open space, maintaining environmental health, and enhancing recreational opportunities. Thus, it is vitally important that any local mitigation planning process be integrated with other concurrent local planning efforts, and any proposed mitigation strategies must take into account other existing community goals or initiatives that will help complement or hinder their future implementation.

2.2 History of Hazard Mitigation Planning in the Eno-Haw Region

Each of the three counties participating in this Plan, along with their incorporated municipal jurisdictions, as well as the Town of Chapel Hill, had a previously approved hazard mitigation plan in place prior to the start of this regional planning effort. The FEMA approval dates for each of these plans, along with a list of their participating municipalities, are listed below.

- *Alamance County Hazard Mitigation Plan* (November 2010)
    - Town of Alamance
    - City of Burlington
    - Town of Elon
    - City of Graham
    - Town of Green Level
    - Town of Haw River
    - City of Mebane
    - Town of Ossipee
    - Town of Swepsonville

- *Orange County Hazard Mitigation Plan* (July 2010)
    - Town of Carrboro
    - Town of Chapel Hill
    - Town of Hillsborough

- *Durham County Hazard Mitigation Plan* (October 2012)
    - City of Durham

- *Town of Chapel Hill Hazard Mitigation Plan* (June 2011)[1]

Each of the plans listed above was developed using the multi-jurisdictional mitigation planning process recommended by FEMA. For this regional plan, all of the jurisdictions listed above have agreed to merge, update, and expand their existing mitigation planning content as part of one new regional format. No new jurisdictions have joined the planning process since the plans above were adopted and all of the jurisdictions that participated in previous planning efforts have agreed to participate in this regional planning effort. The specific process of moving forward with one regional approach is described in more detail in the following subsections.

[1] As previously stated, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill completed a stand-alone hazard mitigation plan in 2006 under a Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) grant from FEMA. This separate study covers 12 natural hazards and is included as an appendix to this Plan for reference.

2.3 Preparing the Regional Plan

Hazard mitigation plans are required by FEMA to be updated every five years in order for the jurisdictions covered under them to remain eligible for federal mitigation and public assistance funding. To simplify and enhance planning efforts for the jurisdictions in the Eno-Haw Region, Alamance, Orange, and Durham counties made the decision to move forward with the creation of the Eno-Haw Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan. This regional approach allows resources to be shared amongst the participating jurisdictions and eases the administrative duties of all of the participants by combining the existing local plans, and the requirements for the five-year plan update, into one consolidated regional planning process.

To help prepare the Eno-Haw Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan, AECOM was hired as a consultant to provide professional mitigation planning services. Per the contractual scope of work, the consultant team followed the mitigation planning process recommended by FEMA and recommendations provided by North Carolina Division of Emergency Management (NCEM) mitigation planning staff. The *Local Mitigation Plan Review Checklist*, found in Appendix B, provides a detailed summary of FEMA's current minimum standards of acceptability for compliance with DMA 2000 and notes the location where each requirement is met within this Plan. These standards are based upon FEMA's Interim Final Rule as published in the Federal Register on February 26, 2002 in Part 201 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The planning team used FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* (released March 2013) for reference as they completed the Plan.

Because each participating jurisdiction had already developed a plan in the past, the combination of the existing plans into one regional plan required the making of some plan update revisions in addition to newly created content. Since this is the first regional mitigation plan amongst the participating jurisdictions, key elements from the previous approved plans are referenced throughout the document (e.g., existing mitigation actions) and required a discussion of changes made. For example, all of the risk assessment elements needed to be updated to include most recent information and any data that was standardized across the regional planning area. It was also necessary to formulate a single set of goals for the region. The *Capability Assessment* (Section 5) includes updated information for all of the participating jurisdictions and the *Mitigation Action Plan* section (Section 7) provides implementation status updates for all of the actions identified in the previous plans.

The process used to prepare this Plan included six major steps that were completed over the course of approximately eight months beginning in August 2014 and ending in March 2015. Each of these planning steps (illustrated in **Figure 2.1**) resulted in critical work products and outcomes that collectively make up the Plan.

