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Learning Objectives

At the end of this webinar, participants will understand:

1. Identify the role of the community planner in integration

2. Strengthen connections between mitigation and the goals of other local plans

3. Planning requirements addressing integration

4. Resources for integration
Mitigation is the reduction or elimination of long-term risk to human life and property from hazards.
Critical Connection

Community Design

Natural Hazard Impacts
Build on Existing Plans

- Conservation and natural resources
- Public facilities and services
- Transportation
- Housing
- Historic preservation
- Economic development
- Recreation and open space
- Environment
- Public safety
- Hazards
Benefits of Integrating Plans

- Leverage resources
- Achieve multiple objectives
- Increase political acceptance of mitigation objectives
- Send consistent message
The Community Planner’s Role
Integrating the Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan into Local Planning

Mitigation Provides Opportunities for Coordination

- Emergency Managers
  - Preparedness
  - Response
  - Recovery

- Community Planners
  - Land Use
  - Economic Development
  - Housing
  - Transportation
  - Other Issues

MITIGATION
What can a planner do?

**Plan**
Participate in mitigation planning

**Mitigate**
Integrate policies and implement actions

**Advocate**
Champion decisions promoting resilience
### Planner’s Role in Implementation

#### Mitigation Projects
- Permitting
- Designing
- Grant writing

#### Regulatory Strategies
- Develop language
- Guide through approval process
- Ensure consistency with other plans and policies
The Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan
Purpose of the Mitigation Planning Process

To **identify policies** and actions that will permanently reduce the risk of damage and loss

To **improve the welfare** of people and their communities

To **enhance the ability** of communities to recover from disasters

To **establish partnerships** for community resilience
Goals

Goal 1: Protect life and reduce injuries resulting from natural hazards.

Goal 2: Minimize public and private property damages and the disruption of essential infrastructure and services from natural hazards.

Goal 3: Implement strategies to mitigate the effects of natural hazards and increase the quality of life and resilience of economies in Deschutes County.

Goal 4: Minimize the impact of natural hazards while protecting, restoring, and sustaining environmental processes.

Goal 5: Enhance and maintain local capability to implement a comprehensive hazard loss reduction strategy.

Goal 6: Document and evaluate progress in achieving hazard mitigation strategies and action items.

Goal 7: Motivate the public, private sector, and government agencies to mitigate the effects of natural hazards through information and education.
## Capability Assessment

### Table 3-1. Legal and Regulatory Capability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Other Jurisdiction Authority</th>
<th>State Mandated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Code</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>: Title 7, Chapter 1, Article A adopts the 2012 International Building Code (IBC), Effective January 1, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Code</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>: Title 8, Chapters 1 thru 11. Adopted 4/11/2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>: Title 9, Chapters 1 thru 6. Adopted: 11/15/1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>: Title 9, Chapter 4 (9-4-1-10) includes provisions for drainage. Adopted 1979. Note-ACHD deploys stormwater standards as they pertain to roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Disaster Recovery</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Review</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Damage Prevention</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong>: Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, Title 10. Last amended 7/24/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk

Risk is the potential for damage, loss, or other impact created by the intersection of natural hazards with development.

Location

Construction

Site Design

Infrastructure
Risk Assessment
Risk Assessment

CITY OF ORTING - LANDSLIDE HAZARD AREA

LEGEND
- 15-30% Slope
- Greater than 30% Slope
- Orch 2012
- Other Cities
- Pierce County Boundary
- Park/Open Space
- Roads
- Limited Access Highway
- Major Road
- Rivers/Streams
- Water Body

The information on this map is approximate and should not be used for legal or surveying purposes. The boundaries are not to scale. The map is subject to change and is updated annually.
Problem/Issue Statements

- “Smith School, located in Aumville, is in a low lying area that is flooded frequently by the Elk River causing disruptions for students.”
- “The North Creek Sewage Treatment Plant is located in the 100-year floodplain along Sky River and has been damaged 4 times in the past 10 years.”
- “Residents of the Village describe ground failure impacts such as 8 homes and 2 critical facilities sinking on their pilings, particularly in the downtown ‘old town’ area.”
- “Approximately 93 percent of the buildings in the floodplain were built before freeboard requirements were in place (1996).”
- “Renter occupied housing rates greater than a percent or two above the city-wide rates are found in the Central City (75 percent) and Northeast Coalition (75 percent), which are areas of high landslide risk.”
The Link
Element 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? 44 CFR 201.6(c)(4)(ii)

a. The plan must describe the community’s process to integrate the data, information, and hazard mitigation goals and actions into other planning mechanisms.

