

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

---

The *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool* demonstrates how the Local Mitigation Plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR §201.6 and offers States and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the community.

- The Regulation Checklist provides a summary of FEMA’s evaluation of whether the Plan has addressed all requirements.
- The Plan Assessment identifies the plan’s strengths as well as documents areas for future improvement.
- The Multi-jurisdiction Summary Sheet is an optional worksheet that can be used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of the each Element of the Plan (Planning Process; Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation; and Plan Adoption).

The FEMA Mitigation Planner must reference this *Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide* when completing the *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool*.

<b>Jurisdictions: Alamance, Orange, and Durham Counties and incorporated municipalities</b>	<b>Title of Plan: Eno-Haw Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan</b>	<b>Date of Plan: April 2015</b>
<b>Local Point of Contact: Kirby Saunders</b>	<b>Address: 510 Meadowlands Drive PO Box 8181 Hillsborough, NC 27278</b>	
<b>Title: Orange County Emergency Management Coordinator</b>		
<b>Agency: Orange County Emergency Services</b>		
<b>Phone Number: (919) 245-6135</b>	<b>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:ksaunders@orangecountync.gov">ksaunders@orangecountync.gov</a></b>	

<b>State Reviewer:</b> <b>John Mello</b>	<b>Title:</b> <b>Hazard Mitigation Planner</b>	<b>Date:</b> <b>5/19/2015</b> <b>6/1/2015</b> <b>6/9/2015</b>
---	---	--

<b>FEMA Reviewer:</b> <b>Brenda Stirrup</b>	<b>Title:</b> <b>Planning Specialist</b>	<b>Date:</b> <b>July 7, 2015, July 23, 2015 (AR), November 19, 2015 (ARs), January 14, 2016 (ARs), February 9, 2016 (ARs) May 2, 2016 (AR), July 1, 2016 (ARs)</b> July 23, 2015
Linda L. Byers (QC)	RIV Lead Planning Specialist	
<b>Date Received in FEMA Region IV</b>	<b>June 17, 2015</b>	
<b>Plan Not Approved</b>		

Plan Approvable Pending Adoption	
Plan Approved	August 3, 2015

**SECTION 1:  
REGULATION CHECKLIST**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The Regulation Checklist must be completed by FEMA. The purpose of the Checklist is to identify the location of relevant or applicable content in the Plan by Element/sub-element and to determine if each requirement has been ‘Met’ or ‘Not Met.’ The ‘Required Revisions’ summary at the bottom of each Element must be completed by FEMA to provide a clear explanation of the revisions that are required for plan approval. Required revisions must be explained for each plan sub-element that is ‘Not Met.’ Sub-elements should be referenced in each summary by using the appropriate numbers (A1, B3, etc.), where applicable. Requirements for each Element and sub-element are described in detail in this *Plan Review Guide* in Section 4, Regulation Checklist.

<b>1. REGULATION CHECKLIST</b>	<b>Location in Plan (section and/or page number)</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)</b>			
<b>ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS</b>			
A1. Does the Plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(1))	Section 2: Planning Process	X	
A2. Does the Plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as other interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement §201.6(b)(2))	Section 2 throughout and specifically Sections 2.6 and 2.7.	X	
A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1))	Section 2.6	X	
A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))	Sections 2.2 and 2.3 Sections 2.2 and 2.3, Section 5; Appendix G	X	
A5. Is there discussion of how the community(ies) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii))	Section 8.3	X	
A6. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a 5-year cycle)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i))	Section 8: Plan Maintenance Procedures	X	
<b>ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>			
A6 see comments in section 2			

<b>1. REGULATION CHECKLIST</b>		<b>Location in Plan</b> (section and/or page number)	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)</b>				
<b>ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT</b>				
B1. Does the Plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction(s)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))	Section 4: Risk Assessment, specifically Section 4.5	X		
B2. Does the Plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))	Section 4.2	X		
B3. Is there a description of each identified hazard's impact on the community as well as an overall summary of the community's vulnerability for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))	Sections 4.5 and 4.6			
B4. Does the Plan address NFIP insured structures within the jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))	Section 4.5 Section 4.5.1.1, Page 4-41	X		
<b>ELEMENT B: REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>				
4-41 section 4.5.1.1				
<b>ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY</b>				
C1. Does the plan document each jurisdiction's existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3))	Section 5: Capability Assessment	X		
C2. Does the Plan address each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))	Section 5, specifically Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.1.3 Section 4.5.1, Page 4-35; Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.1.3	X		
C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))	Section 6: Mitigation Strategy Section 6.2	X		
C4. Does the Plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))	Section 7: Mitigation Action Plans Section 6: Mitigation Strategy, Section 7: Mitigation Action Plans	X		

