RIVERSIDE COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION AGENCY INVENTORY WORKSHEETS

City of San Jacinto
2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: These documents are meant to be discussed, used and reviewed by a multi-disciplinary team. The Participation by a wide range of stakeholders who play a role in identifying and implementing mitigation actions is required.

SPECIAL CONCERNS:

1. *Has the completed Letter of Commitment been returned to OES? OES must forward this completed Letter of Commitment to Cal EMA.*
2. *Has the completed Letter of Participation been returned to OES?*

1. Local Jurisdiction Contact Information page 3
2. Hazard Identification Questionnaire page 4-6
3. Specific Hazards Summary page 7
4. Jurisdiction Vulnerability Worksheet page 8-9
5. Jurisdiction Mitigation Strategies and Goals page 10-14
6. Local Jurisdiction Proposed Mitigation Action and Strategy Proposal page 14-16
7. Local Jurisdiction Development Trends page 17-18
8. Updated Crosswalk from Cal EMA page 19

Following page 19 is the attached crosswalk for your reference. This is the document Cal EMA and FEMA will be using to verify that all of the required information is in the submitted document. Please refer to the document for information. OES will be placing the page numbers in the crosswalk.

1. LOCAL JURISDICTION CONTACT INFORMATION

The information on this page identifies:

- Jurisdiction and the contact person
- Jurisdiction's service area size and population
- EOP Plan and a Safety Element of their General Plan

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

Agency/Jurisdiction:		City of San Jacinto		
Type Agency/Jurisdiction:		Local Government		
Contact Person:	Title:	Public Works Supervisor		
First Name:	Barry	Last Name:	Mulcock	
Agency Address:	Street:	595 S San Jacinto Ave.		
	City:	San Jacinto		
	State:	Ca.		
	Zip:	92583		
Contact Phone	951-487-7386		FAX	951-487-7382
E-mail	bmulcock@sanjacintoca.us			

Population Served	44,000	Square Miles Served	27

Does your organization have a general plan?	Yes
Does your organization have a safety component to the general plan?	Yes
What year was your plan last updated?	

Does your organization have a disaster/emergency operations plan?	Yes
What year was your plan last updated?	2010
Do you have a recovery annex or section in your plan?	Yes
Do you have a terrorism/WMD annex or section in your plan?	No

2. Hazard Identification Questionnaire

The purpose of the questionnaire is to help identify the hazards within your service area. The list was developed from the first round of meetings with the various working groups in the 2005 plan creation, and from the hazards listed in the County's General Plan. Each hazard is discussed in detail in Part I of the 2005 LHMP. The information will be used as the basis for each jurisdiction to evaluate its capabilities, determine its needs, and to assist in developing goals and strategies. The information identifies:

a) What hazards can be identified within or adjacent to the service area of the jurisdiction.
b) Which of those hazards have had reoccurring events
c) What specific hazards and risks are considered by the jurisdiction to be a threat specifically to the jurisdiction? (These locations should be identified by name and location for inclusion in the Specific Hazard Summary Table).
    a. Specific types of facilities owned and operated by the jurisdiction.
    b. Locations damaged from prior disasters or hazard causing events.
d) Information about the jurisdiction's EOC

(Relates to Number 5 in the 2012 Annex : Jurisdiction Template)

With your Multi-Disciplinary Planning Team:

a. Instructions for Updating Jurisdictions, with your planning team: Review your old Questionnaire for accuracy and relevance, mark changes.

b. Instructions for New Jurisdictions and Special Districts, with your planning team, meet and go over the questionnaire. Fill in YES, NO or NA on the Questionnaire.

HAZARD IDENTIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE

DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE:	
AIRPORT IN JURISDICTION	No
AIRPORT NEXT TO JURISDICTION	Yes
DAIRY INDUSTRY	Yes
POULTRY INDUSTRY	Yes
CROPS/ORCHARDS	Yes
DAMS IN JURISDICTION	No
DAMS NEXT TO JURISDICTION	Yes
LAKE/RESERVOIR IN JURISDICTION	Yes
LAKE/RESERVOIR NEAR JURISDICTION	Yes
JURISDICTION IN FLOOD PLAIN	Yes
CONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	Yes
UNCONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	Yes
EARTHQUAKE FAULTS IN JURISDICTION	Yes
EARTHQUAKE FAULTS NEXT TO JURISDICTION	Yes
MOBILE HOME PARKS	Yes
NON-REINFORCED FREEWAY BRIDGES	No
NON-REINFORCED BRIDGES	No
BRIDGES IN FLOOD PLAIN	No
BRIDGES OVER OR ACROSS RIVER/STREAM	Yes
ROADWAY CROSSING RIVER/STREAM	No
NON REINFORCED BUILDINGS	Yes
FREEWAY/MAJOR HIGHWAY IN JURISDICTION	Yes
FREEWAY/MAJOR HIGHWAY NEXT TO JURISDICTION	No
FOREST AREA IN JURISDICTION	No
FOREST AREA NEXT TO JURISDICTION	No
WITHIN THE 50 MILES SAN ONOFRE EVACUATION ZONE	No
MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINES IN JURISDICTION	Yes
MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINES NEXT TO JURISDICTION	Yes
RAILROAD TRACKS IN JURISDICTION	Yes
RAILROAD TRACKS NEXT TO JURISDICTION	Yes
HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITIES IN JURISDICTION	No
HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITIES NEXT TO JURISDICTION	No
HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITIES IN JURISDICTION	No
HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITIES NEXT TO JURISDICTION	No
DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION OWN OR OPERATE A FACILITY	
IN A FLOOD PLAIN	No
NEAR FLOOD PLAIN	Yes
NEAR RAILROAD TRACKS	No
NEAR A DAM	No
UPSTREAM FROM A DAM	No
DOWNSTREAM FROM A DAM	Yes
DOWNSTREAM OF A LAKE	Yes
DOWNSTREAM FROM A RESERVOIR	Yes
NEAR A CONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	Yes
NEAR UNCONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	No
ON AN EARTHQUAKE FAULT	No
NEAR AN EARTHQUAKE FAULT	Yes
WITHIN THE 50 MILE SAN ONOFRE EVACUATION ZONE	No
IN A FOREST AREA	No