b. The plan must identify the local planning mechanisms where hazard mitigation information and/or actions may be incorporated.

c. A multi-jurisdictional plan must describe each participating jurisdiction’s individual process for integrating hazard mitigation actions applicable to their community into other planning mechanisms.

d. The updated plan must explain how the jurisdiction(s) incorporated the mitigation plan, when appropriate, into other planning mechanisms as a demonstration of progress in local hazard mitigation efforts.

e. The updated plan must continue to describe how the mitigation strategy, including the goals and hazard mitigation actions will be incorporated into other planning mechanisms.

Planning mechanisms means governance structures that are used to manage local land use development and community decision-making, such as comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, or other long-range plans.
One of the implementation actions in the Hazardous Areas section of the Plan is to create a county-wide drainage plan. During the Risk Assessment and Public Outreach processes of the mitigation plan effort it was discovered that there are many drainage areas owned by Drainage Districts which are causing repeated damaged to residences and infrastructure. Many of these Districts are not currently active, and maintenance of the drainage infrastructure is not being conducted. A countywide program to address this issue would be supportive of both goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the Canyon County Multi-Jurisdiction All Hazard Mitigation Plan.
One of the implementation actions in the Hazardous Areas section of the Plan is to create a county-wide drainage plan. During the Risk Assessment and Public Outreach processes of the mitigation plan effort it was discovered that there are many drainage areas owned by Drainage Districts which are causing repeated damaged to residences and infrastructure. Many of these Districts are not currently active, and maintenance of the drainage infrastructure is not being conducted. A countywide program to address this issue would be supportive of both goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Section 10 of the Plan states that there are no specific areas in the community that are consider “hazardous”. This finding is similar to the hazard analysis completed on the community with one notable exception of two hazardous chemical sites, one in the city and one just outside of the city, both of which would impact the City should there be a release. There are no goals outlined in Section 10 which are focused on the control of hazardous areas. It is recommended that the Risk Assessment completed as part of the Canyon County Multi-Jurisdiction All Hazard Mitigation Plan for the City of Wilder be added to the Comprehensive Plan.
One of the implementation actions in the Hazardous Areas section of the Plan is to create a county-wide drainage plan. During the Risk Assessment and Public Outreach processes of the mitigation plan effort it was discovered that there are many drainage areas owned by Drainage Districts which are causing repeated damaged to residences and infrastructure. Many of these Districts are not currently active, and maintenance of the drainage infrastructure is not being conducted. A countywide program to address this issue would be supportive of both goals of the Comprehensive Planning and the Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan.

Section 10 of the Plan states that there are no specific areas in the community that are considered “hazardous”. This finding is similar to the hazard analysis completed on the community with one notable exception of two hazardous chemical sites, one in the city and one just outside of the city, both of which are managed by the local emergency management agency.

A description and discussion of the Hazardous Areas is found in Chapter 7. Hazards identified in the Chapter include earthquakes, avalanches, and snow slides. The Risk Analysis conducted as part of the Canyon County indicates that there is no risk to the City of Greenleaf to avalanches or snow slides. References to these two hazards should be removed from the Hazardous Areas Chapter and the Chapter revised to reflect the hazard potentials identified in the risk analysis, which include straight line wind and hazardous chemical transportation through the City. The Chapter does an excellent job addressing the possible flooding in the Renshaw Gulch Drain.
Integration Opportunities

1. Integrate natural hazard information and mitigation policies into the comprehensive plan.

2. Integration is through collaborative planning and implementation.

3. Integration is through coordinated plan reviews and updates.
Local Comprehensive Plan

- Represents larger framework of community planning and decision making
- Opportunities for integration
  - Natural hazards information and mitigation and resilience policies integrated throughout plan
  - Collaborative planning and implementation
  - Coordinated plan reviews and updates
Integration by Plan Element

- Community History
- Future Land Use
- Conservation and natural resources
- Public facilities and services
- Transportation
- Housing
- Historic preservation
- Economic development
- Recreation and open space
- Environment
- Public safety
- Hazards
Future Land Use

1. Does the future land use map clearly identify natural hazard areas?
2. Do the land-use policies discourage development or redevelopment within natural hazard areas?