<b>1. REGULATION CHECKLIST</b>		<b>Location in Plan (section and/or page number)</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)</b>				
C5. Does the Plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including cost benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii))	Section 7: Mitigation Action Plans  Section 6.1.1: Mitigation Action Prioritization; Section 7: Mitigation Action Plans	X		
C6. Does the Plan describe a process by which local governments will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii))	Section 8.1  Section 7, Section 8.1	X		
<b>ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>				
NCEM Note for FEMA: See footnotes on page 6-5 and 2-16 referencing Alamance County Mitigation Action plans.				
<b>ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION</b> (applicable to plan updates only)				
D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 4: Risk Assessment (as described in Section 4, specifically in Section 4.2, the latest GIS data available was used to determine vulnerabilities to existing development beyond what was addressed in previous plan updates) Section 7  Section 4: Planning Area Profile, Section 4, and Section 7	X		
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 7 (the Mitigation Action Plan for each jurisdiction includes an update on previously adopted actions)	X		

<b>1. REGULATION CHECKLIST</b>		<b>Location in Plan</b> (section and/or page number)	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)</b>				
D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 7 (the Mitigation Action Plan for each jurisdiction includes an update on previously adopted actions, including changes in priorities)	X		
<b>ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>				
NCEM Note for FEMA: See footnotes on page 6-5 and 2-16 referencing Alamance County Mitigation Action plans.				
FEMA: Footnote reviewed.				
<b>ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION</b>				
E1. Does the Plan include documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	This will be included in Appendix A	X		
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	This will be included in Appendix A	X		

**1. REGULATION CHECKLIST**

**Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)**

**Location in Plan  
(section and/or  
page number)**

**Met Not  
Met**

**ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS**

**ADOPTION DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED**

7/23/2015

Orange County on;

11/19/2015

Durham County, Unincorporated

City of Graham

City of Mebane

Town of Carrboro

Town of Haw River

Town of Hillsborough

1/14/2016

City of Burlington

Town of Elon

Town of Green Level

Town of Swepsonville

2/9/2016

Alamance, Unincorporated

Village of Alamance

May 2, 2016

Town of Ossipee

July 1, 2016

City of Durham

Town of Chapel Hill

**ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY;  
NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)**

F1.			
F2.			

**ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS**

## SECTION 2: PLAN ASSESSMENT

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The purpose of the Plan Assessment is to offer the local community more comprehensive feedback to the community on the quality and utility of the plan in a narrative format. The audience for the Plan Assessment is not only the plan developer/local community planner, but also elected officials, local departments and agencies, and others involved in implementing the Local Mitigation Plan. The Plan Assessment must be completed by FEMA. The Assessment is an opportunity for FEMA to provide feedback and information to the community on: 1) suggested improvements to the Plan; 2) specific sections in the Plan where the community has gone above and beyond minimum requirements; 3) recommendations for plan implementation; and 4) ongoing partnership(s) and information on other FEMA programs, specifically RiskMAP and Hazard Mitigation Assistance programs. The Plan Assessment is divided into two sections:

1. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement
2. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

***Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement*** is organized according to the plan Elements listed in the Regulation Checklist. Each Element includes a series of italicized bulleted items that are suggested topics for consideration while evaluating plans, but it is not intended to be a comprehensive list. FEMA Mitigation Planners are not required to answer each bullet item, and should use them as a guide to paraphrase their own written assessment (2-3 sentences) of each Element.

The Plan Assessment must not reiterate the required revisions from the Regulation Checklist or be regulatory in nature, and should be open-ended and to provide the community with suggestions for improvements or recommended revisions. The recommended revisions are suggestions for improvement and are not required to be made for the Plan to meet Federal regulatory requirements. The italicized text should be deleted once FEMA has added comments regarding strengths of the plan and potential improvements for future plan revisions. It is recommended that the Plan Assessment be a short synopsis of the overall strengths and weaknesses of the Plan (no longer than two pages), rather than a complete recap section by section.

***Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan*** provides a place for FEMA to offer information, data sources and general suggestions on the overall plan implementation and maintenance process. Information on other possible sources of assistance including, but not limited to, existing publications, grant funding or training opportunities, can be provided. States may add state and local resources, if available.

