Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

Jurisdiction: City of Paso Robles	**Title of Plan:** City of Paso Robles Hazard Mitigation Plan – Administrative Draft (Public Review Draft)	**Date of Plan:** Oct. 13, 2004
Local Point of Contact: Ed Gallagher	**Address:** 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446-2534	
Title: Housing Programs Manager		
Agency: Community Development Department		
Phone Number: 805-237-3970	**E-Mail:** egallagher@prcity.com	

State Reviewer:	**Title:**	**Date:**

FEMA Reviewer: Leslie Ames / 2nd review: Julie Mitchell	**Title:** Plan Reviewer	**Date:** November 19, 2004 **2nd Review:** 8-8-05
Date Received in FEMA Region IX	November 1, 2004	
Plan Not Approved	December 15, 2004	
Plan Approved	August 11, 2005	
Date Approved	August 11, 2005	

Jurisdiction:	**NFIP Status***			
	Y	**N**	**N/A**	**CRS Class**
1. Paso Robles	Y			10
2.				
3.				
4.				
5. [ATTACH PAGE(S) WITH ADDITIONAL JURISDICTIONS]				

*** Notes:** **Y = Participating** **N = Not Participating** **N/A = Not Mapped**

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of "Satisfactory." Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer's comments must be provided for requirements receiving a **"Needs Improvement"** score.

SCORING SYSTEM - Please check one of the following for each requirement.

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite(s) (Check Applicable Box)	**NOT MET**	**MET**
Adoption by the Local Governing Body: §201.6(c)(5) **OR**		✓
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5) **AND**		N/A
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation: §201.6(a)(3)		N/A

Planning Process	**N**	**S**
Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b) and §201.6(c)(1)		✓
Local Capabilities Assessment: §201.4(c)(ii) and §201.6(c)(1)		✓

Risk Assessment	**N**	**S**
Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)		✓
Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)		✓
Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)		✓
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)		✓
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)		✓
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)		✓
Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment: §201.6(c)(2)(iii)		N/A

Mitigation Strategy	**N**	**S**
Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)		✓
Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(ii)		✓
Implementation of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iii)		✓
Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iv)		N/A

Plan Maintenance Process	**N**	**S**
Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan: §201.6(c)(4)(i)		✓
Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms: §201.6(c)(4)(ii)		✓
Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)		✓

Additional State Requirements*	**N**	**S**
See **Planning Process**, Local Capabilities Assessment		
Insert State Requirement		
Insert State Requirement		

STATE REVIEW STATUS OF THE LHMP DATE: **XX/XX/XX**

ALL SECTIONS CONSIDERED SATISFACTORY	
ALL/SOME SECTIONS CONSIDERED TO NEED IMPROVEMENT	

FEMA'S LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS
DATE: **08-11-05**

PLAN NOT APPROVED	
PLAN APPROVED	✓

*States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

See Reviewer's Comments

PREREQUISITE(S)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): *[The local hazard mitigation plan **shall** include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council).*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE NOT MET	SCORE MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted the plan?				✓
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?				✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): *For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan **must** document that it has been formally adopted.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE NOT MET	SCORE MET
A. Does the plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?				N/A
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the plan?				N/A
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?				N/A
		SUMMARY SCORE		N/A

PLANNING PROCESS: *§201.6(b): An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan.*

Documentation of the Planning Process

Requirement §201.6(b): *In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process* ***shall*** *include:*
(1) An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;
(2) An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and
(3) Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.

Requirement §201.6(c)(1): *[The plan* ***shall*** *document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the plan?	Section 4-2 (p.6-8) to 4.4 Sections 6.2 / 6.3 / 6.5(p. 7, 8, 9, 24 and 61)	Requirement met.		✓
B. Does the plan indicate who was involved in the planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, etc.?)	Section 4.2 and Appendix B, 4.4 (p. 8-9)	Requirement met.		✓
C. Does the plan indicate how the public was involved? (Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval?)	Section 4.4 (p.9)	**Recommended Revisions:** • A member of the community should be added to the planning team to insure public involvement.		✓
D. Was there an opportunity for neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, and other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?	Section 4.5 (p. 9) Appendix B	**Recommended Revisions:** Include and document participation from the City's direct neighbors such as Templeton, San Miguel, and Atascadero at the time of plan update.		✓
E. Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	Section 4.6 (p. **11**), Section 10 (p. 96-109)			✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Local Capabilities Assessment (Optional, Additional State OES Requested Information)

Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(ii): *– Of the Federal Register Interim Final Rule 44 CFR Parts 201 and 206 states, "[The State mitigation strategy shall include] a general description and analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities… .*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the plan provide a description of the human, technical and financial resources available within this jurisdiction to engage in a mitigation planning process and to develop a local hazard mitigation plan? (These resources are described in Section 2.2 of the OES LHMP Development Guide)	Section 7.1 (p.59-62)	***Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being approved by FEMA.*** It would be helpful if the plan delineated how shortfalls in capabilities could be filled in the future in order that the City could update this plan with a more in-depth vulnerability assessment.		✓
B. Does the plan list local mitigation funding sources (taxes, fees, assessments or fines) which affect or promote mitigation within the reporting jurisdiction?	Section 7.1 (p.59-62)	***Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being approved by FEMA.***		✓
C. Does the plan list local ordinances which affect or promote disaster mitigation, preparedness, response or recovery within the reporting jurisdiction?	Section 7.1 (p.59-62)	***Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being approved by FEMA.***		✓
D. Does the plan describe the details of ongoing mitigation projects and programs within the reporting jurisdiction?	Section 7.1 (p.59-62)	***Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being approved by FEMA.*** How do the regulatory tools listed in Table 7-2 aid the City's mitigation efforts?		✓

RISK ASSESSMENT: *§201.6(c)(2): The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.*

Identifying Hazards - ***§201.6(c)(2)(i):*** *[The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the type … of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the plan include **a description** of the types of **all natural hazards** that affect the jurisdiction? If the hazard identification omits (without explanation) any hazards commonly recognized as threats to the jurisdiction, this part of the plan cannot receive a Satisfactory score.	Section 6.2 (p.22-24)	Requirement met. Refer to Table 6-3, p. 25		✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Profiling Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan **shall** include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the **location** (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?	Section 6.3 (p.23-51)	**Recommended Revisions:** The text discusses three active faults in the area (p.30), however the fault map (figure 6-2) shows significantly more faults, and many are located much closer to the City than the three discussed. How might these faults affect the City? This can be addressed in the next plan update.		✓
B. Does the risk assessment identify the **extent** (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Section 6.3 (p.23-51)	Excellent maps.		✓
C. Does the plan provide information on **previous occurrences** of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Section 6.3 (p.23-51)	**Recommended Revisions:** Provide information on the previous occurrences that includes property damage, costs of recovery, and level of severity. These can be addressed in the next plan update. Important information that would be helpful to the plan includes: **Earthquake** On what fault was the Bryson earthquake? How close was it to the City? What were the effects of this earthquake in the City? On what fault did the San Simeon earthquake occur? What type of fault motion caused this earthquake? Where were the areas of liquefaction, seismic compression, and potential basin effects that are listed in the text (a map would be useful, especially for liquefaction)? What was the typical damage in the City? What was other notable damage like (i.e. the sulfur hot springs, unreinforced masonry building performance, nonstructural damage, etc.)? What was the cost of the damage (this important information could be used in the vulnerability assessment)? What actions were taken by the City as a result of the San Simeon earthquake? What were the lessons learned from this earthquake? It would be helpful to add a discussion on the City's building codes: When were seismic building codes implemented? How		✓

		and when have they changed? How much of the building stock was built before the codes were implemented, how much of it has been built under current, strict codes, etc.? Are there any requirements for retrofitting older buildings? How are the unreinforced masonry buildings being handled? Does the City own any URMs? **Flooding** What was the damage caused by the historical flooding events? How many structures were affected by the flooding? How deep was the water in the structures? Were these structures rebuilt to their pre-flood condition, or were any mitigation measures undertaken? Are there more structures in the inundated areas than when the flooding occurred? What were the magnitudes of the storms that caused the flooding events (i.e. 10 or 50 -year events)? When was the Salinas Dam built? For what magnitude event does it provide protection? Would it have mitigated any of the historical flooding? **Landslide** What triggered the landslide of 1995? How much material slid? How far did it move?		
D. Does the plan include the **probability of future events** (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	Section 6.3 (p.23-51)			✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): *[The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the plan include an **overall summary** description of the jurisdiction's **vulnerability** to each hazard?	pgs. 17, 18, 33, and Section 6.5 (p 51-58)	**Recommended Revisions:** • More detailed information about the buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities would enable a much more accurate vulnerability assessment (possibly using HAZUS) for the City. This type of assessment reveals the true vulnerability of a community and can be used as an effective tool to recognize the most beneficial mitigation measures and also would guide the prioritization of resources within the community to obtain the greatest benefit. Action items 1.C.1 and 1.C.2 in the plan are important steps to be taken that will enable the City to assess their vulnerability, and their addition to the list of prioritized actions that are expected to be completed in the next 5 years should be carefully considered. • Provide specific information on the buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities owned and/or operated by the City. These can be addressed in the next plan update.		✓
B. Does the plan address the **impact** of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section 6.5 (p 51-58)	**Recommended Revisions:** • Refine the discussion on impact of each of the hazards on the City. This should include the details on the kind and level of damage to buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities, and activities including evacuation and emergency services. • A more realistic assessment of dollar value of the damage, and/or percent of damage likely from a hazardous event would provide better information for the City to assess which mitigation measures would be the most cost-effective and to have an accurate emergency response plan. • Note any data limitations for assessing vulnerability. These can be addressed in the next plan update.		✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): *The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area ... .*