NEAR A FOREST AREA	No
NEAR A MAJOR HIGHWAY	No
A HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY	Yes
NEAR A HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY	No
A HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITY	No
NEAR A HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITY	No
NON REINFORCED BUILDINGS	No
A MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINE	No
NEAR A MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINE	No
DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE ANY LOCATIONS THAT:	
HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY EARTHQUAKE AND NOT REPAIRED	No
HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY FLOOD	No
HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY FLOOD MORE THAN ONCE	No
HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY FOREST FIRE	No
HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY FOREST FIRE MORE THAN ONCE	No
HAVE BEEN IMPACTED BY A TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT	No
HAVE BEEN IMPACTED BY A PIPELINE EVENT	No
EMERGENCY OPERATIONS INFORMATION	
DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE AN EOC	Yes
IS YOUR EOC LOCATED IN A FLOOD PLAIN	No
NEAR FLOOD PLAIN	No
NEAR RAILROAD TRACKS	No
NEAR A DAM	No
UPSTREAM FROM A DAM	No
DOWNSTREAM FROM A DAM	Yes
DOWNSTREAM OF A LAKE	Yes
DOWNSTREAM FROM A RESERVOIR	Yes
NEAR A CONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	No
NEAR UNCONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	No
ON AN EARTHQUAKE FAULT	No
NEAR AN EARTHQUAKE FAULT	Yes
WITHIN THE 50 MILE SAN ONOFRE EVACUATION ZONE	No
IN A FOREST AREA	No
NEAR A FOREST AREA	No
NEAR A MAJOR HIGHWAY	No
A HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY	No
NEAR A HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY	No
A HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITY	No
NEAR A HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITY	No
NON REINFORCED BUILDINGS	No
A MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINE	No
NEAR A MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINE	No
OTHER FACILITY INFORMATION **ARE THERE LOCATIONS WITHIN YOUR JURISDICTION THAT:**	
COULD BE CONSIDERED A TERRORIST TARGET	No
COULD BE CONSIDERED A BIO-HAZARD RISK	No

With your planning team, list the “Yes” answers and discuss. Use the information as a group to summarize your jurisdiction’s hazards and vulnerabilities.

3. SPECIFIC HAZARDS SUMMARY

This table helps to identify the information (name, owner, location, etc.) about the specific hazards identified in the Hazard Questionnaire. (Related to #6 in the 2012 Annex : Jurisdiction Template).

In the Summary Table, list the basic information of the hazards identified by the jurisdiction in the Hazard Identification Questionnaire as a potential threat. These specific hazards were used in the development of response plans, maps, and other analysis data.

a. Instructions for Updating Jurisdictions and Special Districts: With your planning team, review the "Yes" answers and see if there were any changes, if so summarize why there is a difference from the 2005.

The City of San Jacinto LHMP committee deciphered several changes were to be made relating to specific hazards within our jurisdiction:

1) **Deleted** flood control channel – this was removed by committee as an undue threat of the channel that is maintained by Riverside County Flood Control District.
2) **Deleted** Burlington Northern Railroad – LHMP committee removed from hazard list as this railway has been abandoned and not in current use.
3) **Added** Lake Hemet Dam – This specific hazard was not listed in the 2005 report and potentially poses a hazard to City of San Jacinto.

(relates to #6 in the 2012 Annex : Jurisdiction Template)

SPECIFIC HAZARDS SUMMARY

Jurisdiction	Hazard Type	Hazard Name	In Jurisdiction?	Adjacent to Jurisdiction?
San Jacinto	Dam	Diamond Valley Lake	No	Yes
San Jacinto	Fault	San Jacinto Fault Zone	Yes	No
San Jacinto	Lake	Diamond Valley Lake	No	Yes
San Jacinto	River	San Jacinto River	No	Yes
San Jacinto	Dam	Hemet Dam	No	Yes
San Jacinto	Lake	Lake Hemet	No	Yes

JURISDICTION VULNERABILITY WORKSHEET (Related to #5 in the 2012 Annex: Jurisdiction Template)

This table is a listing of the primary hazards identified by the 2005 LHMP working groups. Each jurisdiction was asked to evaluate the potential for an event to occur in their jurisdiction by hazard. They were also asked to evaluate the potential impact of that event by hazard on their jurisdiction. The impact potential was determined based on:

1. Economic loss and recovery
2. Physical loss to structures (residential, commercial, and critical facilities)
3. The loss or damage to the jurisdictions infrastructure
4. Their ability to continue with normal daily governmental activities
5. Their ability to quickly recover from the event and return to normal daily activities
6. The loss of life and potential injuries from the event.