Figure 2.1: Mitigation Planning Process for the Eno-Haw Region

2.4 Eno-Haw Hazard Mitigation Planning Team

In order to guide the development of this Plan, the Eno-Haw counties (Alamance County, Orange County, and Durham County) created the Eno-Haw Hazard Mitigation Planning Team (HMPT). This planning team represented a community based committee made up of representatives from various county departments and municipalities and other key stakeholders identified to serve as critical partners in the planning process.

Beginning in August 2014, the planning team members engaged in regular discussions as well as local meetings and planning workshops to discuss and complete tasks associated with preparing the Plan. This working group coordinated on all aspects of plan preparation and provided valuable input to the process. In addition to regular meetings, planning team members routinely communicated and were kept informed through an email distribution list and a project information website (http://www.orangecountync.gov/emergency/Eno-HawRHMP.asp).

Specifically, the tasks assigned to the Eno-Haw Hazard Mitigation Planning Team included:

- Participate in hazard mitigation planning team meetings and workshops (described in more detail in subsection 2.5);
- Provide best available data as required for the *Risk Assessment* portion of the Plan;
- Complete the *Local Capability Assessment Survey, National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Survey,* and *Safe Growth Survey* and provide copies of any mitigation or hazard-related documents for review and incorporation into the Plan;
- Support the development of the *Mitigation Strategy* portion of the Plan, including the design and adoption of a regional vision statement and regional mitigation goal statements;
- Review the existing mitigation actions from each previously adopted plan, provide an update on those previously adopted mitigation actions, and propose new mitigation actions for their department/agency for incorporation into the new regional Plan;
- Review and provide timely comments on all study findings and draft plan deliverables; and
- Support and facilitate the adoption of the Eno-Haw Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Table 2.1 lists the members of the HMPT who were responsible for participating in the development of the Plan. Planning team members are generally listed by jurisdiction in Table 2.1 for ease of organizing and presenting the information but it should be noted that the committee worked extremely well as one regional unit thinking beyond traditional jurisdictional boundaries to focus on the mitigation planning issues and tasks at hand.

Table 2.1: Members of the Eno-Haw Hazard Mitigation Planning Team

Jurisdiction or Agency	Representative	Department, Title, or Role
PROJECT LEAD	**Kirby Saunders**	**Orange County Emergency Management Coordinator**
ALAMANCE COUNTY	**John Payne**	**Alamance County Assistant EM Coordinator**
Town of Alamance	Ben York	Town Clerk
City of Burlington	Roger Manuel	Emergency Management Director
Town of Elon	Sean Tencer	Town Planner
City of Graham	Melissa Guilbeau/Nathan Page	City Planner
Town of Green Level	Quentin McPhatter	Town Administrator
Town of Haw River	Jeff Earp	Town Manager
City of Mebane	David Cheek	City Manager
Town of Ossipee	Richard Overman	Financial Officer
Town of Swepsonville	Raymond Herring	Mayor
ORANGE COUNTY	**Josh Hollingsworth**	**Emergency Management Planner**
Town of Carrboro	Patricia McGuire	Planning Director
Town of Chapel Hill	Matt Sullivan	Emergency Management Coordinator
Town of Hillsborough	Jerry Wagner	Fire Marshal/EM Coordinator
UNC-ChapelHill	Ron Campbell	Emergency Management Coordinator
DURHAM COUNTY	**Mark Schell**	**EM Coordinator/Durham CI/CO**
City of Durham	Stephan Windsor	CRS Coordinator
OTHER STAKEHOLDERS		
State of North Carolina	Ryan Cox	NCEM Mitigation Planning Supervisor
PROJECT CONSULTANTS		
AECOM	Mike Robinson	Senior Mitigation Planner
	William Hague	GIS Analyst

Multi-jurisdictional Participation

The Eno-Haw Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes three counties and 13 incorporated municipalities. To satisfy multi-jurisdictional participation requirements, each county and its participating jurisdictions performed the following tasks:

- Participate in mitigation planning meetings and workshops;
- Complete the *Local Capability Assessment Survey, National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Survey,* and *Safe Growth Survey*;;
- Provide an update on previously adopted mitigation actions and propose new mitigation actions;
- Review drafts of the Eno-Haw Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan; and
- Adopt their updated local *Mitigation Action Plan*.

