

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*.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Jurisdiction: Grant County, Oregon | Title of Plan: Grant County, Oregon Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan | Date of Plan: May 2020 |
| Local Point of Contact: Katherine Daniel | Address: 635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150 Salem, OR 97301-2540 | |
| Title: Hazard Mitigation Planner | | |
| Agency: Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development | | |
| Phone Number: 503-934-0010 | | |
| | | E-Mail: Katherine.daniel@state.or.us |

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| State Reviewer: | Title: | Date: |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| FEMA Reviewer: Claire Fetters Josh Vidmar John Schelling John.Schelling@fema.dhs.gov | Title: CERC Planner CERC Planner Hazard Mitigation Planning Manager | Date: 06/05/2020 06/24/2020 06/30/2020 |
| Date Received in FEMA Region <i>(insert #)</i> | 06/01/2020 | |
| Plan Not Approved | | |
| Plan Approvable Pending Adoption | 06/30/2020 | |
| Plan Approved | | |

**SECTION 1:
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 | Grant County | County | Ted Williams | | | | Y | Y | Y | Y | APA | |
| 2 | John Day | City | Nicholas Green | | | | Y | Y | Y | Y | APA | |
| 3 | Grant Soil and Water Conservation District | Special District | Jason Kehrberg | | | | Y | Y | Y | Y | APA | |
| 4 | Grant County Education Service District | Special District | Robert Waltenburg | | | | Y | Y | Y | Y | APA | |

**SECTION 2:
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.

| 1. REGULATION CHECKLIST | | Location in Plan (section and/or page number) | Met | Not Met |
|---|--|--|------------|--------------------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans) | | | | |
| ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS | | | | |
| 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 I, pp. 3-5; App. B, pp. 2-27; App. H, pp. 4-34 | 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 I, p. 4; App. B, pp. 3-26 | 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 I, p. 4; App. B, p. 3, 27-42 | X | | |
| A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3)) | Section I, pp. 4-5 | 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 IV, pp. 84-85 | 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 IV, pp. 81-86 | X | | |
| <u>ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u> | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 1. REGULATION CHECKLIST | | Location in Plan (section and/or page number) | Met | Not Met |
|--|---|--|------------|--------------------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans) | | | | |
| ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT | | | | |
| 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 II, pp. 13-58; Volume II, pp. 3-41; App. G, pp. 6-71 | 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 II, pp. 13-58; Volume II, pp. 3-41; App. D, pp. 5-42; App. G, pp. 6-71 | 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)) | Section II, pp. 15-58; Volume II, pp. 3-41; App. D, pp. 5-42 App. G, pp. 6-71 | X | | |
| 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 II, p. 42 Volume II, p. 6 | X | | |
| <u>ELEMENT B: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u> | | | | |
| ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY | | | | |
| 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 III, pp. 73-78; Section IV, pp. 80-81 | 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 II, p. 42; Section III, pp. 67-69 | X | | |
| C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i)) | Section III, p. 59 | 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 III, pp. 63-72; App. C, pp. 1-37 | X | | |
| 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 III, pp. 61-62, 79; App. E, pp. 1-8; App. F, pp. 1-5 | 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 III, p. 73; Section IV, p. 83 | X | | |

| 1. REGULATION CHECKLIST | | Location in Plan (section and/or page number) | Met | Not Met |
|--|---|--|------------|--------------------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans) | | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u> | | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION</u> (applicable to plan updates only) | | | | |
| D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Section II, pp. 43-44; App. A, pp. 13-19, 22-24 | X | | |
| D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Section III, p. 61; App. B, p. 44; App. C, pp. 1-16 | X | | |
| D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | App. B, pp. 43-45 | X | | |
| <u>ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u> | | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION</u> | | | | |
| 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)) | | | | |
| E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5)) | | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u> | | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)</u> | | | | |
| F1. | | | | |
| F2. | | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u> | | | | |

SECTION 3: PLAN ASSESSMENT

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 worksheet created to evaluate the plan is an extremely well-thought out tool.
- There was a thorough presentation of the efforts made to alert and involve public and private stakeholders as well as the public.

Opportunities for Improvement

- The amount of information found in the appendices for the planning process should be included in the basic plan. Be sure to continue to place sign-in sheets, newspaper articles, etc. in the appendix, but all relevant information should be in found in the basic plan.