The jurisdictions were asked to rate the potential and severity using a scale of between 0 and 4 (4 being the most severe). The jurisdictions were also asked to rank the listed hazards as they relate to their jurisdiction from 1 to 19 (1 being the highest overall threat to their jurisdiction).

With the assistance of the RCIP Plan and County Departments, Riverside County OES conducted an extensive evaluation of the severity and probability potential for the county as a whole. The hazards were also ranked for the County. Those numbers and rankings were provided to the jurisdictions as a comparison guide.

A separate table was created to address the hazards relating to agriculture and was assessed by the agriculture working group. This table can be found in the Agriculture Appendix of Part I of the 2005 Plan.

a. Instructions for Updating Jurisdictions and Special Districts: Please review the table, determine if your ranking from the 2005 LHMP remains the same, and note that Pandemic has been added to the list. Please discuss and document new or unchanged severity and rankings.

b. Instructions for New Jurisdictions and Special Districts: Please evaluate the potential for an event to occur in your jurisdiction by hazard. Then, evaluate the potential impact of that event by hazard on your jurisdiction according to #1-6 from the potential impact list above.

NOTE: Under Medical, Pandemic was added. This was a result of the H1N1 and other incidents.

AGENCY: City of San Jacinto DATE: September 2011

	COUNTY		LOCAL JURISDICTION		
HAZARD	**SEVERITY 0 - 4**	**PROBABILITY 0 - 4**	**SEVERITY 0 - 4**	**PROBABILITY 0 - 4**	**RANKING 1 - 19**
EARTHQUAKE	4	3	**4**	**3**	**1**
WILDLAND FIRE	3	4	**2**	**2**	**4**
FLOOD	3	3	**2**	**2**	**3**
OTHER NATURAL HAZARDS					
DROUGHT	3	3	**2**	**2**	**10**
LANDSLIDES	2	3	**2**	**1**	**17**
INSECT INFESTATION	3	4	**2**	**2**	**15**
EXTREME SUMMER/WINTER WEATHER	2	4	**2**	**3**	**9**
SEVERE WIND EVENT	3	3	**3**	**3**	**2**
AGRICULTURAL					
DISEASE/CONTAMINATION	3	4	**2**	**2**	**12**
TERRORISM	4	2	**3**	**2**	**16**
OTHER MAN-MADE					
PIPELINE	2	3	**2**	**1**	**11**
AQUEDUCT	2	3	**3**	**2**	**5**
TRANSPORTATION	2	4	**2**	**2**	**13**
POWER OUTAGE	3	4	**3**	**3**	**7**
HAZMAT ACCIDENTS	3	3	**3**	**3**	**6**
NUCLEAR ACCIDENT	4	2	**3**	**2**	**14**
TERRORISM	4	2	**3**	**2**	**18**
CIVIL UNREST	2	2	**2**	**1**	**20**
JAIL/PRISON EVENT	1	2	**1**	**1**	**19**
MEDICAL					
PANDEMIC			2	2	**8**

4. JURISDICTION MITIGATION STRATEGIES AND GOALS

This comprehensive table is a listing of the various mitigation strategies, goals, and objectives developed by the 2005 LHMP working groups. The jurisdictions were also given the opportunity to list additional strategies, goals, and objectives specific to either their jurisdiction or their workgroup (i.e. the hospitals, agriculture, etc.).

LOCAL JURISDICTION MITIGATION STRATEGIES AND GOALS

With your Planning Team

a. Instructions for Updating Jurisdictions and Special Districts: please review the table; determine if your ranking from the 2005 LHMP remains the same.

b. Instructions for New Jurisdictions and Special Districts: please follow below:

Please evaluate the priority level for each listed mitigation goal identified below as it relates to your jurisdiction or facility. If you have any additional mitigation goals or recommendations, please list them at the end of this document.

Place an H (High), M (Medium), L (Low), or N/A (Not Applicable) for your priority level for each mitigation goal in the box next to the activity.

EARTHQUAKE	
M	Aggressive public education campaign in light of predictions
L	Generate new literature for dissemination to:
L	◊ Government employees
L	◊ Businesses
L	◊ Hotel/motel literature
M	◊ Local radio stations for education
L	◊ Public education via utilities
L	◊ Identify/create television documentary content
L	Improve the Emergency Alert System (EAS)
L	◊ Consider integration with radio notification systems
L	◊ Upgrade alerting and warning systems for hearing impaired
L	◊ Training and maintenance
L	Procure earthquake-warning devices for critical facilities
L	Reinforce emergency response facilities
N/A	Provide training to hospital staffs
L	Require earthquake gas shutoffs on remodels/new construction
N/A	Evaluate re-enforcing reservoir concrete bases
L	Evaluate EOCs for seismic stability
N/A	Install earthquake cutoffs at reservoirs
M	Install earthquake-warning devices at critical facilities
M	Develop a dam inundation plan for new Diamond Valley Reservoir
M	Earthquake retrofitting
M	◊ Bridges/dams/pipelines
L	◊ Government buildings/schools
L	◊ Mobile home parks
M	Develop educational materials on structural reinforcement and home inspections **(ALREADY DEVELOPED)**
H	Ensure Uniform Building Code compliance