Jurisdictions that were unable to attend planning team meetings maintained active involvement through email and telephone discussions with the overall project lead (Mr. Kirby Saunders), the

lead county representatives, and the project consultant (AECOM) to provide necessary data, input, and expertise.

Each jurisdiction participated in the planning process and each jurisdiction has developed and adopted a local *Mitigation Action Plan* unique to that jurisdiction which will be updated over time per the *Plan Maintenance Procedures* described in Section 8.

2.5 Meetings and Workshops

The preparation of this Plan required a series of meetings and workshops for facilitating discussion, gaining consensus, and initiating data collection efforts with local government staff, community officials, and other identified stakeholders. More importantly, the meetings and workshops prompted continuous input and feedback from relevant participants throughout the drafting stages of the Plan.

The following is a summary of the key meetings and workshops held by the HMPT during the development of the Plan. In many cases, routine discussions and additional meetings were held by local staff to accomplish planning tasks specific to their department or agency. For example, completing the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* or seeking approval of specific mitigation actions for their department or agency to undertake and include in their *Mitigation Action Plan*. Public meetings are summarized in subsection 2.6.

HMPT Meeting #1
Project Kickoff (August 11, 2014)
The Project Kickoff meeting was initiated by Kirby Saunders, Orange County Emergency Management Coordinator, and was led by Mike Robinson, CFM (AECOM Mitigation Planner). This meeting consisted of a detailed overview of the project, a review and discussion of the three previous county level mitigation plans and the Town of Chapel Hill plan, an explanation of the process to be followed for updating and integrating the content from the three previous county plans, an open discussion session, and an explanation of next steps.

The meeting began with a brief welcome and opportunity for each of the 23 attendees to introduce themselves to the group. Particular emphasis was placed on identifying what jurisdiction or organization each participant was there to represent. As part of this recognition process, a spreadsheet was passed around for representatives to designate one "Designated Local Jurisdiction Lead" to serve as a primary point of contact for each participating jurisdiction for the duration of the project.

The project overview consisted of an explanation of the purpose of the planning process and the concept of creating a regional hazard mitigation plan to build upon and essentially replace the previously adopted mitigation plans for the planning area. It also covered the geographic scope of the project, the proposed schedule for the project, and a detailed breakdown of the key project tasks. The roles and responsibilities for AECOM, Orange County as the lead local agency, and for all participating jurisdictions were also covered. These roles and responsibilities were presented as follows:

- AECOM
    - Oversee, support, and document the completion of all key project tasks

- Orange County
    - Serving as lead coordinating agency
    - Designation of local project manager
    - Assistance with the collection of documents, data, and other information
    - Logistics for project meetings
    - Hosting and managing project website
    - Responding to inquiries from the public or stakeholders
    - Coordinating with participating jurisdictions

- All participating jurisdictions
    - Designate local jurisdiction lead
    - Attend Hazard Mitigation Planning Team meetings
    - Coordination between counties, municipalities, and local stakeholders
    - Data collection and information sharing
    - Mitigation strategy development (*Mitigation Action Plans*)
    - Assist with public outreach
    - Review and comment on draft plan materials

The review of the three previous county level plans included a comparison of the hazards addressed in each previous county plan, the types of maps that were included in each of the previous county plans, and the structure and content of the mitigation strategy section in each previous county plan. Initial discussions were held to begin to decide how these items should be addressed in the new regional plan format.