			N	S
A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the **types and numbers** of **existing** buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Section 6.5 (p 51-58)	***Note: This information must be included, however a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being approved by FEMA.*** **Recommended Revisions:** For each hazard, identify the kind of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities within their respective hazard areas. Include construction characteristics such as type of construction and year built.		✓
B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the **types and numbers** of **future** buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Section 6.5 (p 51-58)	***Note: This information must be included, however a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being approved by FEMA.***		✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): *[The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate ... .*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the plan estimate **potential dollar losses** to vulnerable structures?	Section 6.5 (p 51-58)	***Note: This information must be included, however a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being approved by FEMA.*** **Recommended Revisions:** A more realistic assessment of dollar value of the damage, and/or percent of damage likely from a hazardous event would provide better information for the City to assess which mitigation measures would be the most cost-effective and to have an accurate emergency response plan. Include estimates for structure, contents, and function losses to present a full picture of the total loss for each building, infrastructure, and critical facility.		✓
B. Does the plan describe the **methodology** used to prepare the estimate?	Section 6.5 (p 51-58)	***Note: This information must be included, however a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being approved by FEMA.***		✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): *[The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the plan describe land uses and development trends?	Section 6.5 (p 51-58)	***Note: This information must be included, however a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being approved by FEMA.***		✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment - ***Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii):*** *For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment **must** assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?				N/A
		SUMMARY SCORE		N/A

MITIGATION STRATEGY: *§201.6(c)(3): The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.*

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): *[The hazard mitigation strategy **shall** include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A Does the plan include a description of mitigation **goals** to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (**GOALS** are long-term; represent what the community wants to achieve, such as "eliminate flood damage"; and are based on the risk assessment findings.)	Section 7.2 (p.63-68)	This list of goals is impressive.		✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): *[The mitigation strategy **shall** include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the plan identify and analyze a **comprehensive range** of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?	Section 7.2 (p.63-68)	**Recommended Revisions:** In light of the recent San Simeon earthquake, it would serve the City well to include more action items that address earthquakes. Some important actions that could be easily implemented are: • Promote awareness of non-structural hazards from earthquakes and promote mitigation measures to minimize non-structural hazards within City facilities, critical facilities, and commercial and residential buildings. • Adopting a commitment to enforcing current seismic codes more stringently, and/or adopting more restrictive codes would also minimize damage. **These can be addressed in the next plan update.**		✓
B Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on **new** buildings and infrastructure?	Section 7.2 (p.63-68)	The City is being proactive by setting strict codes and building restrictions that will prevent construction in high hazard areas and minimize damages from future hazards.		✓
C. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on **existing** buildings and infrastructure?	Section 7.2 (p.63-68)	When implemented, the flood management infrastructure should minimize flooding in the City.		✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Implementation of Mitigation Actions

Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(iii): *[The mitigation strategy section **shall** include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization **shall** include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the mitigation strategy include how the actions are **prioritized**? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)	Section 7.2.2.1 (p. 68-69)	**Recommended Revisions:** Many of the 12 prioritized actions require negligible resources and funding, and many are ongoing projects. Understandably, the City does not want to overextend its resources, however, the more		✓

		mitigation measures that can be implemented, the safer, more disaster-resistant the community will be, and everyone will come out ahead. These can be addressed in the next plan update.		
B. Does the mitigation strategy address how the actions will be **implemented and administered**? (For example, does it identify the responsible department, existing and potential resources, and timeframe?)	Section 7.2.2.2 (p. 69-77)			✓
C. Does the prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a **cost-benefit review** (see page 3-36 of *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance*) to maximize benefits?	Section 7.2.2.1 (p. 68-69)	**Recommended Revisions:** A more quantitative approach comparing avoided losses through implementation of mitigation actions versus the cost of any mitigation actions might help prioritize future actions. This can be addressed in the next plan update.		✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): *For multi-jurisdictional plans, there **must** be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A Does the plan include at least one identifiable **action item** for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?				N/A
		SUMMARY SCORE		

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): *[The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for **monitoring** the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for monitoring and include a schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and meetings?)	Section 8.1 (p. 78-79)	Excellent monitoring tasks, this will result in great mitigation process.		✓

B. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for **evaluating** the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for evaluating the plan and include the criteria used to evaluate the plan?)	Section 8.1 (p. 78-79)			✓
C. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for **updating** the plan within the five-year cycle?	Section 8.1 (p. 78-79)			✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): *[The plan **shall** include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.*

