

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL - FINAL

Hazard Mitigation Plan for the Former Central Connecticut Region 2016-2021 Update (*7 Jurisdictions)

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: Former Central Connecticut Region	Title of Plan: Hazard Mitigation Plan for the former Central Connecticut Region 2016-2021 Update	Date of Plan: 01/22/ 2016
Single or Multi-jurisdiction plan? Multi-Jurisdiction		New Plan or Plan Update? Update
Local Point of Contact: Tim Malone - tmalone@crcog.org Capitol Region Council of Governments 241 Main Street - Hartford, CT 06106-5310 - (860) 522-2217 Regional POC: David Murphy, P.E., CFM Associate Milone & MacBroom, Inc. 99 Realty Drive, Cheshire, CT 06410 203-271-1773 - DMurphy@mminc.com davem@miloneandmacbroom.com https://www.mminc.com/		Local Points of Contact: The last page of this review tool contains contact information for seven (7) participating jurisdictions*
State Reviewer: Tessa Gutowski Gemma Fabris	Title & Email: Manager of Planning tessa.gutowski@ct.gov SHMO – gemma.fabris@ct.gov	Date: 12/28/15; 1/6/2015 05/16/2016 (enquiry) & 8/25/2016

FEMA Reviewer: Jason Farrell David Mendelsohn Brigitte Ndikum-Nyada Barbara Ellis	Title: CERC Community Planner Community Planner HM Community Planner, RSV	Date: 04/04/2016 5/18/2016 5/18 -5/19/2016, 9/9 & 9/13/2016 8/27/2016
Date Received in FEMA Region I	03/08/2016 & 8/25/2016	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption	5/19/2016	
Plan Adopted by Jurisdiction	<i>City of Bristol-6/15/16; City of New Britain-7/13/16; Towns of Berlin-7/7/16, Burlington-7/26/16, Plainville-6/6/16, Plymouth-7/5/16 and Southington-7/25/16</i>	
Plan Approved	9/13/16	

* The **Former Central Connecticut Region (CCRPA)** has developed an update regional multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan in partnership with seven (7) municipalities. These municipalities are: **Cities** of Bristol and New Britain; **Towns** of Berlin, Burlington, Plainville, Plymouth and Southington.

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.

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))	Page ii; Section 1.4, pp. 4-5; Section 5.4, p. 131; Section 6.4, pp. 155-156; Section 7.4, p. 179; Section 8.4, p. 202; Section 9.4, p. 228; Section 10.4, p. 261; Section 11.4, p. 287; Appendix A, pp. A-1 – A-184	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 1.4, pp. 4-5; Section 5.4, p. 131; Section 6.4, pp. 155-156; Section 7.4, p. 179; Section 8.4, p. 202; Section 9.4, p. 228; Section 10.4, p. 261; Section 11.4, p. 287; Appendix A, pp. A-1 – A-184	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 3.3, pp. 83-90; Section 5.2.2, p. 117; Section 6.2.2, p. 139; Section 7.2.2, p. 165; Section 9.2.2, p. 213; Section 11.2.2, p. 270; Section 11.2.3, p. 273; Appendix A, pp. A-1 – A-184	X		
A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))	Section 4, pp. 93-108; Section 5.2.2, pp. 114-115; Section 6.2.2, pp. 137-139; Section 7.2.2, pp. 161-163; Section 8.2.2, pp. 185-187; Section 9.2.2, pp. 207-211; Section 10.2.2, pp. 234-236; Section 11.2.2, pp. 266-269; Section 12, pp. 288-294	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 1.6.5, p. 8	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 1.6, pp. 7-10	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 A: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
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 3.1, p. 32; Section 3.2, pp. 33-83; Section 5.2, pp. 110-124; Section 6.2, pp. 133-149; Section 7.2, pp. 158-172; Section 8.2, pp. 182-196; Section 9.2, pp. 204-221; Section 10.2, pp. 230-248; Section 11.2, pp. 263-279	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))	PP. 1-2 , Section 3, p. 32; Section 3, pp. 33-83; pp. 90-91; Section 4, pp. 100-102; Section 5, pp. 110-124; Section 6, pp. 133-149; Section 7, pp. 158-172; Section 8, pp. 182-196; Section 9, pp. 204-221; Section 10, pp. 230-248; Section 11, pp. 263-279	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 3.1, p. 32; Section 3.2, pp. 33-83; Section 5.2, pp. 110-124; Section 6.2, pp. 133-149; Section 7.2, pp. 158-172; Section 8.2, pp. 182-196; Section 9.2, pp. 204-221; Section 10.2, pp. 230-248; Section 11.2, pp. 263-279	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 3.2.1, pp. 41-42; Section 5.2.2, pp. 115-116; Section 5.3, p 130; Section 6.2.2, p. 139; p. 155; Section 7.2.2, pp. 162, 165, 179; Section 8.2.2, pp. 186-188; Section 8.3.2, p 201; Section 9.2.2, pp. 209; Section 9.3, pp. 227-228; Section 10.2.2, p. 234; Section 10.3.2, pp 260-261; Section 11.2.2, p. 267; Section 11.3.2, p 286; throughout the Appendices	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 4, pp. 93-108; Section 5.2.2, pp. 114-115; Section 6.2.2, pp. 137-139; Section 7.2.2, pp. 161-163; Section 8.2.2, pp. 185-187; Section 9.2.2, pp. 207-211; Section 10.2.2, pp. 234-236; Section 11.2.2, pp. 266-269; Section 12, pp. 288-294	X		

