

## **MITIGATION PLANNING The Good, The Bad and the Ugly**

A presentation to the Indiana  
Association for Floodplain and  
Stormwater Management,  
Inc. October 13-15, 2004

**URS**

## **Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000**

- Reduce loss of life and property
- Reduce human suffering
- Reduce economic disruption
- Reduce disaster assistance costs

**URS**

## Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program

- Competitive grants
- Cost share: 25% State/local except impoverished communities
- Requires approved hazard mitigation plan
- Apply through SHMO

**URS**

## HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM

- Requires Tribal and local governments to submit and receive approval of mitigation plans for HMGP eligibility
- Increases HMGP to 20% for States meeting enhanced planning criteria
- Allows 7% of HMGP funds for planning purposes
- Apply through SHMO

**URS**

## Interim Final Rule - 44 CFR Part 201

- Establishes the mitigation planning requirements for States and local communities
- Serves as governing document for DMA 2000 planning implementation
- Updated to extend requirement date to November 1, 2004

**URS**

## URS RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING THE DISASTER MITIGATION ACT OF 2000

- Lead contractor for FEMA for the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program and the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
- Prepared How-To Guides for FEMA
- Conducts Training Seminars for State and Local Governments
- Reviews Mitigation Plans on FEMA's behalf
- Provides Plan Preparation Consulting Services to States and communities

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation of the planning process includes:
  - A narrative description of how the plan was prepared
  - A discussion of who was involved in the planning process
  - A discussion of how the public was involved including documentation that they were involved during the drafting and prior to adoption

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation of the planning process includes (continued):
  - A discussion of how State and Federal Agencies, neighboring jurisdictions, local businesses, community leaders, educators and relevant private and nonprofit interests were involved
  - A discussion of how existing plans, studies and reports were integrated into the plan

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation of the planning process includes (continued):
  - For multi-jurisdictional plans you must describe how each jurisdiction participated in the planning process

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation of the Risk Assessment includes:
  - A discussion of all natural hazards affecting the community
  - Identification of the locations or geographical area affected by each natural hazard (don't be afraid to include maps)
  - A discussion of the magnitude or severity of each natural hazard

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation of the Risk Assessment includes (continued):
  - A discussion of previous occurrences of each natural hazards
  - A discussion of the probability of each hazard occurring again.

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation of the Vulnerability Assessment Overview includes:
  - A discussion regarding the communities general vulnerability to each hazard
  - A discussion of the impact of each hazard on buildings, infrastructure, critical facilities, evacuations and emergency services

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation of the Vulnerability Assessment in regards to identifying structures includes *(recommended but not required)*:
  - Identification of the type and number of existing building, infrastructure and critical facilities affected by each hazard
  - Identification of the type and number of future building, infrastructure and critical facilities affected by each hazard

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation of the Vulnerability Assessment in regards to estimating potential losses includes *(recommended but not required)*:
  - An estimate of potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures.
  - A discussion regarding the methodology used in estimating losses

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation of the Vulnerability Assessment in regards to analyzing development trends includes *(recommended but not required)*:
  - A discussion regarding existing and proposed land uses in the community including the locations where development is occurring

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- For multi-jurisdictional plans: include risk assessments for those communities that have hazards that are unique from the rest of the communities

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation of the Mitigation Strategy in regards to the goals of the community includes:
  - A discussion regarding the communities long term hazard reduction goals

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation regarding the identification and analysis of mitigation actions includes:
  - A list of all mitigation actions and projects considered
  - Actions and projects that reduce the effects of hazards on new buildings and infrastructure
  - Actions and projects that reduce the effects of hazards on existing buildings and infrastructure

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation regarding how your community will implement the mitigation plan includes:
  - A prioritization of actions including a discussion regarding the method used to determine the prioritization
  - A description of who is responsible for implementing and funding the action, as well as the target date for completion

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation regarding how your community will implement the mitigation plan includes (continued):
  - A discussion regarding the review performed to determine whether the actions decided on have the greatest benefit in relation to costs

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- For multi-jurisdictional plans: include at least one identifiable action for each community

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation regarding your plan maintenance process includes:
  - A discussion regarding who is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the plan, the monitoring schedule and how the monitoring will be conducted

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation regarding your plan maintenance process includes (continued):
  - A discussion regarding who is responsible for evaluating the plan, the schedule for the evaluation and how the plan is going to be evaluated
  - A discussion regarding the schedule, the method and who is responsible for updating the plan (minimum of every five years)

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- Documentation includes a process for identifying other planning mechanisms and incorporating the plan requirements into them;

examples include: comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, zoning ordinances, building codes, permits, job descriptions, etc.

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- A discussion is included regarding how continued public participation will be included in the monitoring, evaluation and updating of the plan

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Good

- The Plan includes documentation, such as a resolution, verifying that that the community has adopted the plan (for multi-jurisdictional plans each jurisdiction must adopt the plan to get credit for it)

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Bad

- The Bad Plans:
  - Assume that the reader knows the process and/or methods followed in making decisions (Remember: the reviewer doesn't have a crystal ball)
  - Don't include public input
  - Don't invite Federal and State agencies, neighboring communities, businesses, educators and non-profits to be involved in the process

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Bad

- The Bad Plans (continued):
  - Doesn't include the best available information
  - Doesn't include a discussion of all hazards that can affect the community
  - Doesn't identify locations affected by each hazard (remember some hazards are site specific and others may affect the entire community; Also, maps are worth a thousand words)

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Bad

- The Bad Plans (continued):
  - Don't tell how bad the disaster can get, don't include a history of more than a few years, and don't include any kind of probability regarding future occurrences
  - Don't identify the affect of the hazard on the built environment
  - Don't include information on how buildings, infrastructure, critical facilities, evacuations or emergency services are affected by the hazards

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Bad

- The Bad Plans (continued):
  - Don't include the communities goals or they identify actions as goals
  - Only include actions decided on, not actions considered
  - Don't include brick and mortar actions that address the existing and proposed built environment

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Bad

- The Bad Plans (continued):
  - Don't prioritize actions
  - Don't identify correct funding sources, implementation responsibilities and target dates
  - Don't identify whether the project provides the greatest cost/benefit

**URS**

## Mitigation Planning-the Bad

- The Bad Plans (continued):
  - Don't document the maintenance, evaluation and update procedures
  - Don't include ways of incorporating the plan into other planning mechanisms
  - Don't include the public in the updates

**URS**

## Mitigations Planning-The Bad

- The Multi-jurisdictional Bad Plans:
  - Haven't been adopted by all participating communities
  - Haven't identified how the communities were involved in the process
  - Haven't included hazards that are unique to some communities
  - Haven't included at least one action for each participating community

**URS**

## Mitigations Planning-The Ugly

- Ugly Plans are those that shouldn't have been submitted as all natural hazard mitigation plans. This includes:
  - Emergency operation Plans
  - Comprehensive Plans without a mitigation planning sections
  - Flood Mitigation Plans-remember this is all hazard plan (Although a FMA Plan can be a part of the all hazard plan)

**URS**

## Mitigations Planning-The Ugly

- Ugly Plans are those that shouldn't have been submitted as all natural hazard mitigation plans. This includes (continued):
  - Old project plans
  - Plans over five years old

**Mitigation Planning, the  
Good, the Bad and the Ugly  
??????????**

**URS**