

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

Jurisdiction Name & State: East Montpelier

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 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: East Montpelier, VT	Title of Plan: Town of East Montpelier, VT: Local Hazard Mitigation Plan	Date of Plan: October 25, 2019
Single or Multi-jurisdiction plan? Single		New Plan or Plan Update? Update
Regional Point of Contact: Bonnie Waninger Title: Executive Director Agency: Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission Phone Number: 802-229-0389 E-Mail: waninger@cvregion.com		Local Point of Contact: Bruce Johnson Title: Town and Zoning Administrator Agency: East Montpelier, VT Phone Number: 802-223-3313 E-Mail: manager@eastmontpeliervt.org

State Reviewer: Stephanie A. Smith	Title: Hazard Mitigation Planner	Date: 8/5/19; 11/19/19
--	--	----------------------------------

FEMA Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Date Received in FEMA Region I		
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption		
Plan Approved		

**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))	2 (p. 4) 4.1 Planning Process (p. 8 – 12)	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))	4.1 Planning Process (p. 8 – 12)	X		
A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1))	4.1 Planning Process (p. 8-12)	X		
A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))	4.2 Existing Hazard Mitigation Programs, Projects, and Activities (p. 13 – 15)	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))	4.3 Plan Maintenance (p. 15 – 16) 8. Attachments (p. 59)	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))	4.3 Plan Maintenance (p. 15 – 16) 8. Attachments (p. 59)	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))	5.1 Hazard Identification and Analysis (p. 18 – 38)	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))	5.1 Hazard Identification and Analysis (p. 18 – 38)	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))	6. Threat Hazards (p. 20 – 38)	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))	6.1 Fluvial Erosion/Inundation Flooding (p. 22)	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))	4.2 Existing Hazard Mitigation Programs, Projects, and Activities (p. 13 – 15)	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))	4.2 Existing Hazard Mitigation Programs, Projects, and Activities (p. 13) 6.1 (p. 22)	X		
C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))	7. Mitigation (p. 39)	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))	7.2 Identified Hazard Mitigation Programs, Projects, and Activities (p. 39 – 41)	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))	7.2 Identified Hazard Mitigation Programs, Projects, and Activities (p. 40 footnotes)	X		

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
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))	4.3 Plan Maintenance (p. 16) 7.1 (p. 39)	X		
<u>ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
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))	3.2 Development Patterns (p. 5)	X		
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	4.4 Status of Prior Plan's Mitigation Actions (p. 16 – 17)	X		
D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	5.1 Hazard Identification and Analysis (p. 18-20)	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))	8. Attachments (p. 60 – 61)			
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	N/A			
<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:

- Overall, nicely done – I think you’ve made some good changes to this template that will make other plans coming from CVRPC stronger in the future!
- A1 – Section 4.1 includes a lot of good information on your planning process, with a good amount of detail about what took place at each meeting and between meetings.
- A3 – great response rate to the survey! Having it available at town meeting was a great idea.
- A6 – The charts you include on pg. 59 are great. I think it would be really helpful to include this in your Section 4.3 Plain Maintenance and tweak it to be community specific.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- A3 – I’m guessing that all of these meetings were Select Board meetings or maybe PC meetings, but it would help to note that somewhere, possibly in the meeting attendees side bar for each. You could also include a note about these meetings being public, how they are advertised, and if anyone from the public provided comments.

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

Strengths:

- B1 – I’m glad to see you’re using the hazard analysis from the SHMP! I also think it is helpful that this plan addresses individual hazards instead of groupings, but you still include some good information on how these hazards relate to other hazards, e.g. hail in the wind section.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- B1 – the list of hazards addressed that you include in section 4.1 does not quite match the list in section 5.1 (p. 19).
- B3 – there is an opportunity to expand upon specifically what is vulnerable within East Montpelier to each of the identified hazards, e.g. critical facilities, critical community services that could be impacted, etc.

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

Strengths:

- C1 – the table you include is great, very clear and easy to read through.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- C3 – having the goals for this plan under the “Town Plan Goals” section is a bit confusing. I would change the header to be goals for this plan and then you can also discuss how the

goals for this plan relate to the town plan goals and strategies.

- C5 – the prioritization process is pretty light. Consider looking at a broader list of criteria to prioritize actions. You can also use the prioritization process from the SHMP if it seems like a good fit: <https://vem.vermont.gov/sites/demhs/files/documents/2018SHMP-MitigationStrategy.pdf>.

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

Strengths:

- D1 – the text you include on the bottom of pg. 17 is great, and also addresses D1. Overall, vulnerability has decreased in East Montpelier since the new development has not had any impact and mitigation projects since the last plan have reduced vulnerability.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- D3 – for your priorities since the last plan, you could consider other town priorities more generally instead of just the hazards that are addressed.