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
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 4.1.1, pp. 93-95; Section 5.2.2, pp. 114-115; Section 6.2.2, pp. 137-139; Section 7.2.2, pp. 161-163; Section 8.2.2, pp. 185-187; Section 9.2.2, pp. 207-211; Section 10.2.2, pp. 234-236; Section 11.2.2, pp. 266-269; Section 12, pp. 288-294	X		
C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))	Section 1.0, p. 1; Section 5.1, p. 109; Section 5.3.2, p. 126, Section 6.1, p. 132; Section 6.3.2, p. 151; Section 7.1, p. 157; Section 7.3.2 p. 174; Section 8.1, p. 180; Section 8.3.2, p. 198; Section 9.1, p. 203; Section 9.3.2, p. 223; Section 10.1, p. 229; Section 10.3.2, p. 252; Section 11.1, p. 262; Section 11.3.2, p. 280	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 5.3.2, p. 126, Section 6.3.2, p. 151; Section 7.3.2 p. 174; Section 8.3.2, p. 198; Section 9.3.2, p. 223; Section 10.3.2, p. 252; Section 11.3.2, p. 280	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 4.4.7, pp. 106-108; Section 5.3.2, p. 126, Section 6.3.2, p. 151; Section 7.3.2 p. 174; Section 8.3.2, p. 198; Section 9.3.2, p. 223; Section 10.3.2, p. 252; Section 11.3.2, p. 280	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 1.5, pp. 6-7	X		
ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS				
ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION (applicable to plan updates only)				
D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 2, pp. 12-31; Section 5.1.1, pp. 109-110; Section 6.1.1, pp. 132-133; Section 7.1.1, pp. 157-158; Section 8.1.1, pp. 180-181; Section 9.1.1, pp. 203-204; Section 10.1.1, pp. 229-230; Section 11.1.1, pp. 262-263	X		

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 5.3.1, pp. 125-126; Section 6.3.1, pp. 150-151; Section 7.3.1, pp. 173-174; Section 8.3.1, pp. 196-197; Section 9.3.1, pp. 222-223; Section 10.3.1, pp. 249-251; Section 11.3.1, pp. 279-280	X		
D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 1.0, pp. 1-2; Section 5.3, pp. 125-126; Section 6.3, pp. 150-151; Section 7.3, pp. 173-174; Section 8.3, pp. 196-197; Section 9.3, pp. 222-223; Section 10.3, pp. 249-251; Section 11.3, pp. 279-280	X		
<u>ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION				
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))	All jurisdictions have adopted the HM Plan. Signed adoption certificates on file. Appendix B (pages 495-506)	X		
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	All jurisdictions have adopted the HM Plan. Signed adoption certificates on file. Appendix B (pages 495-506)	X		
<u>ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)				
F1.				
F2.				
<u>ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				