M	◊ Update to current compliance when retrofitting
M	Insurance coverage on public facilities
L	Funding for non-structural abatement (Earthquake kits, etc.)
L	Pre - identify empty commercial space for seismic re-location
N/A	Electrical co-generation facilities need retrofitting/reinforcement (Palm Springs, others?)
L	Mapping of liquefaction zones
M	Incorporate County geologist data into planning
N/A	Backup water supplies for hospitals
L	Evaluate pipeline seismic resiliency
L	Pre-positioning of temporary response structures
L	Fire sprinkler ordinance for all structures
L	Evaluate adequacy of reservoir capacity for sprinkler systems
L	Training/standardization for contractors performing retrofitting
L	Website with mitigation/contractor/retrofitting information
M	◊ Links to jurisdictions
M	◊ Alerting information
L	◊ Volunteer information
M	Evaluate depths of aquifers/wells for adequacy during quakes
L	Evaluate hazmat storage regulations near faults
COMMUNICATIONS IN DISASTER ISSUES	
M	Communications Interoperability
L	Harden repeater sites
M	Continue existing interoperability project
M	Strengthen/harden
M	Relocate
M	Redundancy
L	Mobile repeaters
FLOODS	
M	Update development policies for flood plains
M	Public education on locations of flood plains
L	Develop multi-jurisdictional working group on floodplain management
M	Develop greenbelt requirements in new developments
L	Update weather pattern/flood plain maps
M	Conduct countywide study of flood barriers/channels/gates/water dispersal systems
M	Required water flow/runoff plans for new development
M	Perform GIS mapping of flood channels, etc.
M	Install vehicular crossing gates/physical barriers for road closure
M	Maintenance of storm sewers/flood channels (revised High to Medium)
M	Create map of flood channels/diversions/water systems etc.
L	Require digital floor plans on new non-residential construction
H	Upgrade dirt embankments to concrete (Revised: Medium to “High “levee project”)
M	Conduct countywide needs study on drainage capabilities
N/A	Increase number of pumping stations
L	Increase sandbag distribution capacities
L	Develop pre-planned response plan for floods
L	◊ Evacuation documentation
M	◊ Re-examine historical flooding data for potential street re-design

L	Training for city/county PIOs about flood issues
L	Warning systems - ensure accurate information provided
L	◊ Publicize flood plain information (website?)
L	◊ Install warning/water level signage
L	◊ Enhanced public information
M	◊ Road closure compliance
L	◊ Shelter locations
L	◊ Pre-event communications
M	Look at County requirements for neighborhood access
M	◊ Secondary means of ingress/egress
L	Vegetation restoration programs
M	Ensure critical facilities are hardened/backed up
L	Hardening water towers
L	Terrorism Surveillance - cameras at reservoirs/dams
L	Riverbed maintenance
M	Evaluate existing lift stations for adequacy
M	Acquisition of property for on-site retention
M	Evaluate regulations on roof drainage mechanism
M	Erosion-resistant plants
L	Traffic light protection
L	Upkeep of diversionary devices
L	Install more turn-off valves on pipelines
M	Backup generation facilities
L	Identify swift water rescue capabilities across County
WILDFIRES	
H	Aggressive weed abatement program
M	◊ Networking of agencies for weed abatement
N/A	Develop strategic plan for forest management
N/A	Public education on wildfire defense
M	Encourage citizen surveillance and reporting
L	Identify hydrants with equipment ownership information
M	Enhanced firefighting equipment
N/A	Fire spotter program/red flag program
N/A	◊ Expand to other utilities
M	Research on insect/pest mitigation technologies
L	Volunteer home inspection program
L	Public education program
L	◊ Weather reporting/alerting
L	◊ Building protection
L	◊ Respiration
L	Pre-identify shelters/recovery centers/other resources
M	Roofing materials/defensive spacing regulations
L	Community task forces for planning and education
M	Fuel/dead tree removal
L	Strategic pre-placement of firefighting equipment
L	Establish FEMA coordination processes based on ICS
N/A	Brush clearings around repeaters

L	Research new technologies for identifying/tracking fires
M	Procure/deploy backup communications equipment
L	"Red Tag" homes in advance of event
L	Provide fire-resistant gel to homeowners
L	Involve insurance agencies in mitigation programs
L	Clear out abandoned vehicles from oases
M	Code enforcement
M	Codes prohibiting fireworks
L	Fuel modification/removal
M	Evaluate building codes
M	Maintaining catch basins
OTHER HAZARDS	
N/A	Improve pipeline maintenance
M	Wetlands mosquito mitigation (West Nile Virus)
L	Insect control study
M	Increase County Vector Control capacities
M	General public drought awareness
L	◊ Lawn watering rotation
N/A	Develop County drought plan
N/A	Mitigation of landslide-prone areas
L	Develop winter storm sheltering plan
L	Ease permitting process for building transmission lines
M	Evaluate restrictions on dust/dirt/generating activities during wind seasons
L	Rotational crop planning/soil stabilization
N/A	Enhance agricultural checkpoint enforcement
L	Agriculture - funding of detection programs
L	Communications of pipeline maps (based on need to know)
L	Improved notification plan on runaway trains
L	Improve/maintain blackout notification plan.
M	Support business continuity planning for utility outages
M	Terrorism training/equipment for first responders
M	◊ Terrorism planning/coordination
L	◊ Staffing for terrorism mitigation
L	Create a SONGS regional planning group
L	◊ Include dirty bomb planning
L	Cooling stations - MOUs in place
L	Fire Ant eradication program
L	White Fly infestation abatement/eradication program
M	Develop plan for supplemental water sources
M	Public education on low water landscaping
N/A	Salton Sea desalinization
L	Establish agriculture security standards (focus on water supply)
L	ID mutual aid agreements
L	Vulnerability assessment on fiber-optic cable
N/A	Upgrade valves on California aqueduct
L	Public education
L	◊ Bi-lingual signs

L	◊ Power Outage information
L	Notification system for rail traffic - container contents
L	Control and release of terrorism intelligence
N/A	Develop prison evacuation plan (shelter in place?)

