



PLAN MAINTENANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION

MAINTAINING THE PLAN	2
ADOPTION	3
TRACKING IMPLEMENTATION	4
MONITORING PROGRESS.....	5
EVALUATING THE PLAN	5
PLAN UPDATE.....	5
PRIORITIZATION	6
FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES	6
CONCLUSIONS.....	6



Maintaining the Plan

§201.6 (c)(4) A plan maintenance process that includes:

(i) A section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.

(ii) A process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.

(iii) Discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

§201.6 (c)(5) Documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council). For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan must document that it has been formally adopted.

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

§201.6(d): Plan review. (1) Plans must be submitted to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer for initial review and coordination. The State will then send the plan to the appropriate FEMA Regional Office for formal review and approval.

(2) The Regional review will be completed within 45 days after receipt from the State, whenever possible.

(3) Plans must be reviewed, revised if appropriate, and resubmitted for approval within five years in order to continue to be eligible for HMGP project grant funding.



The Region 2000 Regional Commission's Multi-jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan has pulled together many different resources into one document and should be considered a living document. The plan needs to be updated, adopted and submitted to the Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) every five years.

The maintenance of this plan will be the responsibility of the members of the steering committee and representation of the jurisdictions involved. Meetings will be scheduled at the request of the plan's governing body. One of the ways the progress of the mitigation plan will be monitored through is the completion of the mitigation actions.

Adoption

The eleven participating jurisdictions (Amherst County, Town of Amherst, Appomattox County, Town of Appomattox, Town of Pamplin City, Bedford County, Bedford City, Campbell County, Town of Altavista, Town of Brookneal, and Lynchburg City) have adopted by resolution the hazard mitigation plan by their governing body. Appendix IV-13 contains the resolutions from each of the communities.

Once the Hazard Mitigation Plan has been adopted by the individual governing bodies, the jurisdictions will be responsible for incorporating the plan into other local plans as follows:

- **Comprehensive Plans:** These plans are updated every three to five years for each jurisdiction according to specific state regulations. County plans sometimes will cover smaller towns plans as well, due to limited planning capacity of the communities. When these plans are updated, the appropriate information for the community will be extracted from the Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan. For comprehensive plans, the HIRA portion of the Hazard Mitigation Plan will be the primary focus for integration, especially on the limitations to future development by the location of hazards such as floodplains or high slope areas. The planning departments of communities are the primary staff involved with comprehensive plan update.
- **Capital Improvement Plans (CIP):** These plans are less formalized than Comprehensive Plans and are the primary tool for determining various community projects, such as street improvements, infrastructure maintenance and repairs, and new community building construction, such as schools. CIPs also play a supporting role to justify expansion of community staff as new departments and programs are established in the annual budget process. The Mitigation Actions section of the Hazard Mitigation Plan will be integrated in each community's CIP and local budgeting as funding and politics allow. For actions such as education, existing or new staff may be able to expand their roles to conduct these projects. For "bricks and mortar" types of actions, these can be built into the CIP budget and timeline. For CIPs, the public



works departments are the primary staff who develops these plans, while annual budgets fall to community administrators and boards.

- Emergency Operation Plans (EOP): These plans focus primarily on the immediate response to emergency events. There are numerous important ties between response plans and mitigation plans, often in terms of personnel training and emergency equipment. Also, human-caused hazards such as hazardous materials spills are addressed in EOPs. To integrate the Hazard Mitigation Plan into community EOPs, the community emergency services directors and the Local Emergency Planning Commissions (LEPCs) will work with the community planning staff. For some hazards, like winter storms, the mitigation actions are extensions of response actions, such as clearing tree debris and having backup power available. For other hazards, like flooding, the mitigations actions may be led by planning staff, but first responders can provide valuable information about hazard impacts that will be useful for mitigation grant applications.

Tracking Implementation

Plan implementation will begin with each localities adoption of the mitigation plan. After the plan has been adopted, future implementation will take place in the form of steering committee meetings. When a hazard mitigation plan is put into action it is important to continuously monitor the goals, objectives, strategies, and projects to make sure that they are current and being implemented effectively. One of the best ways of carrying out a mitigation plan is to incorporate these components into the day-to-day functionality and priorities of the government and development of the region. This can include such things as:

- City or Town Comprehensive Plans
- Capital Improvement Budgets and Plans
- Economic Development Goals and Incentives

Not only is it important to track implementation of the plan, but another critical component to success in hazard mitigation is to monitor occurrence and impacts of natural and manmade hazards/disasters within communities in the region. This will not only keep the region up to date on hazard vulnerability but will also keep data and statistics current for analysis and future implementation purposes.