- Analyze hazard exposure and vulnerability as part of the development of the future land use map and policies.
- Identify hazard areas and include policies to establish standards to control development and reduce vulnerability.
- Identify potential problems that may arise from various densities of development in hazard-prone areas, determine what densities are appropriate, and establish standards to direct development away from high-hazard areas.
- Use easements and acquisition, when possible, to prevent inappropriate or unsafe uses of land.
Couple mitigation goals like floodplain management with clean air and clean water goals.

Designate critical and sensitive areas to focus planning for specific areas that have an especially high priority for protection of natural features.

Establish good floodplain management practices that protect endangered species habitat as well as help reduce and prevent flood damage.

Link the goals and objectives of watershed management (i.e., pollution runoff control, Total Maximum Daily Loads implementation) with hazard mitigation efforts.
Conservation/ Natural Resources

1. Do the land-use policies discourage development or redevelopment within natural hazard areas?

- Protect and restore natural protective features, such as floodplains, wetlands, marshes, and dunes.
- Protect wildlife migration corridors along rivers and streams to serve as habitat and environmental protection.
- Limit development in floodprone areas.
- Preserve natural vegetation and woodlands on steep slopes to reduce the likelihood of landslides.
- Conserve natural woodlands without development to reduce building exposure to wildfires.
Recreation and Open Space

1. Are there policies to encourage the development of waterfront areas for recreational purposes, to serve as tourist attractions, and to provide an economic benefit to the community from land that is otherwise prone to hazards?

- Convert vulnerable floodplain land, steep slopes, and areas vulnerable to wildfire or other hazards into open space or recreational areas to help avert or minimize disaster by sacrificing park land in the short term instead of allowing floods, landslides, wildfires, and other natural hazards to ruin homes or businesses.

- Use natural hazard mitigation objectives to protect and provide public access to areas that are also deemed potentially hazardous for development (i.e., riverfronts and beaches) to guide land acquisition choices for open space.
Public Facilities/ Services

1. Do infrastructure policies limit extension of existing facilities and services that would encourage development in areas vulnerable to natural hazards?

- Include policies that limit public expenditure for infrastructure and public facilities in high-hazard areas.
- Use capital improvement policies to steer development away from hazardous areas.
- Interconnect service networks, such as roads, pipelines, and cables, and allow more than one route to any point so that they are less vulnerable to local failures because individual sections can be isolated as necessary.
- Locate critical public facilities, such as police and fire stations or emergency operation centers, in safe locations that are not likely to be affected by hazards.
- Locate other major public facilities in safe areas to double as emergency shelters.
Transportation

1. Are highways and local streets designed with capacity to accommodate community-wide evacuations?
2. Are movement systems designed to function under disaster conditions (e.g., evacuation)?

- Determine if transportation facilities are adequate in the event of an evacuation.
- Plan for contingencies if there is structural failure of bridges or other infrastructure.
- Use transportation projects to determine the location and density patterns of future growth (projects most likely to be involved directly with capital improvements planning).
- Use transportation policies to guide growth to safe locations and limit access to natural hazard areas.
Hazard Planning Integration

BRINGING WILDFIRE INTO THE PLANNING PROCESS

Molly Mowery, AICP | Wildfire Planning International, LLC | November 2017
Three community-based plans

- Comprehensive Plan
- Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP)

Integrating the Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan into Local Planning
Opportunities

- Many avenues to address wildfire
- Potential to reinforce mutual goals
- Operate at different scales
- Engage diverse group of stakeholders
Potential pitfalls

- Overlap or duplication
- Disjointed planning process
- Different sources of information
- Multiple actions lead to confusion

Image Source: http://www.workingpoint.com/blog/are-you-speaking-your-customers-language
The hazard planning “sweet spot”

- Comprehensive Plan
- Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP)

Integrating the Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan into Local Planning
Solution: Designate the lead plan

- Wildfire History
- Fire Environment & Ecology
- Risk Assessment
- Wildland-Urban Interface Identification
- Prevention, Mitigation, Response, Suppression
- Roles and Responsibilities
- Action Plan

Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP)
Solution: Integrate plans

- Add cross-references
  - Wildfire history
  - Wildland-urban interface
  - Risk assessment
- Align goals, objectives, policies, actions
- Incorporate key trends
- Adopt CWPP as Appendix

Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP)