Use the list and rankings to narrow down or identify "your" strategies. The mitigation strategy serves as the long-term blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment. The mitigation strategy includes the development of goals, objectives, and prioritized mitigation actions.

Goals are general guidelines that explain what you want to achieve. They are broad policy statements and are usually long-term and represent global visions, such as "Protect Existing Property."

Objectives define strategies or implementation steps to attain the identified goals. Unlike goals, objectives are specific, measurable, and may have a defined completion date. Objectives are more specific, such as "Increase the number of buildings protected from flooding."

The development of effective goals and objectives enables the planning team to evaluate the merits of alternative mitigation actions and the local conditions in which these activities would be pursued. A potential mitigation action that would support the goal and objective goal example above is "Acquire repetitive flood loss properties in the Acadia Woods Subdivision."

In the 2005 LHMP, each jurisdiction was required to develop a Mitigation Strategy Proposal based on one of the following:

1. The strategy, goal, or objective rating "High Priority" on the Local Jurisdiction Mitigation Strategies and Goals (WORKSHEET ABOVE)
2. A specifically identified strategy, goal, or objective that was developed as part of one of the working groups planning sessions such as the hospitals or agriculture
3. A specifically identified strategy, goal, or objective that was developed as part of one of the jurisdiction's internal working group planning sessions

5. LOCAL JURISDICTION PROPOSED MITIGATION ACTION AND STRATEGY PROPOSAL

a. Instructions for Updating Jurisdictions and Special Districts: With your planning team, please review the table from # 5, and determine if your ranking from the 2005 LHMP remains the same.

Review the chosen Mitigation Strategy that your jurisdiction submitted. The updated plan **must** identify the completed, deleted, or deferred actions or activities from the previously approved plan as a benchmark for progress.

If the mitigation actions or activities remain unchanged from the previously approved plan, the updated plan **must** indicate why changes are not necessary. Further, the updated plan **shall** include in its prioritization any new mitigation actions identified since the previous plan was approved or through the plan update process.

b. Instructions for New Jurisdictions and Special Districts: With your planning team, Use the "High Priority" rated strategy, goal or objective as a starting point to determine your Mitigation Strategy Proposal.

LOCAL JURISDICTION PROPOSED MITIGATION ACTION AND STRATEGY PROPOSAL #1

Jurisdiction: City of San Jacinto	
Contact:	Barry Mulcock
Phone:	951-487-7386

MITIGATION STRATEGY INFORMATION

Proposal Name:

San Jacinto River Levee – Flood mitigation Plan

Proposal Location:

San Jacinto River - North of Ramona Expressway from Lake Park Bridge on the east to west of Sanderson Ave.

Proposal Type

Place an "X" by the type of mitigation strategy (one or more may apply)

X	Flood and mud flow mitigation
	Fire mitigation
	Elevation or acquisition of repetitively damaged structures or structures in high hazard areas
	Mitigation Planning (i.e. update building codes, planning develop guidelines, etc.)
	Development and implementation of mitigation education programs
	Development or improvement of warning systems
	Additional Hazard identification and analysis in support of the local hazard mitigation plan
	Drinking and/or irrigation water mitigation
	Earthquake mitigation
	Agriculture - crop related mitigation
	Agriculture - animal related mitigation
	Flood inundation/Dam failure
	Weather/Temperature event mitigation

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED MITIGATION STRATEGY

Proposal/Event History	List any previous disaster related events (dates, costs, etc.) Year 1980. Flooding occurred by failed levee causing property damage at an estimated $6 million dollars. Year 1993, a 5 year flood caused levee rupture at several locations and directly impacting property damage estimated at $625,000.
Description of Mitigation Goal Narrative:	Give a detailed description of the need for the proposal, any history related to the proposal. List the activities necessary for its completion in the narrative section below, including estimated timeline. (how long will it take)

STRATEGY: Construct levee to reduce flood risk to populated areas and businesses, protecting residential, commercial and agricultural losses within the flood plain. A severe flood event has the potential losses in millions of dollars as described in the 1980 and 1993 flood events. The Levee project not only will protect flood plain properties with approx value of $136 million dollars, the project will also enhance and incorporate key economic development within the San Jacinto valley.
GOAL: The Levee project will protect approx. 1900 acres within the flood plain to include a major transportation corridor (Future Mid-County Parkway and HWY 79 interchange).The levee project will allow the recovery and development of useful land for major commercial, retail, agricultural businesses, to include residential development. The San Jacinto River levee project cost is estimated at approx $40,000,000. $25 million for construction costs, and $15 million for right-of-way acquisition. The levee project has been in the planning stages for approx10 years with completion expected within a 5-10 year time frame depending upon funding mechanisms. The project also requires ongoing environmental impact studies and surveys to meet California Department of Fish and Game mandates.

Does your jurisdiction have primary responsibility for the proposal? If not, what agency does?

Yes	X	No		**Responsible Agency:** Joint project to involve Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and City of San Jacinto.