A discussion was also facilitated to discuss ways that existing resources could be leveraged, such as existing plans, studies, and reports; existing data and information; local knowledge sharing; and other resources, such as the State of North Carolina iRISK program and Risk Management Tool (RMT). Five primary planning resources were also introduced to the HMPT at this time: the *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook*, *Mitigation Ideas: A Resource for Reducing Risk to Natural Hazards*, *Integrating Hazard Mitigation Into Local Planning*, *Plan Integration Guide*, and *Integrating Historic Property and Cultural Resource Considerations Into Hazard Mitigation Planning*, all relevant publications from FEMA providing mitigation planning guidance.

Emphasis was also placed on the need for effective communication throughout the duration of the project. This included an overview of the planning team's organization and the idea that municipal jurisdictions would coordinate first through their Designated Local Jurisdiction Lead who would in turn coordinate with the Designated Local Jurisdiction Lead for that county, who would in turn coordinate with the overall local project lead, Kirby Saunders with Orange County. Active participation and responsiveness were also stressed in light of the aggressive schedule to complete the plan in the desired timeframe.

A detailed discussion also centered on GIS data collection needs and the process to be followed for collecting and submitting the needed data (which was to follow the chain of communication described in the paragraph above). Emphasis was placed on the need for the GIS data to be submitted in a readily usable format and to be the best data readily available.

The Planning Team was also given an overview of a Public Outreach Strategy that would be developed between HMPT Meeting #1 and HMPT Meeting #2. The goals of the Public Outreach Strategy were stated as:

- Generate public interest;
- Solicit citizen input; and
- Engage additional partners in the planning process.

Specific opportunities for public participation were identified as being at least two in-person open public meetings, the creation of a public project information website, a web-based public participation survey, a project information fact sheet, and use of social media (Facebook, Twitter, RSS, and other various options).

During the open discussion session, the following talking points were covered by the group: potential opportunities in regionalizing the plans, potential obstacles or barriers, naming the regional plan, and other local issues, concerns and ideas.

Next steps were defined as assignment of Designated Local Jurisdiction Leads (to be completed as soon as possible); data collection (to be completed by September 15, 2014); finalize Public Outreach Strategy (to be completed by September 15, 2014); prepare preliminary risk assessment decisions, analysis, and map templates (to be completed by December 4, 2014); and prepare for HMPT Meeting #2 (to be held September 15, 2014).

A copy of the agenda and sign-in sheet for this meeting are included in Appendix E.

HMPC Meeting #2
Public Outreach Strategy (September 15, 2014)
The Public Outreach Strategy meeting was initiated by Kirby Saunders, Orange County Emergency Management Coordinator, and was led by Mike Robinson, CFM (AECOM Mitigation Planner). This meeting consisted of a detailed overview of the final draft Public Outreach Strategy, a hazard identification exercise, recommendations for the *Risk Assessment*, an overview of the *Local Capability Assessment Survey, National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Survey* and *Safe Growth Survey*, discussion of a regional vision statement and mitigation goals, an update on data collection progress, an open discussion session, and an explanation of next steps.

The meeting began with a brief welcome and opportunity for each of the 16 attendees to introduce themselves to the group. A printed handout containing the final draft Public Outreach Strategy was distributed to the HMPT and a review of the document was provided via PowerPoint. The strategy (found in Appendix C) follows the outline presented at the first meeting in terms of goals, outreach opportunities, etc.

Additional details were provided regarding the two proposed in-person open public meetings:

- Public meetings would be scheduled at two key points during the project timeline: following completion of the draft risk and capability assessments and following completion of the draft plan;
- The primary purpose of the meetings would be to inform the public on the process and current status of the regional planning process and to gain input to the process during the drafting stage and prior to plan completion and approval; and

- AECOM would prepare materials to help facilitate two-way communication with public meeting attendees, including comment cards, hard copies of the public participation survey, plotter-size map illustrations, and relevant video clips.

The project information fact sheet was also presented to the group and additional opportunities were discussed for disseminating the fact sheet to the public. The fact sheet contains an overview of the regional mitigation planning effort; an explanation of the planning process including the six main planning steps of public outreach, risk assessment, capability assessment, mitigation strategy development, plan maintenance, and plan adoption; project leadership; project schedule; and contact information.

