

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL –

Hazard Mitigation Plan Update, 2015. A Multi-Jurisdiction Plan for the **former** Windham Region Council of Governments (WINCOG) Towns of Columbia, Coventry, Lebanon, Mansfield, Willington, and Windham

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*.

Jurisdictions: See Above & below	Title of Plan: Hazard Mitigation Plan Update, 2015. A Multi-Jurisdiction Plan for the former Windham Region Council of Governments (WINCOG) - Type of Plan: Single or Multi	Date of Plan: May-2015 Update? Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No: <input type="checkbox"/> Plan Adopted: (see below)
Regional Point of Contact: James S. Butler, AICP Title: Executive Director jbutler@seccog.org Agency: Southeastern CCOGs - 860-889-2324 Address: 5 Connecticut Avenue Norwich, CT 06360	RPOC: Lyle Wray, Executive Director RPOC: Lynne Pike DiSanto, AICP. Sr. Planning & Policy Analyst - lpikedisanto@crcog.org - 860-522-2217 ext. 211 Agency: Capitol Region Council of Governments Address: 241 Main Street, 4 th floor Hartford, CT 06106	
Regional Consultant: David Murphy, P.E., CFM Associate, Milone & MacBroom, Inc. davem@mileoneandmacbroom.com Address: 99 Realty Drive, Cheshire, CT 06410 (203) 271-1773	<i>(See page A-15 of this tool for local contacts information & addresses.)</i>	

State Reviewer: Karen Michaels Tessa Gutowski	Title: Environmental Analyst - Karen.michaels@ct.gov Planning Manager - Tessa.Gutowski@ct.gov	Date: April 2014, May 2015 & 12/14/2015
--	--	---

FEMA Reviewers: Sara Reynolds Brigitte Ndikum-Nyada	Titles: STARR Community Planner	Dates: 7/17/14 7/16/14, 7/22/14, 8/14/15 & 1/8 to 1/11/2016
Date Received in FEMA Region	4/16/2013, 5/26/2015 & 12/18/2015	
Plan Not Approved	Requires revisions 7/23/2014	
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption	8/17/2015	
Plan Adopted by Jurisdictions	As of today 1/11/2016 all six (6) jurisdictions have adopted this Multi	
Plan Approved	1/11/2016	

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))	P. i; Sect. I.C to I.E, pp. 11-13; Sect. IV.E, pp. 241-242; App. II	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))	P. i; Sect. I.C to I.E, pp. 11-13; Sect. IV.E, pp. 241-242; App. II	X	
A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1))	Sect. I.D and I.E, p. 13; Sect. IV.D, pp. 238-239; App. II	X	
A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))	Sect. I.D, p. 12; Sect IV.E, pp. 243-246; Citations/footnotes throughout plan	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))	Sect. IV.C, p. 238	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))	Sect. IV.A, p. 237	X	
ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS:			
Responses to required revisions -			
<p>*An Executive Summary has been added (page xii). It states that the goals and the hazards addressed in the plan have not changed. In addition, a Summary of Plan Revisions (page xiv) is presented immediately following the Executive Summary.</p> <p>*Immediately following the Executive Summary, another new section (“Summary of Plan Revisions”) has been added and explains the varying statuses of the jurisdictions covered by the plan update.</p> <p>*The State of Connecticut NHMP Update 2014 has been incorporated and referenced in numerous sections of the revised plan. The “Climate” section on page 13 has been renamed “Climate and Climate Change” and text has been added.</p> <p>*“the CT Section 322 Plan,” The State of Connecticut NHMP Update 2014 has been referenced in numerous sections of the revised plan, and all references to the “CT Section 322 Plan” have been removed.</p> <p>* Section I.C. (page 1) has been renamed “Planning Process” and separates the discussion of the process followed for the update from the process followed for the initial plan. The “Plan Update Process” discussion begins on page 2. Public meetings are listed on pages 3 and 4.</p> <p>* The “Plan Update Process” discussion on pages 2 and 3 describes how stakeholders were invited.</p> <p>* The “Plan Update Process” discussion on pages 3 and 4 describes how public comments were incorporated (in general, there was very little public comment).</p> <p>* Section IV has been renamed “Plan Maintenance and Incorporation” and now includes this discussion on pages 262-263.</p> <p>* Section IV has been renamed “Plan Maintenance and Incorporation” and now includes this discussion on pages 257-260. Table 7 on page 259 is a schedule.</p>			