SECTION 2: 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

Strengths:

- Annex A includes the PowerPoint decks used in the planning meetings. Inclusion of these slides ensure that meeting materials are preserved for future plan updates
- The plan update process occurred across multiple locations and was well advertised, to attract attention and input into the process
- The use of a publicly distributed survey helped gather input that might have gone uncollected during a standard plan update process, if the only avenue for public comment were in-person participation. Section 2.0 (Regional Overview) provides excellent information on the region as a whole, as well as jurisdiction-specific data
- Excellent description of the current regional planning agencies for each jurisdiction formally affiliated with the former CCRPA. Great job including this information: *“Future monitoring, evaluating and updating of the overall Plan update will be coordinated by the Naugatuck Valley COG, Capitol Region COG, and Northwest Hills COG.”*
- Here is another excellent addition to this HM Plan Update 2016: Including a list of *“Contributors to Plan Update”* at the end of each community Annex is a job done well.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Plan section 3.3.3 is mislabeled, and should be labeled as 3.2.3
- A summary table of planning participants in the opening section of the plan would help summarize team membership, while still allowing for the jurisdictional breakdowns in the respective annexes, as well as the attendee lists in Appendix A
- When discussing the other planning mechanisms and resources that were referenced in the plan update, include information on where in the plan those documents were useful or provided data.
- Having MiloneandMacBroom.com & the company’s Logo listed twice on the footer pages of the entire HM Plan does not allow each participating community to claim ownership of their Plan Annex. The Logo on the first page of the Plan does seem to be sufficient.

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

Strengths:

- Plan makes use of the Hazus-MH tool to estimate vulnerability for hazards
- The plan goes beyond simply listing previous events, and where applicable, provides narratives that also describe the previous occurrences of the hazards

- The plan provides data relative to NFIP participation, Repetitive Loss Structures and NFIP data within the summary table X.2 in each of the jurisdictional specific annexes

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Additional maps could be created for the jurisdictional annexes that display hazard information beyond the relevant flood information
- Probability means the likelihood of the hazard occurring and may be defined in terms of general descriptors (for example, unlikely, likely, highly likely), historical frequencies, statistical probabilities (for example: 1% chance of occurrence in any given year), and/or hazard probability maps. If general descriptors are used, then they must be defined in the plan. For example, “highly likely” could be defined as equals near 100% chance of occurrence next year or happens every year.

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

Strengths:

- Sections X.3.2 in the jurisdictional annexes provide excellent information regarding the proposed mitigation actions for this update, including a descriptive narrative that expands on the stated actions
- The planning process used the STAPLEE ranking method to compile scores for mitigation actions, those scores are provided in Appendix G of the plan for reference

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Section 7.3 states that Objective #5 was re-written, but it was actually 2011 Objective #6 and plan update Objective #6
- A stronger connection could be made between the mitigation strategy and the risk assessment. Projects identified should be address how they will specifically reduce vulnerabilities for the given jurisdiction
- “Considering, ensuring, encouraging, continuing ...” are not actions. What is going to be done about the problem? What is going to be done in the next planning period? What’s the outcome the Town will be looking for when it updates the plan in five years? Projects that answer these questions are actions. Setting up problem statements from the risk and vulnerability assessment will help develop actionable strategies.