Another significant topic covered at the meeting was the online public participation survey (https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/aodhazardmitigation).[2] At the time of the second meeting, screen mock-ups were shown to the group along with several sample questions. It was explained that the survey would go live around September 30, 2014 and would remain open until December 31, 2014. The survey was hosted by AECOM using the SurveyMonkey web hosting service. The primary purpose of the survey was to solicit input from any interested parties in the planning area. The survey also offered individuals that were unable to attend the in-person meetings the opportunity to participate in the planning process. Information from the online survey allows the project team to better understand the types of hazards that most concern the public and the mitigation actions that are of particular interest. The survey was made accessible through hyperlinks posted on the project information website and circulated via email, Facebook, newspaper articles, etc. Additionally, hard copies of the survey would be distributed at the first in-person public meeting on December 4, 2014. The feedback received was ultimately evaluated and incorporated into the HMPT's decision making process and the final plan.

Attendees were asked to participate in an exercise called "Mayor for the Day" in which each planning team member was given $20 in pretend currency (divided into one $10, one $5, and five $1's). Planning team members were then asked to "spend" their limited funds on mitigation actions designed to address the natural hazards of most concern to them. The natural hazards were represented by a row of cups each labeled with the name of a natural hazard likely to be addressed in the regional plan. The results of this exercise are as follows:

- Flood: $75
- Winter Weather: $66
- Hurricane: $22
- Drought: $18
- Thunderstorm: $16
- Dam/Levee Failure: $10
- Tornado: $9
- Erosion: $5
- Wildfire: $1
- Earthquake: $0
- Hail: $0
- Landslide: $0

[2] The online survey was closed on December 31, 2014. This hyperlink is provided for documentation and reference purposes only as the link will no longer access the survey. A complete list of questions and responses can be found in Appendix D.

- Lightning: $0
- Nor'easter: $0
- Other: $0

Observations:

- Flood, winter weather, and hurricane were the top three hazards having received the most funding;
- Flood, winter weather, and hurricane were also the only hazards to receive $10 bills, indicating a high priority;
- Drought and thunderstorm came in 4th and 5th place and are also the only hazards (other than flood and winter weather) to receive $5 bills, indicating a secondary priority;
- Lower priority hazards would include dam/levee failure, erosion, tornado and wildfire
- Earthquake, hail, landslide, lightning, nor'easter, and other hazards could be considered negligible priorities;
- It is important to note that this exercise focused on participants' priorities based on where they would spend their limited money if they had received actual grant money to spend; it does not take into account any actual risk or vulnerability analysis. That analysis will take place over the next couple of months and will be compared to these initial perceptions.

The *Local Capability Assessment Survey* (found in Appendix G) was distributed to the HMPT and explained. Essentially, the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* is designed to capture indicators of local capability in the following categories: planning and regulatory capability, administrative and technical capability, fiscal capability, education and outreach capability, political capability, and self assessment. The Designated Local Jurisdiction Lead was given approximately two weeks to complete the survey and return it to Kirby Saunders with Orange County Emergency Management. Results of this survey are presented in the *Capability Assessment* section (Section 5) and Appendix G.

The *National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Survey* (also found in Appendix G) was distributed to the HMPT and explained. Basically this survey instrument is designed to assess the activities undertaken by the jurisdiction to maintain compliance in the NFIP and plans for continuing to maintain compliance in the future. Responses to this survey were used to help document each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP per mitigation planning requirements. The Designated Local Jurisdiction Lead was given approximately two weeks to complete the survey and return it to Kirby Saunders with Orange County Emergency Management.