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))	Sect. II.B, pp. 26-44; Sect. III, p. 47 Chaplin: Sect. III, pp. 52-65	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))	Sect. II.B, pp. 26-44; App. I Chaplin: Sect. III, pp. 52-65	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))	Sect. II.B, pp. 26-44; Sect. III, p. 47 Chaplin: Sect. III, pp. 48-50, 52-65	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))	p 140	X		
ELEMENT B: REQUIRED REVISIONS:				
<u>Responses to required revisions -</u>				
<p>* Additional text and expanded discussions can be found on pages 21-49 (for the region) and for each community as follows: Columbia (pages 56-77), Coventry (pages 87-108), Lebanon (pages 122-143), Mansfield (pages 162-185), Willington (pages 201-220), and Windham (pages 233-252).</p> <p>* None of the commonly recognized hazards have been omitted. Refer to text on page 20.</p> <p>* Tables 7 and 8 (pages 47 and 48) have been added to characterize frequency of occurrence.</p> <p>* Details about vulnerabilities and loss estimates have been added for each community as follows: Columbia (pages 56-77), Coventry (pages 87-108), Lebanon (pages 122-143), Mansfield (pages 162-185), Willington (pages 201-220), and Windham (pages 233-252).</p> <p>* This information can be found on pages 20, 65, and 173.</p>				

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))	Sect. II.B, pp. 26-44 Chaplin: Sect. III, pp. 54-65	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))	Sect. III, pp. 45-46 Chaplin: Sect. III, pp. 56, 60	X		
C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))	Chaplin: Sect. III, pp. 66-67	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))	App. III Chaplin: Sect. III, pp. 54-65, 66-67; App. IV	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))	Chaplin: Sect. III, pp. 66-67; App. IV	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))	Sect. IV.B, pp. 237-238	X		

ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS**Responses to required revisions -**

* A list of "authorities who play advisory, supervisory, or direct roles in hazard mitigation" has been provided for each town on pages 56, 87, 122, 162, 201, and 233. A summary paragraph has been added under each "Mitigation Efforts" subsection for each hazard (for each town) to describe capabilities and whether they have changed. The page numbers are too numerous to list. However, in general these paragraphs are found as follows: Columbia (pages 56-77), Coventry (pages 87-108), Lebanon (pages 122-143), Mansfield (pages 162-185), Willington (pages 201-220), and Windham (pages 233-252).

* Details have been added as follows: Columbia (page 65), Coventry (page 96), Lebanon (page 131), Mansfield (page 173), Willington (page 210), and Windham (page 242).

* The STAPLEE method has been incorporated into this plan. Refer to the new section III.B. which begins on page 49. The required revisions are located as follows: Columbia (page 77-81), Coventry (page 108-115), Lebanon (page 143-151), Mansfield (page 185-195), Willington (page 220-226), and Windham (page 252-256). A STAPLEE table of actions has been developed and added to the plan as Appendix IV.

* Refer to page 261-263. It is not believed that this was achieved for any of the communities, but a process for doing so is presented for the communities to utilize moving forward.

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))	Sect. II.A, pp. 20-22, 24-25 Sect. III, pp. 48-52	X	
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Sect. III, pp. 68-70	X	
D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Sect. III, pp. 66-70	X	

ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS**Responses to required revisions -**

* These discussions have been added as follows: Columbia (page 52), Coventry (page 83), Lebanon (page 118), Mansfield (pages 157-158), Willington (page 196), and Windham (pages 228-229).

* Tables that summarize progress relative to individual actions have been added as follows: Columbia (page 78), Coventry (page 109), Lebanon (page 144), Mansfield (page 186), Willington (page 222), and Windham (page 253).

* For each town, the goal and objectives from the initial plan are listed and a statement was added about whether objectives have changed and if any were added: Columbia (page 77-79), Coventry (page 108-112), Lebanon (page 143-148), Mansfield (page 185-189), Willington (pages 221-223), and Windham (pages 252-254).

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 six (6) participating jurisdictions in this Multi have adopted the final HM Plan. All adoption certificate are included from page 306-312.	X	
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	Pending...see Appendix V, p. 337 (5-2)	X	

ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS:**Responses to required revisions -**

*Appendix V has been updated with sample adoption documents specific to each of the former WINCOG communities. In addition to providing the adoption paperwork and updating the adoption date, it is expected that strikethroughs will be removed from the final document that will change page numbers and page breaks throughout the document. New page numbers will be reflected in the final table of contents. Textual edits to the final plan document will not be performed, although some stylistic changes (such as underlines) may be needed for consistency between sections.