The final thing to consider during implementation is the security of all data and information involved in the plan. Maintain security of any information that pertains to vulnerabilities, security measures, and response plans. Ensure that sensitive information is handled in such a way as to maintain security and have adequate protections in place to ensure that sensitive information is not released when it is requested by members of the public who have no justifiable reason for seeing the information.



Monitoring Progress

This plan will be monitored through meetings of the governing bodies and steering committee members as they see fit. When updates of this plan are needed, the changes will be submitted to VDEM and FEMA for review. Jurisdictions will take on the responsibility for keeping the public involved with the updates and revisions of this plan. Programs are already in place at the local level to deal with different types of hazards. These programs have been documented throughout this plan.

In order to accomplish this method of tracking progress, committees and affiliated entities need to monitor agendas, attend meetings, send memos, monitor funding opportunities, keep stakeholders and the public updated, and promote a safe and sustainable community as a result of the actions within their plan. As the mitigation plan takes shape, progress reports should be compiled and distributed to state and federal agencies, local government, regional commissions, industry, organizations, and legislators.

Evaluating the Plan

Evaluation of the plan will be the responsibility of the governing bodies and steering committee members. Evaluation of the plan will take the form that they have followed in the development of this plan. Comments and additions will be obtained by the governing bodies and steering committee and they will be incorporated in the update of the plan. Realistically, funding for future updates and evaluations of this plan will fall heavily on state and federal resources.

Plan Update

During the implementation process, there may be road blocks, new objectives, new demands, or alternative strategies that arise which force the plan to be altered and updated. It is important to keep track of these changes and incorporate revisions into the plan when necessary. A five-year written update to the Hazard Mitigation Plan will be submitted to VDEM and FEMA for review, unless federal regulations change this timeframe or format. The local community planning and emergency services departments will work closely in updating the portions of the Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan that relates to that community. For some communities with greater local capacity, like Lynchburg City, the update to the plan may have the community develop a separate plan document. For the smaller communities, like Town of Brookneal, the plan update will be an integral part of the county's updated plan, since the town has limited planning capacity to update the plan themselves. The plan revisions will include new objectives and strategies, filling in gaps in data as new data becomes available, and describing alternative analysis and implementation procedures. Success in updating this plan involves:

- Evaluating successes and failures of implemented mitigation strategies



- Monitoring changes in and updating hazard risks, asset inventory, government policies and programs, and development trends
- Evaluating public and municipal participation in current implementation strategies

Prioritization

Mitigation plan implementation can flow more smoothly if strategies and projects are prioritized in an order that makes most sense given current hazard vulnerabilities and available funding. This includes prioritizing disaster assessments based on highest vulnerability rankings, targeting key locations and facilities that are impacted the most by each hazard, determining the budgeting requirements for each section of the mitigation plan, and staying on top of funding opportunities that can contribute to project completions. Low or no-cost recommendations have the greatest likelihood of succeeding, so these actions should be pursued first. Then, as new funding becomes available, other high priority projects can be initiated. As in the prioritization of the mitigation projects, the FEMA STAPLE(E) approach will be utilized to determine capability and feasibility of the proposed projects and plan updates. Prioritization will be completed at the jurisdictional level and will follow local evaluation criteria.

The STAPLE(E) prioritization method takes into account seven criteria:

1. Socially Acceptable
2. Technically feasible
3. Administrative support
4. Politically acceptable
5. Legal
6. Economically justifiable
7. Environmentally responsive

Other considerations when prioritizing will be how well the project reduces future losses, how they further the goals and objectives put forth in this plan, and the cost versus the benefit of the project.

Funding Opportunities

By tracking funding opportunities the jurisdictions will be able to apply these funding sources to implement imperative and costly mitigation actions. Pragmatically, funding opportunities from the state and federal government will be the keystone in the future updates of this plan.

Conclusions

With the Region 2000 Regional Commission's All Hazard Plan adopted and in place, the region will have a better handle on mitigating the hazards that impact their region. The shift to mitigating hazards before they happen is prevalent with Region 2000. Through meetings and group interactions it was observed that the region works well together and