The *Safe Growth Survey* (found in Appendix H) was distributed to the HMPT and explained. Essentially, the *Safe Growth Survey* is designed to capture indicators of safe growth policy in the following categories: comprehensive planning (land use, transportation, environmental management, and public safety), zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, capital improvement programming and infrastructure policies, and other indicators. The Designated Local Jurisdiction Lead was given approximately two weeks to complete the survey and return it to Kirby Saunders with Orange County Emergency Management. Results of this survey were taken into account by members of the HMPT as they reviewed, revised, and crafted their updated *Mitigation Action Plans*.

A suggestion was made by AECOM to develop a regional vision statement to help define the new regional plan. General thoughts about a vision statement that were shared as part of the presentation included that a vision statement:

- Captures the overall purpose of the planning process;
- Expresses the outcome that the participating jurisdictions seek to accomplish as the plan is implemented;
- Helps drive the planning process;
- Unites the planning team around a common purpose;
- Provides a foundation for the rest of the planning process; and
- Communicates the reason for the plan to stakeholders, elected officials, and the public.

The draft vision statement shared with the HMPT was:

"Through a coordinated regional planning effort, create and implement an effective hazard mitigation plan that will identify and reduce risk to natural hazards in order to protect the health, safety, quality of life, environment and economy of the Alamance, Orange, Durham county area."

The meeting ended with open discussion and a list of next steps, which consisted of the following: Next meeting: Thursday, December 4; discuss draft risk assessment results and capability assessment results; begin thinking about mitigation strategy development including finalizing the regional vision statement; developing regional mitigation goals; and reviewing existing mitigation actions and developing new ones.

HMPT Meeting #3
Mitigation Strategy Workshop (December 4, 2014)
The Mitigation Strategy Workshop was initiated by Kirby Saunders, Orange County Emergency Management Coordinator, and was led by Mike Robinson, CFM (AECOM Mitigation Planner). This meeting consisted of an overview of draft risk assessment findings and draft capability assessment results, an update on public outreach, discussion of the regional vision statement, an exercise to formulate regional mitigation goals and regional mitigation actions, and an explanation of next steps.

The meeting began with a brief welcome and opportunity for each of the 21 attendees to introduce themselves to the group. The meeting continued with an overview of the draft risk assessment findings. The hazards addressed included: riverine flood, wildfire, tropical/extratropical wind (hurricane), thunderstorm wind, winter storm, tornado, earthquake, drought, extreme heat, landslide, hail, lightning, and dam failure. For each hazard the following information was shared, as appropriate: hazard maps, tables of at-risk buildings and infrastructure, and historical hazard occurrences. Complete inventories and maps were shown for demographic data, building footprints, critical facilities, and infrastructure elements. The technical information shared during this portion of the presentation is too extensive to share in this section. Copies of the PowerPoint slides are available in Appendix E and the final results of the risk assessment are shown in the *Risk Assessment* section (Section 4).

The next portion of the presentation consisted of an overview of the draft capability assessment findings. Participation from the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* at the time of the this meeting

was 50%. Reminders were issued at the meeting and follow-up emails were sent out to the HMPT following the meeting. The results centered on findings in the areas of planning and regulatory capability, administrative and technical capability, fiscal capability, education and outreach capability, political capability, and a community self assessment. The point system and overall capability assessment score for the Region were presented to the group along with a ranking of local capability by jurisdiction. All of this information is presented in its final form in the *Capability Assessment* section (Section 5).

An update on the Public Participation Survey was also provided just prior to a working lunch being served. At the time of the meeting, less than 50 online surveys. Ideas for further promoting the survey were discussed and announcements were made with regard to web pages where the link to the survey had been added. A reminder was also issued that the first public meeting would be held that evening (December 4, 2014) at the Whitted Human Services Building meeting facilities where the workshop was currently being held.

An update was also given on the public project information website proposed at the first meeting. At the time of the December 4, 2014 meeting, the website was live and already contained the final project information fact sheet; contacts, task lists, meeting slides, and handouts for the planning committee; existing plan documents; planning guidance and resources; social media integration; and project contact information. The URL for the project information website is http://www.orangecountync.gov/emergency/Eno-HawRHMP.asp.