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

F1.			
-----	--	--	--

F2.			
ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS			

Other edits in addition to required revisions -

A table of recent disaster declarations has been added to page 20.

- The EF scale has been added to the plan on page 38.
- Changes to the State’s Dam Safety Program have been described up front on page 22 and then briefly repeated in the dam safety section for each town.
- The numbers and hazard classes of dams in each town were updated based on the current inventory provided by CT DEEP. Edits can be found as follows: Columbia (page 56-57), Coventry (page 86-87), Lebanon (page 120-121), Mansfield (page 159-160), Willington (page 197-199), and Windham (page 229-230).
- The Town of Windham provided information about flood risk in the Tyler Square area. This has been added to pages 236 and 238.
- References to the Connecticut Automated Flood Warning system have been removed throughout the document, as this warning system is defunct (in favor of the NWS watches and warnings).
- Amendments to the State Building Code have been referenced in several locations.
- “CL&P” has been changed to “Eversource Energy”
- For each town’s discussion of mitigation actions, the word “When” has been changed to “Timeframe”
- A brief discussion of Mitigation Funding Sources has been added as Section III.C.
- A brief discussion of the ongoing Plan of Conservation and Development update in Mansfield was added to the end of the “General Town Description” section for Mansfield, as well as Section IV.B. A related mitigation strategy involving microgrids has been added for Mansfield.

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

Plan Strengths:

- All in all, this Multi-Jurisdiction HM Plan was well done, contains best available data and all participating six (6) communities adopted the final Plan and all included a paragraph of their town's Charter in the adoption resolution document. Kudos! Final HM Plan also includes some of the communities' adoption resolution minutes. From page 306 thru 312 all adoption certificates are included. .
- The plan provides a brief summary of the process used to update the plan. Appendix II documents the specific activities that made up the planning process, identifies those individuals involved, and includes meeting agendas and sign-in sheets to further document the update process.
- Public participation is an important part of the hazard assessment process. Staff interviewed individuals from each of the nine towns to help determine the impact of various historical events. Meetings, open to the public, were also held monthly with WINCOG's Regional Emergency Planning Workgroup.
- Citations and footnotes are used throughout the plan to document how relevant information from existing plans, studies, and reports was incorporated into the plan.
- The Towns of Chaplin, Hampton, and Scotland joined NECCOG and had adopted that Multi-HM Plan; The Towns of Columbia, Coventry, Mansfield, and Willington joined CRCOG; and the Towns of Lebanon and Windham joined SCCOG.
- Resources researched and subject matter experts consulted for this update is impressive.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- After accomplishing a successful completion of the update of this HM Plan 2015, all the six (6) municipalities **are encouraged** to use social media, local newspaper, town's web page and/or local cable TV to celebrate the successful completion of this HM Plan Update as each community gets ready to implement this plan following FEMA's formal approval as of 1/11/2016.
- Ensure page numbers and appendices referenced in the plan text refer to the correct page/appendix.
- Although the plan documents the activities that made up the planning process in Appendix II, consider expanding the narrative in Section I to better summarize the plan update process.
- Although a diverse group of stakeholders was represented during plan development, consider inviting additional stakeholders such as businesses, academia, and other private and non-profit interests to participate in the planning process.
- Consider using more diverse methods of participation, such as surveys, questionnaires, or workshops, to solicit additional feedback from the public.
- Although the plan documents the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, and reports with citations throughout the plan and with a reference list, consider including a narrative description to summarize which plans, studies, and reports were reviewed and how relevant information from those items was incorporated into the plan.

