

*Appendix B – Local Mitigation Plan Review Crosswalk*

## **INSTRUCTIONS FOR USING THE PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK FOR REVIEW OF LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS**

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the **Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance**, published by FEMA in July, 2008. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act* (Stafford Act), as amended by Section 322 of the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), the *National Flood Insurance Act of 1968*, as amended by the *National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004* (P.L. 108-264) and *44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 201 – Mitigation Planning*, inclusive of all amendments through October 31, 2007.

### **SCORING SYSTEM**

**N – Needs Improvement:** The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer’s comments must be provided.

**S – Satisfactory:** The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer’s comments are encouraged, but not required.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated “Satisfactory” in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of “Satisfactory.” A “Needs Improvement” score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing.

When reviewing single jurisdiction plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the boxes for multi-jurisdictional plan requirements. When reviewing multi-jurisdictional plans, however, all elements apply. States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements. Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards, assessing vulnerability, and identifying and analyzing mitigation actions are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

### **The example below illustrates how to fill in the Plan Review Crosswalk.:**

<b>Assessing Vulnerability: Overview</b>				
<i>Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the jurisdiction’s vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description shall include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.</i>				
Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include an <b>overall summary</b> description of the jurisdiction’s <b>vulnerability</b> to each hazard?	Section II, pp. 4-10	The plan describes the types of assets that are located within geographically defined hazard areas as well as those that would be affected by winter storms.		<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan address the <b>impact</b> of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section II, pp. 10-20	The plan does not address the impact of two of the five hazards addressed in the plan. <b>Required Revisions:</b> • Include a description of the impact of floods and earthquakes on the assets. <b>Recommended Revisions:</b> This information can be presented in terms of dollar value or percentages of damage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	

**LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY**

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted. Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated “Satisfactory” in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of “Satisfactory.” Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. A “Needs Improvement” score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer’s comments must be provided for requirements receiving a “Needs Improvement” score.

**Prerequisite(s) (Check Applicable Box)**

	NOT MET	MET
1. Adoption by the Local Governing Body: §201.6(c)(5) OR	X	
2. Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5) AND	X	
3. Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation: §201.6(a)(3)	X	

**Planning Process**

	N	S
4. Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b) and §201.6(c)(1)		X

**Risk Assessment**

	N	S
5. Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)	X	
6. Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)	X	
7. Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)		X
8. Assessing Vulnerability: Addressing Repetitive Loss Properties. §201.6(c)(2)(ii)		X
9. Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures, Infrastructure, and Critical Facilities: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)	X	
10. Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)		X
11. Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)	X	
12. Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment: §201.6(c)(2)(iii)		X

\*States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

**SCORING SYSTEM**

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

**N – Needs Improvement:** The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer’s comments must be provided.

**S – Satisfactory:** The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer’s comments are encouraged, but not required.

**Mitigation Strategy**

	N	S
13. Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)	X	
14. Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(ii)	X	
15. Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: NFIP Compliance. §201.6(c)(3)(ii)	X	
16. Implementation of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iii)	X	
17. Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iv)	X	

**Plan Maintenance Process**

	N	S
18. Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan: §201.6(c)(4)(ii)		X
19. Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms: §201.6(c)(4)(ii)	X	
20. Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)		X

**Additional State Requirements\***

	N	S
Insert State Requirement		
Insert State Requirement		
Insert State Requirement		

**LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS**

PLAN NOT APPROVED

See Reviewer’s Comments

PLAN APPROVED

**Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status**

<b>Jurisdiction:</b> Erie County, Pennsylvania	<b>Title of Plan:</b> Erie County 2011 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update	<b>Date of Plan:</b> Submitted 07/15/2011 for PEMA and FEMA review
<b>Local Point of Contact:</b> Dale Robinson <b>Title:</b> Assistant Director Emergency Management Coordinator	<b>Address:</b> 2880 Flower Road Erie, PA 16501	
<b>Agency:</b> Department of Public Safety		
<b>Phone Number:</b> 814-451-7922	<b>E-Mail:</b> drobinson@ecdops.org	

<b>State Reviewer:</b> Russell Kratzer, III	<b>Title:</b> PEMA Emergency Management Specialist	<b>Date:</b> July 15, 2011
--	---	----------------------------