FUNDING INFORMATION

Place an "X" by the proposed source of funding for this proposal

X	Unfunded proposal - funds are not available for the proposal at this time (Partially funded by RCFC & WCD)
	Local jurisdiction General Fund
	Local jurisdiction Special Fund (road tax, assessment fees, etc.)
	Non-FEMA Hazard Mitigation Funds
	Local Hazard Mitigation Grant Funds - Future Request
	Hazard Mitigation Funds

X	Has your jurisdiction evaluated this mitigation strategy to determine its cost benefits? YES

- The current values of residential/commercial parcels within flood plain: Currently 802 parcels zoned residential with structures exist with value of $111, 118,087.00; Currently 45 commercial zoned parcels with structures valued at $26,100,616.00 (Total Value of structures within potential flood zone $136,218,000.00). Source: Riverside County GIS Data, Assessor's Parcel information dated October11, 2011

(MAP of Levee project area)

As part of this process, each Submitting Jurisdiction is required to perform a cost-benefit analysis. They were required to answer the question at the bottom of the Proposal page that asks if they had conducted a Cost-Benefit Analysis of some type. This analysis was conducted either by completing a Cost Benefit form or by some other approved method. Many of the jurisdictions used the cost-effective analysis approach outlined in the FEMA publication, *Cost and Benefits of Natural Hazards Mitigation.* This cost-benefit analysis was not restricted to natural hazards.

In some cases, the jurisdiction or working group identified a proposal that highlighted a life- safety issue over a standard hazard proposal. This was done when there was either historical data or other sources of information indicating that the life-safety issue needed to be emphasized or brought to the public's attention.

LOCAL JURISDICTION PROPOSED MITIGATION ACTION AND STRATEGY PROPOSAL #2

Jurisdiction:	City of San Jacinto
Contact:	Barry Mulcock
Phone:	951-487-7386

MITIGATION STRATEGY INFORMATION

Proposal Name:

Aggressive Weed Abatement Strategy

Proposal Location:

Unimproved parcels throughout city limits

Proposal Type

Place an "X" by the type of mitigation strategy (one or more may apply)

	Flood and mud flow mitigation
X	Fire mitigation
	Elevation or acquisition of repetitively damaged structures or structures in high hazard areas
	Mitigation Planning (i.e. update building codes, planning develop guidelines, etc.)
	Development and implementation of mitigation education programs
	Development or improvement of warning systems
	Additional Hazard identification and analysis in support of the local hazard mitigation plan
	Drinking and/or irrigation water mitigation
	Earthquake mitigation
X	Agriculture - crop related mitigation
	Agriculture - animal related mitigation
	Flood inundation/Dam failure
X	Weather/Temperature event mitigation

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED MITIGATION STRATEGY

Proposal/Event List any previous disaster related events (dates, costs, etc.)

History	October 2007, the City of San Jacinto was subject to a severe and damaging wind storm. City council declared a local state of emergency due to downed trees, power lines, soil erosion, and substantial amounts of sand and debris. Estimated damages totaled over $1,000,000 to residential, businesses, city maintained right-of-ways, and schools. Although this is weather related strategy which caused substantial soil erosion, a fire threat was a possibility that had potential for a greater public threat. Large wild fire events occurred during this wind event in San Diego County causing millions of dollars of damage to public and private properties.
Description of Mitigation Goal Narrative:	Give a detailed description of the need for the proposal, any history related to the proposal. List the activities necessary for its completion in the narrative section below, including estimated timeline. (how long will it take)
	Mitigation strategy included adoption of Ordinance 15.30.010 on October 23rd, 2008 restricting weed abatement activities to control or reduce soil erosion. The objective and goal of the ordinance is to protect residential communities in close proximity and adjacent to agricultural and undeveloped parcels where frequent plowing or discing occurs. Ordinance restricts the discing and plowing of fields in compliance with weed abatement practices. Proactive enforcement of ordinance is through code enforcement office.

Does your jurisdiction have primary responsibility for the proposal? If not, what agency does?

Yes	X	No		

FUNDING INFORMATION

Place an "X" by the proposed source of funding for this proposal

	Unfunded proposal - funds are not available for the proposal at this time
X	Local jurisdiction General Fund
	Local jurisdiction Special Fund (road tax, assessment fees, etc.)
	Non-FEMA Hazard Mitigation Funds
	Local Hazard Mitigation Grant Funds - Future Request
	Hazard Mitigation Funds

X	Has your jurisdiction evaluated this mitigation strategy to determine its cost benefits?

Cost to institute ordinance with results that outweigh potential damages was a proactive approach to support both residential development and maintain agricultural standards and growth that does not impact public safety. City continues on-going legal practices to post liens on unresponsive property owners that violate ordinances through Riverside County Assessor's Office.

As part of this process, each Submitting Jurisdiction is required to perform a cost-benefit analysis. They were required to answer the question at the bottom of the Proposal page that asks if they had conducted a Cost-Benefit Analysis of some type. This analysis was conducted either by completing a Cost Benefit form or by some other approved method. Many of the jurisdictions used the cost-effective analysis approach outlined in the FEMA publication, *Cost and Benefits of Natural Hazards Mitigation.* This cost-benefit analysis was not restricted to natural hazards.

In some cases, the jurisdiction or working group identified a proposal that highlighted a life- safety issue over a standard hazard proposal. This was done when there was either historical data or other sources of information indicating that the life-safety issue needed to be emphasized or brought to the public's attention.

6. LOCAL JURISDICTION DEVELOPMENT TRENDS QUESTIONNAIRE (Same as #7 in the 2012 Annex : Jurisdiction Template)

LAND USE ISSUES - COMPLETE THE INFORMATION BELOW

This questionnaire identifies a comparison of specific land use issues between 2004, 2012 and 2017. The questionnaire also identifies the specific threat potential to the jurisdiction in relationship to residential and commercial structures along with critical facilities. This threat potential is focused on structural loss rather than dollar-value loss as it relates to the three main natural hazards – earthquakes, floods, and wild-land fires. The determination of dollar-value loss relating to commercial and critical facilities was found to be very limited and a difficult task to establish. This issue will be addressed in future updates of the Plan.