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

Strengths:

- The summary tables provided in section x.3.1 of the jurisdictional annexes provide a breakdown on the status of previously identified projects. Comments are provided for each project, whether it was completed, deferred or removed
- The statement on page 1 that “Each community reaffirmed its hazard mitigation planning goal and reviewed its objectives to meet its goal” puts that piece of information right in the front of the plan, and in the mind of the reader from the very beginning

Opportunities for Improvement:

- When discussing the progress made on the mitigation actions from the previous draft of the plan, celebrate examples of how the planning process increased resilience of the community
- Section 2 provides excellent data on the status of the region, and could include some of the projected census numbers to help address potential future growth/losses in the planning area
- Discussing trends in the STAPLEE scoring might be a useful evaluation tool. For example, if flood related actions received higher priority in this update than in the last plan, flooding could be considered a higher priority for a given jurisdiction.
- Describe if potential development will occur within each community and indicate where the development will most likely happen. Identify if the projected development is in an area identified as vulnerable to hazards.
- Consider the following questions during the next update. What are the community's vulnerabilities to natural hazards that keep elected officials worried and awake at night? Do the mitigation goals and objectives still reflect the concerns of local residents, business owners, and officials? Have local conditions changed so that findings of the risk and vulnerability assessments should be updated? Are new sources of information available that will improve the risk assessment? If risks and vulnerabilities have changed, do the mitigation goals and objectives still reflect the risk assessment? What hazards have caused damage locally since the last edition of the HMP was developed? Were these anticipated and evaluated in the HMP or should these hazards be added to the plan? Are current personnel and financial resources at the local level sufficient for implementing mitigation actions? For each mitigation action that has not been completed, what are the obstacles to implementation? What are potential solutions for overcoming these obstacles? Are the changes in development related to community's vulnerability? Did the risk assessment integrate climate and resilience considerations?
- Was hazard Identification and risk analysis, take into account economic impact (looking at loss of businesses that do not return after a major catastrophic event (1 in 4 or 25%) and the grand list/tax implication due to loss of homes? For each mitigation action that has been completed, was the action effective in reducing risk? What mitigation actions should be added to the plan and proposed for implementation? If any proposed mitigation actions should be deleted from the plan, what is the rationale? Were the anticipated timeframes for completion accurate or needed adjustments? In evaluating the community's existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, how effective were they? And how is the community able to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? See FEMA Local Planning Handbook of March 2013 worksheet 7.2 for more examples.

B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

The Connecticut State Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO) and State Mitigation Planners can provide guidance regarding grants, technical assistance, available publications, and training opportunities.

Chapter 3 and Appendix 5-3 of the *2014 State of Connecticut Hazard Mitigation Plan* identifies a number of potential funding resources for various mitigation actions. More information about applying for grants,

available publications and training opportunities can be obtained from Gemma Fabris, Connecticut Acting State Hazard Mitigation Officer at Gemma.Fabris@ct.gov

- Develop and maintain a web page dedicated to hazard mitigation planning and public participation.
- Identify and apply for State and Federal hazard mitigation grant programs (CT and FEMA).
- Consider what actions can be funded by various governmental agencies (federal and state), especially when meeting multiple community goals. Federal agencies may support integrated planning efforts such as rural development, sustainable communities and smart growth, wildfire mitigation, conservation, etc.
- Seek out other non-governmental or non-emergency management funding sources such as from private organizations and businesses, federal initiatives (Smart Growth, Sustainable Communities), Federal Highways pilot projects, and historic preservation programs.

All 7 Jurisdictions of this multi are encouraged to work with the State to maximize use of every 406 hazard mitigation opportunity when available during federally declared disasters. A better alignment and increasing the effectiveness of 406 and 404 mitigation funds, greatly benefit these communities in the long run.

Publications

New! Online FEMA Region I Webliography:

<http://www.fema.gov/about-region-i/about-region-i/hazard-mitigation-planning-webliography>

Federal Funds and Technical Assistance

Federal agencies may support integrated planning efforts such as rural development, sustainable communities and smart growth, wildfire mitigation, conservation, etc.

A variety of sources may be available for grants, guidance, and partnerships, including academic institutions, non-profit foundations, community organizations, and businesses.