<b>FEMA Reviewer:</b> ER & TG	<b>Title:</b> HM Community Planner	<b>Date:</b> 08/22/11
<b>Date Received in FEMA Region 3</b>	08/03/2011	
<b>Plan Not Approved</b>		
<b>Plan Approved</b>		
<b>Date Approved</b>		

ERIE COUNTY – Wide		Actions: 1, 2, 12, 13, 14, 16		DFIRM		NFIP Status*			
Jurisdiction:	Mitigation Actions:	In Plan	NOT in Plan	Y	N	N/A	CRS Class		
1. Albion Borough	1, 2, 14	X		X			not participating		
2. Amity Township	3	X		X			not participating		
3. Concord Township	3	X		X			not participating		
4. Conneaut Township	1, 2, 14	X		X			not participating		
5. Corry City	5, 6	X		X			not participating		

<b>Jurisdiction:</b>	<b>Mitigation Actions</b>					
6. Cranesville Borough	7, 8	X		X		not participating
7. Edinboro Borough	9, 25	X		X		not participating
8. Elgin Borough	3	X		X		not participating
9. Elk Creek Township	8, 10, 31	X		X		not participating
10. Erie City	11	X		X		not participating
11. Fairview Township	11	X		X		not participating
12. Franklin Township	8, 31	X		X		not participating
13. Girard Borough	8, 19, 20, 40	X		X		not participating
14. Girard Township	3, 8, 19, 21, 22, 23, 31	X		X		not participating
15. Greene Township	24	X		X		not participating
16. Greenfield Township	1, 2, 14	X		X		not participating
17. Harborcreek Township	3	X		X		not participating
18. Lake City Borough	1, 2, 8, 25	X		X		not participating
19. Lawrence Park Township	1, 2, 14	X		X		not participating
20. LeBoeuf Township	1, 2, 14	X		X		not participating
21. McKean Borough	8	X		X		not participating
22. McKean Township	6, 8, 26, 27	X		X		not participating
23. Mill Village Borough	1, 2, 39	X		X		not participating

<b>Jurisdiction:</b>	<b>Mitigation Actions</b>					
24. Millcreek Township	28	X		X		not participating
25. North East Borough	29, 30	X		X		not participating
26. North East Township	29	X		X		not participating
27. Platea Borough	8, 31	X			X	not participating
28. Springfield Township	1, 2, 14	X		X		not participating
29. Summit Township	1, 2, 14	X		X		not participating
30. Union City Borough	1, 2, 14	X		X		not participating
31. Union Township	1, 2, 14	X		X		not participating
32. Venango Township	3, 32, 33	X		X		not participating
33. Washington Township	8, 31, 34	X		X		not participating
34. Waterford Borough	1, 2, 14	X		X		not participating
35. Waterford Township	35	X		X		not participating
36. Wattsburg Borough	3, 36	X		X		not participating
37. Wayne Township	3, 37, 38	X		X		not participating
38. Wesleyville Borough	1, 2, 14	X		X		not participating

\* Notes:

Y = Participating

N = Not Participating

N/A = Not Mapped

PREREQUISITE(S)

**1. Adoption by the Local Governing Body**

**Requirement §201.6(c)(5):** [The local hazard mitigation plan **shall** include] 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).

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted <b>new or updated</b> plan?	TBD	Review of draft plan	X	
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?	TBD	Review of draft plan	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

**2. Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption**

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

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?	Chapter 2 Table 2.3.1 Chapter 3 Table 3.1.1 Pgs 22 -24 Appendix C	Community profile - Table 2.3.1 Captures a 10% population decrease from 2000 – 2010 Notable - Freshwater Fishing Capital of the World Matrix -Summary of local municipality participation and specific participation in the planning process – supportive documentation in Appendix C		X
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	TBD	Review of draft plan	X	
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?	TBD	Review of draft plan	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

**3. Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation**

**Requirement §201.6(a)(3):** Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process ... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe <b>how</b> each jurisdiction participated in the plan's development?	Chapter 3 Planning Process Narrative 3.1	Utilization of Survey forms, availability of Erie County HMP website, publicized meetings and teleconferences. Table 3.1.1 list 100 % participation of all 38 jurisdictions.	X	