Integrating the Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan into Local Planning
Solution: Cast wide net

- Consider other local plans that support wildfire/hazard mitigation planning
Example: Missoula County, MT

- Community Wildfire Protection Plan Update
  - Incorporates demographic, growth, and land use trends
  - Aligns Pre-Disaster Mitigation and Growth Policy goals and actions

Image Source: USDA Forest Service/ Rocky Mountain Research Station
Example: City of Wenatchee, WA

- Urban Area Comprehensive Plan Update
  - Adds new wildfire topic in Natural Environment
  - Includes policies for “good” and “bad” wildfires
  - Supports other Elements and development of future plans

Image Source: WPI
Sweet spot benefits

- Increases funding potential
- Builds foundation for future regulations
- Synchronizes actions
- Reduces stakeholder fatigue
- Leverages the right information
- Reduces risk

Integrating the Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan into Local Planning
Thank you!

MOLLY MOWERY, AICP

MOLLY@WILDFIREPLANNING.COM

Community Planning Assistance for Wildfire

www.planningforwildfire.org
Poll

Do you currently integrate hazard mitigation elements into your local comprehensive plan? (only 1 choice)
- Yes
- No
- We don’t have a comprehensive plan
- N/A

If yes, what elements of your comprehensive plan address hazard mitigation? (Multiple Choice)
- Conservation and natural resources
- Public facilities and services
- Transportation
- Housing
- Historic preservation
- Economic development
- Recreation and open space
- Environment
- Public safety
- Hazards
- Land Use
- Community History
- Other
Clackamas County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan

October 2002

Jay Wilson, Clackamas County Resilience Coordinator
JayWilson@co.Clackamas.or.us

Integrating the Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan into Local Planning
1. How does the mitigation plan address integrating into the local comprehensive plan?

**CC NHMP 2002 - Implementation through Existing Programs**

- The goals and action items in the NHMP may be achieved through activities recommended in the county's Capital Improvement Plans (CIP).
- Various county departments develop CIP plans, and review them on an annual basis.
- Upon annual review of the CIPs, the Hazard Mitigation Advisory Committee (HMAC) will work with the county departments to identify areas that the hazard mitigation plan action items are consistent with CIP planning goals and integrate them where appropriate.
2. What was the process the county went through to integrate?

**CC NHMP 2007 - Implementation through Existing Programs**

The County will be adopting the latest updates / requirements from Title 13 of Metro’s Functional Plan (Water Quality) that pertains to Goal 5 resources within the Portland metropolitan area. Through these updates, Metro has identified new riparian Goal 5 resources, along with protection programs for each resource. The County shall be implementing a work program for adopting, implementing and conforming to these Title 13 updates over the course of the next 12 to 18 months. This timeframe conforms to the DLCD adoption process timeline.

**CC NHMP 2013 – Mitigation Plan Update Checklist**

Is mitigation being implemented through existing planning mechanisms (such as comprehensive plans, or capital improvement plans)?

Yes or No?

If the community has not made progress on process of implementing mitigation into existing mechanisms, further refine the process and document in the plan.
3. Why does the county address mitigating risk in the comprehensive plan?

• Clackamas County is required to integrate the policies of Goal 7 of the Oregon Statewide Planning Goals. For instance, Ch. 4 of the Comp Plan, sets forth policies to ensure that a floodplain management district (FMD) is used to regulate development within Special Flood Hazards Area (SFHA). Essentially, these policies ensure safe development within SFHAs by applying building standards that; require structures to be properly elevated, anchored, and constructed with flood resistant materials.

• Other Comp Plan polices require development restrictions and/or mitigation measures for development proposed on steep slopes, landslide hazard area, etc. And there are still other Comp Plan polices that guide development for properties in earthquake prone areas, along stream banks, in wildfire areas, etc.
4. How does the comprehensive plan address mitigating risk?

The Comp Plan sets forth provisions to establish inventories, maps, lists, plans etc. to demarcate and evaluate areas considered a natural hazard, and provides polices to mitigate hazards within these areas.

If an area is prone to a certain risk, say a property is on an inventoried landslide deposit, and a homeowner choses to build on said landslide, then the Comp Plan may allow mitigation of the landslide hazard based on established and proven engineering techniques that allow for a site specific plan that avoids adverse impacts.