			N	S
A. Does the plan identify other local planning mechanisms available for incorporating the requirements of the mitigation plan?	Section 8.2 (p.79-80)			✓
B. Does the plan include a process by which the local government will incorporate the requirements in other plans, when appropriate?	Section 8.2 (p.79-80)	The City of Paso Robles is commended for their acknowledged awareness of how their own processes affect their neighboring communities. **Recommended Revisions:** Although this element has been amended, the plan maintenance process describes intent but remains very general. On Page 80, the plan states that the Hazard Mitigation Team will conduct periodic reviews. Include a definite timeframe and schedule of periodic reviews t the time of plan update. • Describe how the periodic reviews of the other planning mechanisms will result in the incorporation of the requirements of the mitigation plan. Action item 1.A.1 addresses this process in part, but failed to make the list of the prioritized action items expected to be completed in the next 5 years. • Describe the process to incorporate the mitigation plan requirements into the local planning mechanisms; which party will take the lead on incorporating the requirements? • How will mitigation plan requirements be incorporated into existing planning mechanisms?		✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Continued Public Involvement				
Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): *[The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.*				
			N	S
A. Does the plan explain how **continued public participation** will be obtained? (For example, will there be public notices, an on-going mitigation plan committee, or annual review meetings with stakeholders?)	Section 8.3 (p.80-81)	**Recommended Revisions:** Provide more opportunities for the public to participate during the plan's monitoring, evaluation and updates (e.g. soliciting input, holding meetings etc.). Include a schedule for public participation opportunities, who will be responsible for organizing events, who will maintain the website etc. This can be addressed in the next plan update.		✓
		SUMMARY SCORE		✓

Matrix A: Profiling Hazards

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure that their plan addresses each natural hazard that can affect the jurisdiction. **Completing the matrix is not required.**

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each ***applicable*** *hazard. An "N" for any element of any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.*

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)	A. Location		B. Extent		C. Previous Occurrences		D. Probability of Future Events	
	Yes	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S
Avalanche	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Erosion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Storm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Dam Failure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Drought	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Earthquake	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Expansive Soils	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Extreme Heat	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Flood	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hailstorm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hurricane	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Land Subsidence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Landslide	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Severe Winter Storm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tornado	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tsunami	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Volcano	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Wildfire	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Windstorm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

To check boxes, double click on the box and change the default value to "checked."

Legend:
§201.6(c)(2)(i) Profiling Hazards
A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each hazard addressed in the plan?
B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?
C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?
D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?

Matrix B: Assessing Vulnerability

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure that their plan addresses each requirement. **Completing the matrix is not required.**

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each ***applicable*** *hazard. An "N" for any element of any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.*

Note: Receiving an N in the shaded columns will not preclude the plan from passing.

To check boxes, double click on the box and change the default value to "checked."

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)	§201.6(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability: Overview					§201.6(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures				§201.6(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses			
		A. Overall Summary Description of Vulnerability		B. Hazard Impact			A. Types and Number of Existing Structures in Hazard Area (Estimate)		B. Types and Number of Future Structures in Hazard Area (Estimate)		A. Loss Estimate		B. Methodology	
	Yes	N	S	N	S		N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S
Avalanche	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Erosion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Storm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Dam Failure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Drought	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Earthquake	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Expansive Soils	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Extreme Heat	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Flood	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hailstorm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hurricane	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Land Subsidence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Landslide	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Severe Winter Storm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tornado	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tsunami	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Volcano	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Wildfire	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Windstorm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Legend:

§201.6(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?

B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?

§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A) Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?

§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B) Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

A. Does the plan estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?

A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?

B. Does the plan describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?

Matrix C: Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure consideration of a range of actions for each hazard. **Completing the matrix is not required.**

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each ***applicable*** *hazard. An "N" for any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.*

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)	A. Comprehensive Range of Actions and Projects	
	Yes	N	S
Avalanche	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Erosion	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Storm	☐	☐	☐
Dam Failure	☐	☐	☐
Drought	☐	☐	☐
Earthquake	☐	☐	☐
Expansive Soils	☐	☐	☐
Extreme Heat	☐	☐	☐
Flood	☐	☐	☐
Hailstorm	☐	☐	☐
Hurricane	☐	☐	☐
Land Subsidence	☐	☐	☐
Landslide	☐	☐	☐
Severe Winter Storm	☐	☐	☐
Tornado	☐	☐	☐
Tsunami	☐	☐	☐
Volcano	☐	☐	☐
Wildfire	☐	☐	☐
Windstorm	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐

To check boxes, double click on the box and change the default value to "checked."

Legend:
§201.6(c)(3)(ii) Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions
A. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?