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

Plan Strengths:

- Best available data and significant and current resources were used for this Update Plan.
- The plan includes hazard profiles that review the hazard risks, vulnerability, and existing mitigation tools.
- Maps are used to delineate the areas at risk to earthquake, past hurricanes, tornado, dam failure, and flood. An **excellent map on page 42** “Tornadoes in CT by County from 1950 to 2011.”
- The plan summarizes each town’s overall vulnerability by identifying infrastructure, concentrations of population, or other structures which are at risk to the identified hazards.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Consider estimating potential losses and expanding the description of potential impacts for all of the identified hazards.
- Estimate the population as well as the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, critical facilities, and infrastructure that are or will be located in the identified hazard areas to evaluate current and future risk.
- It is important all participating communities in the NFIP have current and best available data of all insured structures within their jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods. The information must describe the type (i.e., residential, commercial, etc.) and estimate the number of repetitive loss properties each community. The following information provided on page 260 of the revised draft HM Plan does not address the requirement: *“The local coordinator will be responsible for obtaining a current list of repetitive loss properties (RLPs) in the community each year, although it is understood that some of the communities do not currently have any RLPs. This list is available from the State NFIP Coordinator with Connecticut DEEP. The RLPs shall be subject to a windshield survey at least once every two years to ensure that the list is reasonably accurate relative to addresses and other basic information.”*
-

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

Plan Strengths:

- Each Town developed its own goals, objectives, and mitigation strategies based upon internal resources, discussions, and meetings with local officials and the general public. The Towns reviewed the Risk and Vulnerability Assessment as well as the strengths and weakness of their existing mitigation strategies and developed proposed mitigation strategies.
- An extensive and diverse list of mitigation efforts (presented by the hazard they address) were listed for consideration under the Evaluation of Risks & Vulnerabilities sections for each Town.
- The mitigation strategies were prioritized by answering the following questions about each task: mitigate multiple natural hazards, feasible, effective in avoiding or reducing future losses, cost seem reasonable for the size of the problem and likely benefits, enough political and public support to ensure success, improve upon existing programs or support other municipal priorities.
- Appendix IV includes a checklist of the potential mitigation projects and indicates the answer to each criteria question (listed above) as well as the overall priority ranking (high, medium, and low).

Opportunities for Improvement:

- For the next HM Plan Update, it is very important to consider the following: Avoid using passive language when identifying or describing mitigation actions and strategies (i.e., **consider, ensure, encourage, etc...**). Exercise the use of more direct language that explains how the issue will be addressed. Also consider this “Continue to regulate and enforce...” Rewording of some of the mitigation prioritized actions (in passive language) would transform them to quality and sound mitigation actions. We encourage and recommend the use of **more direct (not passive) language** which should explain how the issue will be addressed in reducing long-term risk. These communities should not at be “considering” already identified, prioritized and ranked mitigation actions in its HM Plan. They are common error found with mitigation actions when they are in passive language. How can an action that is being considered help a community to mitigate and reduce/eliminate long-term risk from natural hazards? (**For example, read FEMA definition below.* “(1) Consider conducting a comprehensive drainage study... (2) Consider local floodproofing options for homes... (3) Consider replacing and increasing the capacity... (4) Consider constructing a flood wall or berm... (5) Consider constructing a flood wall or berm (6) Consider the use of beaver deterrent etc...” **Actions listed as:** “Consider replacing and increasing the capacity of the culverts...,” need to be expanded to either include existing size or the estimated new size the **culverts** needed to be upgraded as well as change the word “consider.” ***Mitigation actions and projects means a hazard mitigation action, activity or process (for example, adopting a building code) or it can be a physical project (for example, elevating structures or retrofitting critical infrastructure) designed to reduce or eliminate the long term risks from hazards.** Mitigation actions reduce or eliminate long-term risk and are different from actions taken to prepare for or respond to hazard events. Mitigation activities lessen or eliminate the need for preparedness or response resources in the future.
- Although the plan identifies several existing mitigation measures, it only does so for a few of the hazards. Consider expanding the capability assessment to include additional policies, programs and resources as well as other available resources for mitigation, such as staff or fiscal resources (i.e., available funding through taxing authority and/or annual budgets).
- Better link the risk/vulnerability assessment with the mitigation strategy by identifying the hazards addressed by each mitigation strategy and identifying the specific vulnerable locations/areas that are targeted by the mitigation strategies.

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

Plan Strengths:

- The regional overview describes the history, geology, climate, land cover, transportation, demographics, land use and developmental trends for the WINCOG Region. Additional information on each Town is also provided, including population change, critical facilities, cultural resources, and land cover.
- The plan includes a list of completed mitigation strategies and delisted mitigation strategies from the 2007 plan. A reason is given for delisting each strategy that is no longer included but was not completed.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- More clearly indicate which mitigation strategies are new actions and which are existing actions from the previous plan that were not completed.
- Although the plan update reprioritized the mitigation strategies, consider including a narrative description of if and how any priorities have changed since the plan was previously approved to

reflect current financial, legal, political, and post-disaster conditions. Also, consider indicating the previous priority rating in addition to the current rating so that a comparison can be made for any existing mitigation strategies that were deferred from the previous plan.