HMPT Meeting #4
Presentation of Draft Mitigation Plan (March 27, 2015)
The Presentation of Draft Mitigation Plan meeting was initiated by Kirby Saunders, Orange County Emergency Management Coordinator, and was led by Mike Robinson, CFM (AECOM Mitigation Planner). This meeting consisted of a high-level walkthrough of the working draft Hazard Mitigation Plan including all of its sections, instructions for the committee's review and comment period, results of the public participation survey, discussion of plan maintenance procedures, an open discussion session, and an explanation of next steps.

The portion of the presentation covering a walkthrough of the working draft plan document consisted of an overview of the plan's organization (i.e., table of contents), a brief status update on each section, an explanation of the review and comment process, suggested areas of focus for the committee members, availability of the review files on the project information website, and instructions for submitting review comments by April 10, if possible.

Some of the questions asked regarding plan maintenance procedures included the following:

- Who will be the lead agency for future mitigation planning meetings, updates, progress reports, etc.?
- What will be the schedule for any ongoing meetings of the HMPT, prior to the next 5-year plan update? (Such as annual meetings, bi-annual meetings, "as-needed" meetings, etc.)
- To what extent will you seek to integrate the regional plan with other local plans, policies and programs? (Such as comprehensive plans, land use plans, emergency operations plans, etc.)
- What other implementation strategies can you use?
- What criteria will be used for 5-year plan updates?

- What kind(s) of reporting procedures would you like to adopt?
- How will you keep the public involved?
- How will you keep stakeholders involved?

Responses and decisions based on these questions are reflected in the *Plan Maintenance Procedures* section (Section 8).

The discussion of next steps consisted of another reminder regarding the review/comment period and deadline, an explanation that the next version of the plan document would be considered a final draft based on the committee's review comments, an overview of the upcoming State and FEMA plan review process, and local adoption procedures and expectations.

2.6 Involving the Public

An important component of any mitigation planning process is public participation. Individual citizen and community-based input provides the entire planning team with a greater understanding of local concerns and increases the likelihood of successfully implementing mitigation actions by developing community "buy-in" from those directly affected by the decisions of public officials. As citizens become more involved in decisions that affect their safety, they are more likely to gain a greater appreciation of the hazards present in their community and take the steps necessary to reduce their impact. Public awareness is a key component of any community's overall mitigation strategy aimed at making a home, neighborhood, school, business, or entire planning area safer from the potential effects of hazards.

Public involvement in the development of the Eno-Haw Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan was sought using various methods including open public meetings, an interactive public information website, a project information fact sheet with contact information, a public participation survey, and by making copies of draft Plan documents available for public review on county websites and at government offices. Public meetings were held at two distinct periods during the planning process: (1) during the drafting stage of the Plan; and (2) upon completion of a final draft Plan, but prior to official plan approval and adoption. These public meetings were held at a central location to the planning area to ensure that citizens from each of the three participating counties had reasonable access to the opportunity to participate in-person in the planning process. The public participation survey (discussed in greater detail in subsection 2.6.1) was made available online via the project information website, each county's website, through web links forwarded via email and newspaper articles, Facebook, Twitter, etc., and in hardcopy form at the first public meeting.

Public Meeting #1
Public Meeting #1 was held from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. on Thursday, December 4, 2014 at the Whitted Human Services Building meeting facilities. Four "stations" were set up for members of the public to browse through with two County staff and NCEM staff to host the stations and "float" as needed. Station #1 consisted of a sign-in sheet, print copies of the Public Participation Survey, and a comment card for members of the public to complete during their visit. Station #2 consisted of a set of full color, plotter-sized maps of the planning area showing various hazard zones for discussion. Station #3 consisted of a kiosk presenting a background video on "what is mitigation?" Station #4 consisted of a kiosk presenting a background video on flood insurance. This public meeting was attended by one member of the public.