Again, development restriction and/or mitigation policies are established for other natural hazard areas listed above.
Role of Disaster Management

Community Engagement Process on Mitigation Opportunities

Transparency, Ownership, and Building Trust

Advocating for what is allowed and eligible by federal grants

Goal of “No Adverse Impacts”

Association of State Floodplain Managers
## Appendix – Hazard Mitigation and Comprehensive Plan Integration Scoring Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>BP?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are existing natural hazard areas described?</td>
<td>0 = not mentioned 1 = described with narrative text 2 = described with data/maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are data/maps of hazard areas sufficient for homeowners to determine if their property is within boundaries?</td>
<td>0 = no 1 = yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is risk assessment/impact information from the hazard mitigation plan included?</td>
<td>0 = not mentioned 1 = referenced in plan 2 = incorporated into plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the future land use map clearly identify natural hazard areas?</td>
<td>0 = not mentioned 1 = identifies flood hazards 2 = identifies 2 or more hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do the land-use policies discourage development or redevelopment within natural hazard areas?</td>
<td>0 = not mentioned 1 = policies limit/restrict development 2 = policies prohibit development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the plan provide adequate space for expected future growth in areas located outside natural hazard areas?</td>
<td>0 = not mentioned 1 = yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the transportation plan limit access to hazard areas?</td>
<td>0 = not mentioned 1 = yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is transportation policy used to guide growth to safe locations?</td>
<td>0 = not mentioned 1 = yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are movement systems designed to function under disaster conditions (e.g., evacuation)?</td>
<td>0 = not mentioned 1 = yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safe Growth Audit

Use this worksheet to identify gaps in your community’s growth guidance instruments and improvements that could be made to reduce vulnerability to future development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Plan</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the future land use map clearly identify natural hazard areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Zoning Ordinance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the zoning ordinance conform to the comprehensive plan in terms of discouraging development or redevelopment within natural hazard areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the ordinance contain natural hazard overlay zones that set conditions for land use within such zones?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do zoning procedures recognize natural hazard areas as limits on zoning changes that allow greater intensity or density of use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the ordinance prohibit development within, or filling of, wetlands, floodways, and floodplains?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subdivision Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do the subdivision regulations restrict the subdivision of land within or adjacent to natural hazard areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do the regulations provide for conservation subdivisions or cluster subdivisions in order to conserve environmental resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do the regulations allow density transfers where hazard areas exist?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Objectives

Review

1. Identify the role of the community planner in integration

2. Strengthen connections between mitigation and the goals of other local plans

3. Planning requirements addressing integration

4. Resources for integration
Resources

- Region 10 Integrating Natural Hazard Mitigation into Comprehensive Planning
  [http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/89725](http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/89725)

- Plan Integration: Linking Local Planning Efforts
  [https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/108893](https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/108893)

- Hazard Mitigation: Integrating Best Practices into Planning (American Planning Association)
  [https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/19261](https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/19261)

- Local Mitigation Planning Handbook
Resources

- Washington: Optional Comprehensive Plan Element for Natural Hazard Reduction (Download from Coffee Break site)

- Planning for Natural Hazards: Oregon Technical Resource Guide
  https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/handle/1794/1909

- Planning for Wildfire in the Wildland-Urban Interface: A Resource Guide for Idaho Communities

- Planning for Hazards: Land Use Solutions for Colorado
  https://planningforhazards.com
Linking Recovery and Mitigation Planning
December 8, 2017
10am-11am PST

A key goal of both hazard mitigation and recovery is increasing resilience. Although these two activities differ in many respects, this shared objective of increased resilience allows mitigation and recovery planning to reinforce one another and leverage greater benefits within the development of plans, and programs or projects. Because both mitigation and recovery planning can be carried out pre-disaster, there is generally ample time to coordinate activities and promote more widespread attention to resilience.

Guest Speakers
- Allison Boyd, Multnomah County Department of Community Services
- Erika Lund, City of Seattle
- Tom Donnelly, FEMA Recovery Planner
Contact

FEMA REGION 10 MITIGATION PLANNING TEAM

- Brett Holt, Mitigation Planning Program Manager, brett.holt@fema.dhs.gov
- Amanda Siok, Mitigation Planner, amanda.siok@fema.dhs.gov

ALASKA

- Brent Nichols, State Hazard Mitigation Officer, brent.nichols@alaska.gov

IDAHO

- Lorrie Pahl, State Mitigation Planner, lpahl@imd.idaho.gov

OREGON

- Joseph Murray, State Planner, joseph.murray@mil.state.or.us

WASHINGTON

- Derrick Hiebert, State Mitigation Strategist, derrick.hiebert@mil.wa.gov
According to Alaska Statute 29.40, a municipality may implement land use regulations, such as a zoning or subdivision ordinance, only after it has legally adopted a comprehensive plan by ordinance.