	Pg 21 Table 3.1.1 Appendix C	<b>Required Revisions:</b> Meeting notes do not promote full participation in planning process, see page 4 of meeting notes. Clarify why full participation of all jurisdictions is not promoted in the planning process.		
	Section 3.1, pg 21	Meeting notes in Appendix C describe a question posed about the implications of not achieving 100% participation. Participation was encouraged throughout planning process and achieved. Updated section 3.1 to include more information on how the full participation of jurisdictions in the planning process was promoted.		
B. Does the updated plan identify all participating jurisdictions, including new, continuing, and the jurisdictions that no longer participate in the plan?	Chapter 3 Narrative 3.1 Planning Process Table 3.1..1	<b>2004 Review :</b> Original plan narrates minimal participation from 38 jurisdictions. Attempts were made to extract information utilizing hazard mitigation project forms distributed to jurisdictions <b>2011 plan update:</b> 3.1.1. Spreadsheet identifies participation of all 38 jurisdictions in HMPU (Hazard Mitigation Plan Update)		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>			X	

**PLANNING PROCESS:** §201.6(b): *An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan.*

#### 4. Documentation of the Planning Process

**Requirement §201.6(b):** *In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process shall include:*

- (1) *An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;*
- (2) *An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and*
- (3) *Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.*

**Requirement §201.6(c)(1):** *[The plan shall document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Chapter 3 Planning Process Pgs 21-28 3.1 Update Process Table 3.1.	Formation of the 2011 Erie County Hazard Mitigation Planning Team. Plan update changes are includes a joint effort supported by the Erie County Dept of Planning and Erie County Dept of Public Safety.  Table 3.1.2 Identifies section changes in format from 2006 format to 2011		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan indicate who was involved in the <b>current</b> planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as	Table 3.1.1 Planning Team Pgs 22-24	Table 3.1.1 Summarizes level of participation from local municipalities during the 2011 HMPU to include kick-off meetings, teleconferences and survey forms. Formation of the Erie County Hazard Mitigation Steering		X

**4. Documentation of the Planning Process**

**Requirement §201.6(b):** In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process **shall** include:

- (1) An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;
- (2) An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and
- (3) Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.

**Requirement §201.6(c)(1):** [The plan **shall** document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.

	Location in the		SCORE	
contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, etc.?)	3.2 Pg 25  3.3 Meetings & documentation  Section 3.2, page 25	Erie County plan update oversight was Hazard Mitigation Steering Committee to include 5-member leadership.  <b>Recommended Revisions:</b> Identification of agency or position – lead point of contact should be clearly stated in planning process. Consider increasing planning committee when the plan is next updated to include more representatives from the County, jurisdictions and NGO.  Lead point of contacts for each agency comprising the hazard mitigation steering committee can be found in Section 3.2. Recommended revision to expand the planning committee for the next plan update is noted.		
C. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan indicate how the public was involved? (Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval?)	Section 3.2 Table 3.2.1 Pgs 26 & 27 Figure 3.4.1 Pg 29 Appendix C Website  Section 3.4, pgs. 29-30.	Table 3.2.1 Identifies both municipalities and names participants. A broad variety of knowledgeable community contributors are included on HMPT. Figure 3.4.1 provides visual sampling of advertisement inviting public participation in the HMP process. Notification clearly identifies website opportunity to review and comment on the plan update, Ample period of comment timeline is provided. (30 days) June 16 – July 16 2011 Utilization of Erie-HMP website to afford accessibility for public comment and participation  <b>Recommended revisions:</b> Consider including any comments from the public in the plan. When the plan is updated next additional efforts should be deployed to increase public participation in planning process.  Revised Section 3.4 to include comment received from the public. Recommended revision to increase public participation efforts for the next plan update is noted.		X

**4. Documentation of the Planning Process**

**Requirement §201.6(b):** *In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process shall include:*

- (1) *An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;*
- (2) *An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and*
- (3) *Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.*