- Element D2: Consider comparing the data of population change between the 2006 and 2014 NHM Plans so as to provide a better picture when reflecting changes in development. In 2006 Mansfield was the only community to experience a population drop. Then in 2010 Mansfield experienced the highest population increase. See figures below.
- More clearly establish the progress of its risk reduction measures over the long term. Explain further how Town's long term risk may be decreasing, increasing, or have no effect as a result of these implemented actions. Significant improvement is needed to associate how the changes in development are affecting the Town's risk along with the implementation of mitigation actions in meeting its mitigation goals. There are several organizations and partnerships evolving with the business and development community in your community that can be utilized to expand on this discussion.
- Identify any barriers or obstacles to successful implementation of the existing mitigation actions that were not completed as well as solutions to overcome them (e.g., ways to increase funding and staff resources).
- Regarding identifying changes in risk with respect to changes in development, FEMA's current Plan Review Guidance states the intent of this Element as "To ensure that the mitigation strategy continues to address the risk and vulnerabilities to existing and potential development, and takes into consideration possible future conditions that can impact the vulnerability of the community." For the next plan update ensure that this Element also include approved planned development that may not have yet been constructed but will be in the future. This changes in development and vulnerability analyses must not only address completed or underway construction from the last 5+ years, but also *potential development* (approved plans, projects, etc.), redevelopment, changes in zoning, codes, land use, policies, regulations, standards, new initiatives, etc. that the Towns have approved over the last planning period. This must also address how this may have had an effect on the town's risk.
- Although the plan assesses future development, consider further analyzing development trends to determine where future development would most likely take place and how it could affect at-risk-areas areas.
- It is important to relate the changes in development to the vulnerabilities, the actions and the progress in risk reduction for the community. Include redevelopment, expansions of existing structures or use, and changes in codes or policies when addressing changes in development. In the next Plan Update describe changes in development that may occur in hazard prone areas and increased or decreased the vulnerability of your community since the last plan's adoption and approved by FEMA.
- Provide comments from committee members describing the effectiveness of existing protections and policies and how the communities are able **to expand on and improve** them.
- It is important to relate the changes in development to the vulnerabilities, the actions and the progress in risk reduction for the community. Include redevelopment, expansions of

existing structures or use, and changes in codes or policies when addressing changes in development. Describe changes in development that have occurred in hazard prone areas and increased or decreased the vulnerability of each since the last plans were adopted and approved by FEMA.

- 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

- 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 Emily Pysh, Connecticut State Hazard Mitigation Officer at Emily.pysh@ct.gov, Tessa Gutowski, Manager of Planning Tessa.Gutowski@ct.gov and Karen Michaels, Environmental Analyst at karen.michaels@ct.gov.
- **WINCOG jurisdictions** are encouraged to do everything possible 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 the community in the long run.

- 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.

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.

Federal Grants resource center

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

Risk MAP: 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.

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

FEMA publications

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

[Mitigation Ideas, A Resource for Reducing Risk from Natural Hazards](#)

[Available upon request from FEMA Region 1](#)

Through Risk MAP, FEMA has developed and released this new resource for helping communities identify actions to improve their disaster resiliency! *Mitigation Ideas: A Resource for Reducing Risk from Natural Hazards* 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.

[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>

The publications below can be downloaded from <http://www.fema.gov/library>. Search in the FEMA library by title/number or use the web links below.

[Managing Floodplain Development through the NFIP](#) provides guidance to municipal officials considering changes to local regulations and zoning. A copy can be downloaded from

<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?id=2108>

FEMA P-762, [Local Officials Guide to Coastal Construction](#) assists building officials in understanding the connection between National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) guidelines, the International Building Code, and the International Residential Code. The guide also explores building performance, real-life successes and failures following storm events while recommending design and construction “best practices”.

<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=3647>

FEMA P-55 [Coastal Construction Manual: Principles and Practices of Planning, Siting, Designing, Constructing, and Maintaining Residential Buildings in Coastal Areas \(4th ed.\)](#) at

<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=1671>

A 2-volume publication providing a comprehensive approach to planning, siting, designing, constructing, & maintaining homes in the coastal environment.