The questionnaire also requires the jurisdiction to identify the process it will use to maintain their portion of the Plan.

LOCAL JURISDICTION DEVELOPMENT TRENDS QUESTIONNAIRE 2011

LAND USE ISSUES - COMPLETE THE INFORMATION BELOW

JURISDICTION:	**DOES YOUR AGENCY HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LAND USE AND/OR DEVELOPMENT ISSUES WITHIN YOUR JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES? YES NO**			
	2005 DATA	**2012 DATA**		**2017**
Current Population in Jurisdiction or Served	26,041	44,199	Projected Population in Jurisdiction or Served - in 2017	57,000
Current Sq Miles in Jurisdiction or Served	27	27	Projected Sq Miles in Jurisdiction or Served - in 2017	31
Does Your Jurisdiction have any ordinances or regulations dealing with disaster mitigation, disaster preparation, or disaster response?	Yes	Yes	If yes, please list ordinance or regulation number. 1029 – Fire Severity Zones; 1071 – Administration of Disaster Operations and Relief	
What is the number one land issue your agency will face in the next five years	State Highway 79 re-alignment			
Approximate Number of Homes/Apts/etc.	8151	11,626	Projected Number of Homes/Apts/etc.- in 2017	13,000
Approximate Total Residential Value	831,599,855	1,678,618,915	Projected Residential Total Value - in 2017	1,877,003,775
Approximate Number of Commercial Businesses	900	470	Projected Number of Commercial Businesses - in 2017	500
Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in flood hazard zones	20%	3%	Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in flood hazard zones - in 2017	3%
Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in earthquake hazard zones	5%	4%	Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in earthquake hazard zones - in 2017	4%
Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in wildland fire hazard zones	0%	>1%	Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in wildland fire hazard zones - in 2017	1%
Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in flood hazard zones	2%	>1%	Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in flood hazard zones - in 2017	>1%
Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in earthquake hazard zones	1%	>1%	Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in earthquake hazard zones - in 2017	>1%
Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in wildland fire hazard zones	0%	0%	Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in wildland fire hazard zones - in 2017	0%
Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in flood hazard zones	0%	0%	Projected Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in flood hazard zones - in 2017	0%
Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in earthquake hazard zones	0%	0%	Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in earthquake hazard zones - in 2017	0%
Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in wildland fire hazard zones.	0%	0%	Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in wildland fire hazard zones - in 2017	0%
Does your jurisdiction plan on participating in the County's on-going plan maintenance program every two years as described in Part I of the plan?	Yes	Yes	If not, how will your jurisdiction do plan maintenance?	
Will a copy of this plan be available for the various planning groups within your jurisdiction for use in future planning and budgeting				Yes

7. Crosswalk for all CA Local Government Jurisdictions participating in Multi-Jurisdictional, Local Hazard Mitigation Plans

FEMA's Local Mitigation Plan requirements under 44 CFR §201.6 specifically identify criteria that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans. Many issues are better resolved by evaluating hazards more comprehensively by coordinating at the county, regional, or watershed level.
Although economy-of-scale efforts are apparent and encouraged with multi-jurisdictional plans, FEMA requires that all participating jurisdictions meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6. While certain elements are common to all participating jurisdictions
(*e.g.,* planning process, hazards, goals, and maintenance), there are some elements that are unique to each participating jurisdiction, including:

- risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- mitigation actions (actions must be identified for each jurisdiction);
- participation in the planning process (examples of participation include attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, *etc*.); and
- adoption (each jurisdiction must formally adopt the plan).

Each separate jurisdiction participating in a Multi-Jurisdictional Plan, must a formally adopt the Multi-Jurisdictional Plan as their own LHMP. Even though a jurisdiction is "participating" in a multi-jurisdictional plan, EACH JURISDICTION must ensure that certain requirements of the Multi-Jurisdictional Plan have been met. Failure to do so MAY delay review and or approval of the multi-jurisdictional plan.

While each multi-jurisdictional plan must be a "stand alone" document upon completion, each jurisdiction must be aware of the information and requirements, unique to each participant that must be provided in order for the multi-jurisdictional plan to be complete. The advantage for each local government in participating in a multi-jurisdictional plan is, among many, that most information and data (i.e. information, data, maps), may be shared by all participating jurisdictions.

The actual page numbers required in the Crosswalk will be inserted by OES during the compilation process of the plan. The Crosswalk is to be used as a guide to ensure the information for the county and each jurisdiction and special district is complete.

The following Plan Review Crosswalk **should be completed by each participating jurisdiction** to document how and where information needed by the multi-jurisdictional planning effort, but specific to each participating jurisdiction, has been included.