Governmental agencies (federal and state) can be helpful, especially when meeting multiple community goals. Federal agencies may support integrated planning efforts such as rural development, sustainable communities and smart growth, wildfire mitigation, conservation, historic preservation programs, etc. FEMA's RiskMAP may bring technical assistance resources rather than direct funding.

Federal Grants resource center

<http://reconnectingamerica.org/resource-center/federal-grant-opportunities/>

FEMA Risk MAP <http://www.fema.gov/rm-main> .

Technical assistance is available through Risk MAP to assist communities in identifying, selecting, and implementing activities to support mitigation planning and risk reduction; Attend any Risk MAP's discovery meetings that may be scheduled in the State (or neighboring communities with shared watersheds boundaries) in the future.

[FEMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance Grant Program](http://www.fema.gov/hazard-mitigation-assistance)

<http://www.fema.gov/hazard-mitigation-assistance>

This program provides funding for projects under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP), Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM), and Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA). Individuals and businesses are not eligible to apply for HMA funds; however, an eligible applicant or subapplicant may apply for funding to mitigate private structures.

USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

Conservation Technical Assistance

<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/technical/cta>

Financial Assistance <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/financial/>

Conservation Innovation Grant Programs

<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs>

HUD

Sustainable Housing and Communities Initiative

http://portal.hud.gov/portal/page/portal/HUD/program_offices/sustainable_housing_communities

CDBG Disaster Recovery Assistance

http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/communitydevelopment/programs/drsi

HUD flexible grants help cities, counties, and States recover from Presidentially declared disasters, especially in low-income areas, subject to availability of supplemental appropriations.

The CDBG Disaster Recovery grants primarily benefit low-income residents in and around communities that have experienced a natural disaster. These can be either activities in which all or the majority of people who benefit have low or moderate incomes or activities that benefit an area or service group in which at least 51 percent of the population are of low- and moderate-income.

EPA

Tools are supplied to help communities become more flood resilient using smart growth approaches and help communities prepare for and recover from disaster.

Learn about the Smart Growth Implementation Assistance Program:

<http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/sgia.htm>

Hazard Mitigation Planning Webliography, FEMA Region I

<http://www.fema.gov/about-region-i/about-region-i/hazard-mitigation-planning-webliography>

Publications

FEMA Region I Webliography

<http://www.fema.gov/about-region-i/about-region-i/hazard-mitigation-planning-webliography> The

compilation of government and private online sites are useful sources of information for developing and implementing hazard mitigation programs and plans within the New England area.

Mitigation Ideas: A Resource for Reducing Risk to Natural Hazards

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

FEMA B-797, Hazard Mitigation Field Book – Roadways

<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=4271>

Flood Hazard Mitigation Handbook for Public Facilities

<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=3724>

FEMA 386-6, Mitigation Planning How To #6: Integrating Historic Property & Cultural Resource Considerations into Hazard Mitigation Planning. Provides guidance regarding how to involve community-based organizations in mitigation planning.

<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=1892>

FEMA P-787 Catalog of FEMA Wind, Flood & Wildfire Publications, Training Courses & Workshops (2012)

<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=3184>

FEMA publications

FEMA 2015 Hazard Mitigation Guidance, HMA Guidance, FEMA requirements regarding HMGP, PDM, and FMA grants. http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1424983165449-38f5dfc69c0bd4ea8a161e8bb7b79553/HMA_Guidance_022715_508.pdf

Local Mitigation Planning Handbook, FEMA, March 2013

<http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/31598?id=7209>

Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide, FEMA, October 1, 2011

<http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/23194>

Integrating the Local Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan into a Community's Comprehensive Plan

<http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1388432170894-6f744a8afa8929171dc62d96da067b9a/FEMA-X-IntegratingLocalMitigation.pdf>

Integrating Hazard Mitigation Into Local Planning

http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1908-25045-0016/integrating_hazmit.pdf

FEMA Public Information

Numerous publications can be downloaded for free from <http://www.fema.gov/library>. Many of these may be useful in public information/outreach programs. In some cases, paper literature can be ordered at no cost for public distribution.