Volume I: hazard identification, siting decisions, regulatory requirements, economic implications, and risk management; audience- design professionals, officials.

Volume II: in-depth descriptions of design, construction, & maintenance practice; audience - design professional

FEMA B-797, [Hazard Mitigation Field Book – Roadways](#)
<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=4271>

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>

[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 P-754, [Wildfire Hazard Mitigation Handbook for Public Facilities](#)
<http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/16568?id=3723>

The following FEMA publications are especially useful in public information/outreach programs and can be ordered in hard copy for public distribution.

FEMA P-737, [Home Builder's Guide to Construction in Wildfire Zones](#)
<http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/15962?id=3646>

FEMA 232, [Homebuilders' Guide to Earthquake-Resistant Design and Construction](#) provides seismic design and construction guidance for one- and two-family light frame residential structures that can be utilized by homebuilders, homeowners, and other non-engineers.
<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=2103>

FEMA 347, [Above the Flood: Elevating your Flood-prone House](#)
This large publication (69 pages) could be placed in the reference section of a local public library or at a City or Town Hall for lending.
<http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=1424>

Private non-profit information sources

National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Firewise Program
<http://www.firewise.org>

NFPA codes and standards
www.nfpa.org/freeaccess

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 of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, also contains a self-assessment tool, sample community plans and 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.

Former Windham Region Council of Governments (WINCOG) Council Members contact information *(from pages ii & iii of final adopted HM Plan) and from web pages.*

<p>Town of Columbia Carmen Vance, First Selectman cvance@columbiact.org. 860-228-4509 Jonathan Luiz, Town Administrator (Alt.) Mark Paquette Interim Town Administrator (860) 228-0110 townadministrator@columbiact.org</p> <p>Address: 323 Jonathan Trumbull Highway Columbia, CT 06237</p>	<p>Town of Coventry Elizabeth Woolf, Chairman; John Elsesser, Town Manager (Alt.) JElsesser@coventryct.org Noel Waite, Fire Marshal / EMD (860) 742-4064 - Nwaite@coventryct.org</p> <p>Address: 1712 Main Street Coventry, CT 06238</p>	<p>Town of Lebanon Joyce Okonuk, First Selectman firstselectman@lebanonct.gov</p> <p>Brandon Handfield Public Works Dir./Town Engineer 860-642-2011 Publicworks@lebanontownhall.org</p> <p>Address: 579 Exeter Road Lebanon, CT 06249</p>
<p>Town of Mansfield Elizabeth Paterson, Mayor, Matthew W. Hart, Town Manager (Alt.) TownMngr@mansfieldct.org</p> <p>Fran Raiola, EMD (860) 429-3328 OEM@mansfieldct.org</p> <p>Linda Painter Dir. of Planning & Development (860) 429-3330 - PainterLM@mansfieldct.org</p> <p>Address: 4 South Eagleville Road Mansfield, CT 06268</p>	<p>Town of Willington Christina Mailhos, First Selectman cmailhos@willingtonct.org</p> <p>Stuart Cobb, Contact via First Selectman's Office (860) 487-3100</p> <p>Address: Robin H. Campbell Office Manager</p> <p>Town Office Building 40 Old Farms Road Willington, CT 06279</p>	<p>Town of Windham Ernest Eldridge, Mayor, Neal Beets, Town Manager (Alt.)</p> <p>James Finger, AICP, Town Planner jfinger@windhamct.com (860) 465-3045</p> <p>Address: 979 Main Street Willimantic, CT 06226</p>

Former WINCOG Staff
Initial Plan Update

Mark Paquette, Executive Director
Dagmar Noll, Planner
Michael Cipriano, GIS Analyst.

SECTION 3: MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET (OPTIONAL)

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

MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET												
#	Jurisdiction Name	Jurisdiction Type (city/borough/township/village, etc.)	Plan POC	Mailing Address	Email	Phone	Requirements Met (Y/N)					
							A. Planning Process	B. Hazard Identification & Risk	C. Mitigation Strategy	D. Plan Review, Evaluation & Implementation	E. Plan Adoption - Sample	F. State Requirements
1	Columbia	Town	Carmen Vance				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2	Coventry	Town	Elizabeth Woolf				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3	Lebanon	Town	Joyce Okonuk				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4	Mansfield	Town	Elizabeth Paterson				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5	Wilmington	Town	Stuart Cobb				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	Windham	Town	Ernest Eldridge				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y