**Requirement §201.6(c)(1):** *[The plan shall document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.*

	Location in the		SCORE	
D. <b>Does the new or updated plan discuss the opportunity for neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, and other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?</b>	Section 3.4 Table 3.2.1 Pg 29 Website  Section 5.2 Pgs 167-168	HMPT includes members from neighboring communities. Virtual teleconference meetings were also used as a method of reaching a broader range and level of municipality participation. (EX: Corry City, Union City Borough) Utilization of Erie-HMP website to afford accessibility for public comment and participation. Participation of county EMA's who offer a unique working knowledge of the impacts of hazard events within their community. Ultimately 100% participation of the 38 jurisdictions represented was achieved.		X
E. Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	Chapter 3 Section 3.6 Pg 30-31  Section 5.2.1 Pgs 167-168 Table 5.2.1	Plan update references inclusion and consideration of the a multitude of community planning documents to include the Erie County Comprehensive Plan Plan update references consideration and discussion of multiple existing plans throughout the plan update process. Mechanisms were discussed at community meetings and captured in Table 5.2.1		X
F. <b>Does the updated plan document how the planning team reviewed and analyzed each section of the plan and whether each section was revised as part of the update process?</b>	Sections 3.1 Pg 25  Table 3.1.2 Summary of changes  Pgs 28-30 Appendix C	4 point tool-kit encouraged participation using evaluation forms, capability assessment surveys, Mit Strategy comment worksheets & mitigation action forms. Planning team sponsored 'break-out' meetings for the purpose of reviewing each plan section. 2006 HMP remains current and included in 2011 HMPU Changes identified in Table 3.1.2  Additional changes are summarized in each section of the plan update. (4.1;5.1;6.1 & 7.1)		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X



**6. Profiling Hazards**

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i):** [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan **shall** include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the <b>location</b> (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	<p>Chapter 4 Hazard Profiles and Vulnerability Assessment Individual Haz ID matrixes</p> <p>Table 4.3.4-1, pg. 70</p> <p>Section 4.3.8, pgs. 104-117</p> <p>Section 4.3.4.1, pg. 66; Table 4.3.4-1, pgs. 70-73</p>	<p>Each identified hazard location is addressed in narrative throughout the Hazard Profiles. Supportive mapping of affected areas provide additional geographic identification throughout the HMPU.</p> <p>A variety of matrixes are used to demonstrate locations of identified hazards (Ex:Pg 69 Table 4.3.4.1 Identifying Flood and flash flood locations within the Erie County)</p> <p>Utilization of maps throughout most of the Hazard Id sections are additional useful for the location clarity</p> <p><b>Required Revisions: Clarify if the 1994 snow/ice event impacted Erie County.</b></p> <p>The 1994 ice jam is listed in Table 4.3.4-1. This ice jam resulted in flooding along roads and land between Rt. 5 and 20. No additional information is available about this specific ice jam event.</p> <p><b>Most of the information in this section for location of impact is for the entire state, additional details on hazard events that impacted Erie need to be noted in the plan.</b></p> <p>County specific info provided in all sub-sections of Winter Storm profile, including Table 4.3.8-1 which contains details on winter storm events in Erie County.</p> <p><b>Creeks that experience flash floods needs to be included in the plan.</b></p> <p>Revised list of flood prone streams in Section 4.3.4.1 to also include streams prone to flash flooding. Existing Table 4.3.4-1 includes details on flash flood events in the County.</p> <p><b>Dam section has information for 4 dams, clarify if there are other dams in Erie County that could impact the jurisdictions A mitigation strategy to collect additional information should be</b></p>	X	

		added to the mitigation section		
	Appendix G – Dam Failure Section 4.3.9.5, pg. G-4; Table 6.4-1, pg. 201	Added language to Appendix G – Dam Failure Section 4.3.9.5, pg G-4, to include total number of dams in the County (including category 2 and 3 dams). Added mitigation action #41 to collect additional dam information to Table 6.4-1, pg 201.		
B. Does the risk assessment identify the <b>extent</b> (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Chapter 4 Hazard Profiles – Range of magnitude portion Vulnerability Assessments  Section 4.3.1.1, pg. 40; Section 4.3.3.1, pg. 59; Section 4.3.4.1, pg. 65; Section 4.3.7.1, pg. 92	Narrative captures the extent of each identified hazard throughout the Hazard Profiles – notably in the Range of Magnitude portion of each hazard identification section. A variety of matrixes are used to demonstrate magnitude of both previous and recent extent or magnitude. (Ex: tornado events table 4.3.7.2 on pg 95 and Table 4.3.7.3 Windstorm events on Pg 97 ) Utilization of photos are randomly used when applicable to depict magnitude of damage (ex: Pg 43 Figure 4.3.1.3 & .4)  Required Revisions: Most of the information in this section for location of impact is for the entire state, additional details on hazard events that impacted Erie need to be noted in the plan.  Added additional county-specific location and extent info to Sections 4.3.x.1 for Coastal Erosion, Earthquake, Flood, Flash Flood and Ice Jam, and Tornado and Windstorm hazards. Local information is included in all other hazard profiles.	X	
C. Does the plan provide information on <b>previous occurrences</b> of each hazard addressed in the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Chapter 4 Hazard Profiles and Vulnerability Assessment  Sections 4.3.x.3	Each identified hazard previous occurrence was discussed in narrative throughout the Hazard Profiles. Past occurrences are called out in each identified hazard section. Historical data from a variety of supportive website data is captured in matrixes & mapping for all identified hazards and is well documented  Required Revisions: Most of the information in this section for location of impact is for the entire state, additional details on hazard events that impacted Erie need to be noted in the plan  Local information regarding previous occurrences is included in all existing sections 4.3.x.3.	X	
D. Does the plan include the <b>probability of future events</b> (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Chapter 4 Hazard Profiles	Each identified hazard future occurrence is analyzed and discussed in narrative throughout the Hazard Profiles and subsequent Vulnerability Assessments.		X