Other Federal web resources

No Adverse Impact (NAI) How-To Guides

The intent of these How to Guides is to expand on the knowledge base within the original No Adverse Impact Toolkit and to provide specific tools for incorporating NAI floodplain management into local regulations, ordinances, requirements, design, standards and practices. Complete information about NAI can be found at: <http://www.floods.org/index.asp?menuID=460>

Beyond the Basics: Best Practices in Local Mitigation Planning

DHS Coastal Hazards Center of Excellence developed the following: <http://mitigationguide.org/>. The purpose is to help communities develop and improve their local hazard mitigation plan. The site, which was created by the DHS Science and Technology Coastal Hazard Center of Excellence and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, also contains a self-assessment tool, sample community plans and a place to share experiences and lessons learned.

U.S. Climate Resilience Toolkit - <https://toolkit.climate.gov>

Scientific tools, information, and expertise are provided to help people manage their climate-related risks and opportunities, and improve their resilience to extreme events. This aid assists planning through links to a wide-variety of web-tools covering topics including coastal flood risk, ecosystem vulnerability, and water resources among others. Experts can be located in the NOAA, USDA, and Dept. of Interior, as well as state climatologists. Case studies in resilience are presented, including six within New England states. The site is designed to serve interested citizens, communities, businesses, resource managers, planners, and policy leaders at all levels of government.

<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=3724>

FEMA P-754, [Wildfire Hazard Mitigation Handbook for Public Facilities](#)

<http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/16568?id=3723>

A useful database for New England. <http://www.epa.gov/raine>

<http://nws.weather.gov/nthmp/> - A coordinated national effort to assess **tsunami** threat, prepare community response, issue timely and effective warnings, and mitigate damage.

SECTION 3: MULTI-JURISDICTION CONTACT LIST

INSTRUCTIONS: For multi-jurisdictional plans, the Contact List must be completed. Identify each participating jurisdiction, the jurisdiction type, and POC information.

#	Jurisdiction Name	Jurisdiction Type (city/borough/ township/village, etc.)	Plan POC	Mailing Address	Email	Phone
1	City of Bristol	City	Walter Veselka	111 North Main Street Bristol, CT 06010	WalterVeselka@bristolct.org	(860) 584-6103
2	City of New Britain	City	Robert Trottier	27 West Main Street New Britain, CT 06051	RTrottier@newbrtainct.gov	(860) 826-3355
3	Town of Berlin	Town	Matthew Odishoo	240 Kensington Road Berlin, CT 06037	Modishoo@town.berlin.ct.us	(860) 828-7018
4	Town of Burlington	Town	Ron Roberts	200 Spielman Highway Burlington, CT 06013	BurlingtonEM@gmail.com	(860) 673-6789 x213
5	Town of Plainville	Town	Mark Devoe	1 Central Square Plainville, CT 06062-1955	Devoe@plainville-ct.gov	(860) 793-0221 x210
6	Town of Plymouth	Town	Margus Laan	80 Main Street Terryville, CT 06786	MLaan@plymouthct.us	(860) 585-4043
7	Town of Southington	Town	Robert Phillips	196 North Main Street Southington, CT 06489	PhillipsR@southington.org	(860) 276-6248

SECTION 4: MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET

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). *Please Note: Sub-elements that do not have jurisdiction-specific requirements are ‘blocked-out’ in the Summary Spreadsheet.*

MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET (<i>Regional & Municipals’ Annexes met all Requirements</i>)																						
#	Jurisdiction Name	Requirements Met (Y/N)																				
		A. Planning Process						B. Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment				C. Mitigation Strategy						D. Plan Review, Evaluation & Implementation			E. Plan Adoption	
		A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	D1	D2	D3	E1	E2
1	City of Bristol	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
2	City of New Britain	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
3	Town of Berlin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
4	Town of Burlington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
5	Town of Plainville	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
6	Town of Plymouth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
7	Town of Southington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
8																						