Public Meeting #2
Public Meeting #2 was held from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. on Thursday, April 30 at the Durham County Emergency Operations Center located at 2422 Broad Street, Durham, North Carolina. Four "stations" were set up for members of the public to browse through with planning team members to host the stations and "float" as needed. Station #1 consisted of a kiosk presenting a background video on "what is mitigation?" Station #2 consisted of a set of full color, plotter-sized maps of the planning area showing various hazard zones for discussion. Station #3 provided print copies of the draft plan and specifically the *Mitigation Strategy* section and the *Mitigation Action Plans* for each participating jurisdiction for members of the public to review and comment on. (Printed comment forms were provided for the public to leave comments on.) Station #4 consisted of a kiosk presenting a background video on flood insurance. This public meeting was attended by one member of the public. No substantial comments were received.

2.6.1 Public Participation Survey

The Eno-Haw Hazard Mitigation Public Participation Survey was made available on September 30, 2014 and remained available until December 31, 2014 per the Public Outreach Strategy. During this time, 24 surveys were completed. The complete results of the survey can be found in a summary report found in Appendix D. Charts and figures are also provided in the PowerPoint file for Meeting #4 (found in Appendix E).

The following list is a high-level summary of the dominant responses obtained from the survey.

- 87.5% said they have been personally impacted by a disaster.
- When asked which hazards they have personally been impacted by, the top three responses were severe winter storm, hurricane/tropical storm, and drought/extreme heat, in that order.
- When asked how concerned they are about the possibility of their community being impacted by natural hazards, the top three concerns were severe winter storms, severe thunderstorms, and hurricanes/tropical storms, in that order.
- When asked which category of community assets are the most *susceptible* to natural hazards, most respondents chose cultural and historic resources.
- When asked how *important* each type of community asset is to them, the top three answers were hospitals and medical care facilities, fire stations, and police stations, in that order.
- When asked which type(s) of mitigation actions are most important to them, most respondents said protecting critical facilities.
- When asked which category(ies) of mitigation techniques are most important to them, most respondents said actions relating to plans and regulations and education and awareness programs.
- 76.19% of respondents said that the best way for them to receive information related to natural hazards and hazard mitigation is via the Internet.
- 95.0% said they are interested in making their home or neighborhood more hazard resistant.
- 90.48% said their home is not located in the floodplain.

- 85.71% said they do not carry flood insurance.
- 42.86% said they have lived in the Eno-Haw area 20+ years.
- 95.24% said they own their home.
- 95.24% live in a single-family home.

The results of the survey were presented to members of the HMPT at HMPT Meeting #4 so that public opinion could be factored into final changes and additions to each jurisdiction's *Mitigation Action Plan*.

2.7 Involving Stakeholders

The Eno-Haw Hazard Mitigation Planning Team included a variety of stakeholders beyond the representatives from each participating jurisdiction. Input from additional stakeholders, including neighboring communities, was welcomed through the open public meetings and online survey. If any additional stakeholders representing other agencies and organizations participated through the Public Participation Survey, that information is unknown due to the anonymous nature of the survey.

2.8 Documentation of Plan Progress

Progress in hazard mitigation planning for the participating jurisdictions in the Eno-Haw Region is documented in this plan update. Since hazard mitigation planning efforts officially began in the participating counties with the development of the initial hazard mitigation plans in the early 2000s, many mitigation actions have been completed and implemented in the participating jurisdictions. These actions will help reduce the overall risk to natural hazards for the people and property in the Eno-Haw Region. The actions that have been completed are documented in the *Mitigation Action Plans* found in Section 7.

In addition, community capability continues to improve with the implementation of new plans, policies, and programs that help to promote hazard mitigation at the local level. The current state of local capabilities for the participating jurisdictions is captured in Section 5: *Capability Assessment*. The participating jurisdictions continue to demonstrate their commitment to hazard mitigation and hazard mitigation planning and have proven this by reconvening the Hazard Mitigation Planning Team to update and combine the previous hazard mitigation plans into this new regional plan and by continuing to involve the public in the hazard mitigation planning process.