## A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas where these could be improved beyond minimum requirements.

### Element A: Planning Process

#### Plan Strengths

The specific steps that the Eno-Haw Hazard Mitigation Planning Team used to develop the plan were clearly outlined. The plan stated 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. This is an indication of the cohesiveness and commitment of the team to develop and implement the plan in an effective manner.

The Planning Team also developed a 'Public Outreach Strategy' to encourage increased public participation in the planning process. The purpose of the Strategy was to 1) generate public interest, 2) solicit citizen input, and 3) engage additional partners in the planning process.

Numerous and diverse public outreach opportunities and methods were put in place for residents and stakeholders, such as the following:

1. In-person public meetings
2. Public information website (including social media integration, where possible)
3. Project information fact sheet
4. Planning resources
5. Public participation survey

The above methods increase the awareness of mitigation for all that may be impacted. When residents are aware, it increases the likelihood that residents will embrace and implement mitigation practices.

In addition to utilizing the Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide, the Planning team also used the Plan Review Handbook in developing the plan.

## Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

### Plan Strengths

All of the sections in the Risk Assessment were updated, as appropriate, to ensure that the most recent information across the regional planning area was included in the plan. The Capability Assessment was also updated for all of the jurisdictions that participated in the plan. The identification of local capabilities assisted in discovering gaps that needed to be addressed in the Mitigation Strategy. In addition to discovering gaps, the Capability Assessment also showcased the positive mitigation measures that were already in place or being implemented at the local level. These measure should continue to be supported through future mitigation efforts.

## Element C: Mitigation Strategy

### Plan Strengths

The *Mitigation Strategy* section included a *Mitigation Action Plan* (MAP) for each participating jurisdiction. The MAP included specific actions for each participating jurisdiction that reflected their unique risks and capabilities, as well as their needs and concerns. The actions listed in the MAP will function as an easy to understand guide of mitigation policies and projects for the local decision makers to effectively and efficiently access and use.

The key problems that were identified in the Risk Assessment and Capability Assessment were addressed in the Mitigation Strategy section of the plan through specifically identified mitigation actions.

There were effective discussions of the integration of mitigation actions with other resources, programs, and policies.

The plan stated the following:

*The intent of the Mitigation Strategy is to provide the Eno-Haw Region with overall goals that will serve as guiding principles for future mitigation policy and project administration, along with an analysis of mitigation techniques deemed available to meet those goals and reduce the impact of identified hazards. It is designed to be comprehensive, strategic, and functional in nature.*

The Team's sense of duty to protect the residents of the Eno-Haw region from natural disasters was very evident in reading the plan. It was further supported by concrete, comprehensive, and current information.

## Element D: Plan Update, Evaluation, and Implementation (*Plan Updates Only*)

### Plan Strengths

A summary assessment of the implementation of each county's previous plan was included in this regional plan. The summary outlined meetings that were or were not held, progress reports that were or were not developed, coordination among stakeholders, meeting attendance, etc. While the development of the plan update should have started as soon as the previous county plans were approved, the regional plan indicates that such was not the case for many of the counties. Mistakes that were made were delineated in the plan, along with corrective monitoring, evaluation and enhancement procedures, to implement in the future.

The status of mitigation actions from the previous county plans was provided in the regional plan. A one-word description was provided for each actions, along with a narrative explanation, as appropriate.

A myriad of opportunities for public involvement in the development of Regional plan were provided to residents and stakeholders, with the goal of increasing public input in the planning development process. Those opportunities included the following:

- open public meetings
- an interactive public information website
- e-mails
- Facebook
- Twitter
- a project information fact sheet with contact information
- a public participation survey

## B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

The plan listed and utilized numerous planning resources. This was evidence of the Hazard Mitigation Planning Team dedication to developing a living resource for the communities.

We offer the following additional FEMA specific plan update and implementation resources that can be useful in updating your hazard plan in the next update cycle:

### **Local Mitigation Planning Handbook**

This resource is very effective when used in tandem with the Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide.

The Handbook provides guidance to local governments on developing or updating hazard mitigation plans to meet the requirements under the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 44 – Emergency Management and Assistance §201.6.

<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=7209>

### **Mitigation Ideas**

Communities can use this resource to identify and evaluate a range of potential mitigation actions for reducing risk to natural hazards and disasters.

<http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/30627?id=6938>

### **Integrating Mitigation Strategies with Local Planning**

This resource provides practical guidance on how to incorporate risk reduction strategies into existing local Plans, policies, codes, and programs that guide community development or redevelopment patterns.