**SUMMARY SCORE**

X	
---	--

**7. Assessing Vulnerability: Overview**

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii):** [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction’s vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include an <b>overall summary</b> description of the jurisdiction’s <b>vulnerability</b> to each hazard?	Chapter 4 4.1 Pgs 31-32 Hazard Profiles and Vulnerability sections	Summary captures review of the 2004 original plan and the 2011 plan update. Individual Hazard Id profiles include Vulnerability Assessments to include various tables, matrixes, and mapping tools providing a visual overview of affected jurisdictional vulnerabilities.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan address the <b>impact</b> of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Chapter 4 Profiles and vulnerability	Hazard profiles include Range of Magnitude section depicting county-wide impact. More prevalent identified hazards are analyzed in greater detail to address the overall impact to jurisdictions. Utilization of mapping tools provides additional illustration of specific jurisdictional impact.		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

**8. Assessing Vulnerability: Addressing Repetitive Loss Properties**

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii):** [The risk assessment] **must** also address National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) insured structures that have been repetitively damaged floods.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S



	pg. 128-129; Table 4.3.11-1, pg. 136; Table 4.3.12-4, pg. 145-146; Table 4.3.13-2, pg. 149-151	Explosion (Table 4.3.13-2).		
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe vulnerability in terms of the <b>types and numbers</b> of <b>future</b> buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Chapter 4 4.4.3 Pg 156  Section 4.4.4, pg. 167	<b>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing</b>  Required Revisions: Jurisdictions that experienced a high % of growth should indicate whether or not this growth occurred in hazard areas. Jurisdictions to consider include for example: Conneaut, Cranesville, Lake City and Summit.  Revised Section 4.4.4 to include additional language addressing location of growth vs. hazard areas.	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

### 10. Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B):** [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(ii)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate ... .

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan estimate <b>potential dollar losses</b> to vulnerable structures?	Section 4.4.3 Pg 156 Appendix F HAZUS results Pg 156 narrative  Table 6.4-1, pg. 201	<b>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</b>  RF Valuation and HAZUS-MH provide <i>potential</i> loss ESTIMATES  Recommended Revisions: The plan needs to clarify why a level 2 analysis was not performed for the plan.  A level 2 HAZUS analysis was not performed for this plan due to lack of necessary data to perform the analysis (i.e. Building Value, Lowest Floor Elevation, Building Type, Occupancy Type, Foundation Type, Number of Stories and Square Footage). Added Action #42 to Table 6.4-1 so that data is collected to perform a HAZUS Level 2 analysis in the next HMP update.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe the <b>methodology</b> used to prepare the estimate?	Section 4.4 Table 4.4.1	<b>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</b>		X