Land use regulation is required for only a minority of the communities in Alaska and is elective for second class cities, which are largely located in rural Alaska.

Alaska State Law requires that planning, platting, and land use regulation are carried out by the State’s incorporated municipalities, including home rule, unified home rule, first-class, and second-class boroughs; unified municipalities; and first-class and home rule cities outside of boroughs.

Second-class cities located outside of boroughs may, but are not required to, exercise planning powers.

The unorganized borough is not a municipal corporation, thus the State of Alaska has no legal authority to mandate planning, platting, and land use regulations in second class cities or in unincorporated communities in the unorganized borough.
Idaho Planning

- Idaho adopted its Local Land Use Planning Act (LLUPA) in 1975. See Idaho Code Title 67, Chapter 65 Local Land Use Planning. This act requires every city and county to adopt a comprehensive plan, zoning ordinance, subdivision ordinance, and area of city impact ordinances.

- The LLUPA also grants cities and counties the authority to adopt certain laws and policies at the discretion of the governing board.
• State law requires each city and county to adopt a comprehensive plan and the zoning and land-division ordinances needed to put the plan into effect.

• Local comprehensive plans must be consistent with the statewide planning goals. Goal 7 specifically addresses “areas subject to natural hazards” and requires that communities consider natural hazards as a part of their comprehensive plan.
• GMA provides the tools to counties and cities to manage and direct growth to urban areas where public facilities and services can be provided most efficiently, to protect rural character, to protect critical areas, and to conserve natural resources.

• Under the statute, all counties and cities are required to designate and protect critical areas, including wetlands, frequently flooded areas, and geologically hazardous areas, and to designate natural resource lands.

• Only those counties and cities considered faster growing are required to fully plan under the GMA by meeting all of the goals and requirements of the act, including adopting a comprehensive plan.
The mitigation planning process is not new, not different

1. Build on existing data
2. Involve the public
3. Identify problems
4. Propose solutions
5. Adopt the plan
6. Implement and monitor
7. Evaluate and update
Economic Development

- Develop policies to aid economic recovery post disaster, such as undergrounding utilities within a business district.
- Provide technical assistance to support natural hazard mitigation for vulnerable small businesses.
- Use the community’s safety to attract potential new businesses to the area.
Community History, Existing Conditions, and Physical Features

- Include a description of past natural disasters and their effects on the community as well as the geographical extent, severity, and probability of potential natural hazards.

- Include hazard maps to identify the location of hazardous areas within the community.
Zoning or Development Ordinance
Specific examples of flood zoning elements include:

1. Does the ordinance prohibit development within, or filling of, wetlands, floodways, and floodplains?

- Regulations that permit only open space uses within floodplains;
- Setbacks to minimize flood exposure of buildings and provide waterfront buffers, maintain natural vegetation, and limit runoff;
- Non-conforming use regulations that prescribe standards for permissible reconstruction of flood-damaged structures;
- Special-use permits that require development to meet set criteria or conditions to minimize future flooding; and
- Overlay districts that add a separate level of regulation to sensitive areas such as floodplains.
Specific examples of earthquake zoning elements include:

1. Does the ordinance contain natural hazard overlay zones that set conditions for land use within such zones?

- Regulations that prohibit development on soils susceptible to liquefaction;
- Regulations that restrict development near earthquake faults and on steep slopes;
- Non-conforming use regulations that prescribe standards for permissible reconstruction of earthquake-damaged structures; and
- Regulations that require development located in high-hazard seismic zones to meet set criteria or building standards to minimize future earthquake damage.
Specific examples of wildfire zoning elements include:

1. Does the ordinance contain natural hazard overlay zones that set conditions for land use within such zones?

- Regulations that limit development in the wildland-urban interface;
- Setbacks to maintain a defensible buffer between buildings and grasses, trees, shrubs, or any wildland area;
- Special-use permits that require development to meet set criteria or conditions to minimize future wildfire risk; and
- Overlay districts that add a separate level of regulation to sensitive areas such as the wildland-urban interface.