<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?id=7130>

### **Risk Mapping, Assessment, and Planning (Risk MAP)**

Risk MAP is the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Program that provides communities with flood information and tools they can use to enhance their mitigation Plans and take action to better protect their citizens. Through more precise flood mapping products, risk assessment tools, and planning and outreach support, Risk MAP strengthens local ability to make informed decisions about reducing risk.

<http://www.fema.gov/risk-mapping-assessment-Planning>

In addition, following are several Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Mitigation funding resources:

The EPA makes available funds for water management and wetlands protection programs that help mitigate against future costs associated with hazard damage.

<b>Mitigation Funding Sources Program</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Clean Water Act Section 319 Grants	Grants for water source management programs including technical assistance, financial assistance, education, training, technology transfer, demonstration projects, and regulation.  <a href="http://www.epa.gov/OWOW/NPS/cwact.html">http://www.epa.gov/OWOW/NPS/cwact.html</a>	Funds are provided only to designated state and tribal agencies
Clean Water State Revolving Funds	State grants to capitalize loan funds. States make loans to communities, individuals, and others for high-priority water-quality activities.  <a href="http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/initiative/srf.html">http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/initiative/srf.html</a>	States and Puerto Rico
Wetland Program Development Grants	Funds for projects that promote research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of water pollution.  <a href="http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/initiative/#financial">http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/initiative/#financial</a>	See website

**SECTION 3:**  
**MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET (OPTIONAL)**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For multi-jurisdictional plans, a Multi-jurisdiction Summary Spreadsheet may be completed by listing each participating jurisdiction, which required Elements for each jurisdiction were ‘Met’ or ‘Not Met,’ and when the adoption resolutions were received. This Summary Sheet does not imply that a mini-plan be developed for each jurisdiction; it should be used as an optional worksheet to ensure that each jurisdiction participating in the Plan has been documented and has met the requirements for those Elements (A through E).

MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET												
#	Jurisdiction Name	Jurisdiction Type (city/borough/township/village, etc.)	Plan POC	Mailing Address	Email	Phone	Requirements Met (Y/N)					
							A. Planning Process	B. Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment	C. Mitigation Strategy	D. Plan Review, Evaluation & Implementation	E. Plan Adoption	F. State Requirements
1	Alamance	County	Alva Sizemore		alva.sizemore@alamance-nc.com	336-227-1365	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
2	Alamance	Village	Ben York		villagealamance@bellsouth.net	336-226-0033	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
3	Burlington	City	Roger Manuel		rmanuel@ci.burlington.nc.us	336-516-4674	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET**

#	Jurisdiction Name	Jurisdiction Type (city/borough/ township/ village, etc.)	Plan POC	Mailing Address	Email	Phone	Requirements Met (Y/N)					
							A. Planning Process	B. Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment	C. Mitigation Strategy	D. Plan Review, Evaluation & Implementation	E. Plan Adoption	F. State Require- ments
4	Elon	Town	Sean Tencer		stencer@ci.elon.nc.us	336-584-2859	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
5	Graham	City	Melissa Guilbeau		mguilbeau@cityofgraham.com	336-570-6705	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
6	Green Level	Town	Quentin McPhatter			336-578-3443	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
7	Haw River	Town	Jeff Earp		jearp@townofhawriver.com	336-578-0010	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
8	Mebane	City	David Cheek		dcheek@cityofmebane.com	336-584-0526	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
9	Ossipee	Town	Richard Overman		rovermanosipee@bellsouth.net	336-584-8555	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
10	Swepsonville	Town	Raymond Herring			336-578-1500	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

**MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET**

#	Jurisdiction Name	Jurisdiction Type (city/borough/ township/ village, etc.)	Plan POC	Mailing Address	Email	Phone	Requirements Met (Y/N)					
							A. Planning Process	B. Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment	C. Mitigation Strategy	D. Plan Review, Evaluation & Implementation	E. Plan Adoption	F. State Require- ments
11	Orange	County (Lead)	Josh Hollingsworth		jhollingsworth@orangecounty.nc.gov	919-245-6100	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
12	Carrboro	Town	Travis Crabtree		tcrabtree@townofcarrboro.org	919-918-7327	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
13	Chapel Hill	Town	Matt Sullivan		MSULLIVAN@townofchapelhill.org	919-968-2814	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
14	Hillsborough	Town	Jerry Wagner		Jerry.Wagner@hillsboroughnc.org	919-241-4801	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
15	Durham	County	Mark Schell		mschell@dcov.gov	919-560-0663	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
16	Durham	City	Mark Schell		mschell@dcov.gov	919-560-0663	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