	Pg 150 -151 Appendix F			
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

**11. Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends**

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C):** [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe land uses and development trends?	Chapter 2 2.3 Table 2.3.1 Pgs 10 & 11 Pg 14  Chapter 4 4.4.4 Pg. 164-166  Section 4.4.4, pg. 167	<b>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</b> Population declining 10% however the pace of Erie County development has been greater than the population growth.  Narrative articulates consideration of EC Comp Plan and Land Use plan for sensible development of land use guidelines in areas of new growth.  <b>Required Revisions: Jurisdictions that experienced a high % of growth should indicate whether or not this growth occurred in hazard areas. Jurisdictions to consider include for example: Conneaut, Cranesville, Lake City and Summit. The plan needs to indicate why the 2010 data was not used in this updated plan.</b>  Revised Section 4.4.4 to include additional language addressing location of growth vs. hazard areas. 2010 population data was used in the plan update for municipal populations (Table 2.3-1). 2000 Census Block geography was used for vulnerability assessments because 2010 centroid data was not yet available.	X	
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

**12. Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment**

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii):** For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment **must** assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?	Chapter 4 Table 4.4.3 Pgs 154-155	Table captures the unique risk factors as applies to the individual jurisdictions, and demonstrates how the risk might vary in impact from the county. Ranking method is explained in the narrative portion prior to the chart.		X

**SUMMARY SCORE**

X

**MITIGATION STRATEGY:** §201.6(c)(3): *The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction’s blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.*

**13. Local Hazard Mitigation Goals**

**Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i):** *[The hazard mitigation strategy shall include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include a description of mitigation <b>goals</b> to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards?	Chapter 6 Summary 6.1 Page 177  Pg 179 Section 6.2 Table 6.2.1  Section 6.1, pg. 180; Section 6.4 pgs 185-186	Summary description: 4 Goals identified in original 2006 plan. HMSC examined 2006 goals and determined that an expansion of goals to conform with FEMA 386 guidelines. 2006 goals are included/continued in the 2011 Plan update goals. Narrative describe Table indicators that capture 4 goals inclusive of 19 corresponding objectives. Table 6.2.1 detail 2011 HMGP goals and objectives <b>Required Revision: The plan needs to clearly indicate how the mitigation section was updated.</b>  A description of the review and update of goals and objectives by the HMSC and Planning Team is in Section 6.1, Update Process Summary. A description of action/project evaluation and selection is available in Section 6.4, Mitigation Action Plan. Meeting minutes and other documentation from the Mitigation Solutions Workshop, in which the planning team evaluated goals and objectives, reviewed mitigation techniques and developed/updated mitigation actions, is located in Appendix C.	X	
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>			X	

**14. Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions**

**Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii):** *[The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan identify and analyze a <b>comprehensive range</b> of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?	6.3 Mitigation Techniques Pg 181	Mitigation Techniques 6-point criteria to form the Mitigation Action Plan	X	

	<p>Table 6.4-1, pgs 186-202</p> <p>Table 6.3-1, pg. 185</p> <p>Table 6.4-1, pgs. 186-202</p> <p>Table 6.4-1, pg. 195</p>	<p><b>Required Revisions:</b> The plan needs to include additional mitigation activates for Winter hazard event.</p> <p>Existing Actions 6, 11, 17, 23, 32 address winter storms. New non-emergency services mitigation action #43 added to Table 6.4-1 to also address winter storm hazards.</p> <p>Other hazards that need to be profiled will need to have strategies identified for that hazard.</p> <p>It was agreed during the FEMA crosswalk review call, no additional hazards will be profiled.</p> <p><b>ALL profiled hazards need to have mitigation strategies included in the plan.</b> Please ensure that all hazards have mitigation strategies noted in the plan.</p> <p>All hazards have at least one mitigation action. Table 6.3-1 updated to better illustrate that all hazards have at least one mitigation strategy.</p> <p>Prep and Response and recovery actions should be separated from true mitigation action.</p> <p>All actions that are solely related to enhancing emergency services were separated by color in the Mitigation Action Table and marked with an asterisk so that they can easily be identified. The table header and the text introducing Table 6.4-1 have been edited to reflect this change.</p> <p>Page 179 number 6 is not consistent with objective 1.3 Several of the actions, see additional strategies that deal with stormwater issues. MAN</p> <p>Existing Action #6 carried over into the 2011 plan and added to Action #25 in Table 6.4-1.</p>		
<p>B Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on <b>new</b> buildings and infrastructure?</p>	<p>6.4 Table 6.4.1</p>	<p>Mitigation Action Plan – addresses the continued monitoring of new development to include building code enforcement and ordinances. Specific proposal to provide performance standards in local land use ordinances for development. Actions addressing NEW bldg and infrastructure are: 1,2,13</p>		<p>X</p>