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

Plan Strengths

- Utilizing information, data, and maps from other plans and reports to support vulnerability analyses and hazard profiles was a best-practice method.
- The clear identification of hazards that have occurred since the previous plan was uniform throughout each hazard profile.

Opportunities for Improvement

- The separation of the more in-depth hazard risk assessments from the basic plan was unnecessary. Include the wildfire, flood, drought, and landslide annexes in the plan.
- While the hazards that did not have as critical assessments completed were not deemed as big of threat, they were included in the mitigation plan. Provide the same high-level analysis for all hazards included in the plan.
- The RiskMAP report could have been incorporated into the plan as it is an extremely strong document to reference and incorporate into the flooding hazard profile.

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

Plan Strengths

- All high-priority mitigation actions had dedicated worksheets that provided further information.
- The mitigation plan identified the planning area's regulatory, technical, financial, and administrative capabilities.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Identify funding sources and estimated costs for each mitigation action.
- Although there were actions that seek to integrate the plan into other planning mechanisms, be sure to clearly identify what aspects of the mitigation plan will be referenced in each planning tool.

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

- A thorough discussion of land development and future trends was presented in the plan.
- It was clear how the steering committee suggested changes to be made and how the mitigation efforts have been completed since the previous plan.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Consider permitting the public to submit comments regarding the plan electronically even if the plan is not in the process of being updated.

B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

FEMA Mitigation Planning and the Community Rating System Key Topics Bulletin supports communities who participate in the National Flood Insurance Program's CRS Program, or who would like to, and updating a Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan. You can reach this information at <https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/171290>.

The **Region 10 Integrating Natural Hazard Mitigation into Comprehensive Planning** is a resource specific to Region 10 states and provides examples of how communities are integrating natural hazard mitigation strategies into comprehensive planning. You can find it in the FEMA Library at <http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/89725>.

The **Integrating Hazard Mitigation Into Local Planning: Case Studies and Tools for Community Officials** 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. It includes recommended steps and tools to assist with local integration efforts, along with ideas for overcoming possible impediments, and presents a series of case studies to demonstrate successful integration in practice. You can find it in the FEMA Library at <http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?id=7130>.

The **Mitigation Ideas: A Resource for Reducing Risk from Natural Hazards** resource presents ideas for how to mitigate the impacts of different natural hazards, from drought and sea level rise, to severe winter weather and wildfire. The document also includes ideas for actions that communities can take to reduce risk to multiple hazards, such as incorporating a hazard risk assessment into the local development review process. You can find it in the FEMA Library at <http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?id=6938>.

The **Local Mitigation Planning Handbook** provides guidance to local governments on developing or updating hazard mitigation plans to meet and go above the requirements. You can find it in the FEMA Library at <http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?id=7209>.

The **Integration Hazard Mitigation and Climate Adaptation Planning: Case Studies and Lessons Learned** resource is a 2014 ICLEI publication for San Diego with a clear methodology that could assist in next steps for integration impacts of climate change throughout mitigation actions. <http://icleiusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Integrating-Hazard-Mitigation-and-Climate-Adaptation-Planning.pdf>

The **Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide and Tool** resource is available through FEMA's Library and should be referred to for the next plan update. <http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?id=4859>

The **Tribal Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance**: This resource is specific to tribal governments developing or updating tribal mitigation plans. It covers all aspects of tribal planning requirements and the steps to developing tribal mitigation plans. You can find the

document in the FEMA Library at <http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/18355>

Volcanic Eruption Mitigation Measures: For information on Mitigation Actions for Volcanic Eruptions that would satisfy the C4 requirement, please visit: <http://earthzine.org/2011/03/21/volcanic-crisis-management-and-mitigation-strategies-a-multi-risk-framework-case-study/> and <http://www.gvess.org/publ.html>.

The FEMA Region 10 **Risk Mapping, Analysis, and Planning program (Risk MAP)** releases a monthly newsletter that includes information about upcoming events and training opportunities, as well as hazard and risk related news from around the Region. Past newsletters can be viewed at <http://www.starr-team.com/starr/RegionalWorkspaces/RegionX/Pages/default.aspx>. If you would like to receive future newsletters, email rxnewsletter@starr-team.com and ask to be included.

The mitigation strategy may include eligible projects to be funded through FEMA's hazard mitigation grant programs (Pre-Disaster Mitigation, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, and Flood Mitigation Assistance). Contact your State Hazard Mitigation Officer, Amie Bashant at amie.bashant@mil.state.or.us, for more information.