DIRECTIONS FOR USING THE PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK FOR REVIEW OF LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

1. 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.:

Example

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 **new or updated** plan include an **overall summary** description of the jurisdiction's **vulnerability** to each hazard?	Section II, pp. 4-10	Submitting Jurisdiction input in Green. State comments in Blue. FEMA requirements & reviewer comments in Red. 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.		☐
B. Does the **new or updated** plan address the **impact** 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. **Required Revisions:**	☐	

		• Include a description of the impact of floods and earthquakes on the assets. **Recommended Revisions:** This information can be presented in terms of dollar value or percentages of damage.		
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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		
2. Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5)		
AND		
3. Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation: §201.6(a)(3)		

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

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

*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)		
14. Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(ii)		
15. Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: NFIP Compliance. §201.6(c)(3)(ii)		
16. Implementation of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iii)		
17. Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iv)		

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

State		
Multi-jurisdictional: Letter of Commitment for each jurisdiction		
Summary of mitigation projects		
Summary of hazards		

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED	
See Reviewer's Comments	
PLAN APPROVED	

TABLE A: SUMMARY OF MITIGATION ACTIONS

This table will assist FEMA and the State in identifying potential projects, actions or strategies for various mitigation grant programs and whether the identified projects, actions or strategies are consistent with State and Local Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plans. Local jurisdictions may find the table useful to ensure that their plan addresses each hazard that can affect the jurisdiction and possible actions to reduce risk to their respective community. ***Completing this table is required***. ***Identifying Mitigation Actions §201.6(c)(3)(iii).***

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Mitigation Action by Grant Activity Type	**Page # – Location in Plan Where Actions are Identified**	**Total # of Projects All Hazards**	**Flood Hazard** Project # Only	**Fire Hazard** Project # Only	**Earthquake Hazard** Project # Only	**Tsunami Hazard** Project # Only	**Other Hazard** Project # Only
General Mitigation Project							
Property Acquisition and Structural Demolition							
Property Acquisition and Structural Relocation							
Structural Elevation							
Mitigation Reconstruction							
Dry Floodproofing of Historic Residential Structures							
Dry Floodproofing of Non-residential Structures							
Minor Localized Flood Reduction Projects							
Structural retrofitting of Existing Buildings							
Non-structural Retrofitting of Existing Buildings and Facilities							
Infrastructure Retrofit							
Soil Stabilization							
Wildfire Mitigation							
Post-Disaster Code Enforcement							
Hazard Mitigation Planning							
Other Levee//Flood Control Channel		1	1				
Other Weed Abatement		1		1			
Other _____							

Legend:

§201.6(c)(3)(iii) Mitigation Actions

A. Type of eligible activity per the FEMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance Unified Guidance for HMGP, PDM, FMA, SRL, and RFC.

B. List each page where project/s or activities can be found in the community's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.

C. Total number of projects that would fall under this Grant Activity Type (combining all disaster project types Columns D-H).

D – H. Number of projects specific to this type of Hazard.

H. If this Column is used, identity Hazard Type and project by using "Other" in Column A.

Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

Jurisdiction: City of San Jacinto	Title of Plan: Local Hazard Mitigation Plan	Date of Plan: January 2012
Local Point of Contact: Barry Mulcock	Address: 595 S San Jacinto Ave. San Jacinto, Ca. 92593	
Title: Public Works Supervisor		
Agency: City of San Jacinto		
Phone Number: 951-487-7386 Fax: 951-487-7382	E-Mail: bmulcock@sanjacintoca.us	

State Reviewer:	Title:	Date:

FEMA Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Date Received in FEMA Region [Insert #]		
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved		
Date Approved		

Jurisdiction:	dFIRM in plan?	Adopted	Participating	Risk Assessment	Mitigation Action	NFIP Status			
	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	N/A	CRS Review Y/N	CRS Class
1.									
2.									
3. [ATTACH PAGE(S) WITH ADDITIONAL JURISDICTIONS]									

*** 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	SCORE MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted **new or updated** plan?				
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE MET
A. Does the **new or updated** plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?				
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the **new or updated** plan?				
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE MET
A. Does the **new or updated** plan describe **how** each jurisdiction participated in the plan's development?				
B. Does the updated plan identify all participating jurisdictions, including new, continuing, and the jurisdictions that no longer participate in the plan?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan indicate who was involved in the **current** planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, *etc*.?)				
B. Does the **new or updated** 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?)				
C. **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?				

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. Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?				
E. Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the **new or updated** plan?				
F. 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?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

RISK ASSESSMENT: *§201.6(c)(2): The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.*

5. Identifying Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment* ***shall*** *include a] description of the type … of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction.*

Element	Location in the **Plan** (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan include **a description** of the types of **all natural hazards** that affect the jurisdiction?				

SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the **location** (*i.e.*, geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the **new or updated** plan?				
B. Does the risk assessment identify the **extent** (*i.e.*, magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the **new or updated** plan?				
C. Does the plan provide information on **previous occurrences** of each hazard addressed in the **new or updated** plan?				
D. Does the plan include the **probability of future events** (*i.e.*, chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the **new or updated** plan?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan include an **overall summary** description of the jurisdiction's **vulnerability** to each hazard?				
B. Does the **new or updated** plan address the **impact** of each hazard on the jurisdiction?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE S
A. Does the new or updated plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of *repetitive loss properties* located in the identified hazard areas?		***Note: This requirement becomes effective for all local plans approved after October 1, 2008.***		
		SUMMARY SCORE		

9. Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): *The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area … .*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan describe vulnerability in terms of the **types and numbers** of **existing** buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?		***Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.***		
B. Does the **new or updated** plan describe vulnerability in terms of the **types and numbers** of **future** buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?		***Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.***		
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan estimate **potential dollar losses** to vulnerable structures?		***Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.***		
B. Does the **new or updated** plan describe the **methodology** used to prepare the estimate?		***Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.***		
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan describe land uses and development trends?		***Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.***		
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE S
A Does the **new or updated** plan include a description of mitigation **goals** to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

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	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan identify and analyze a **comprehensive range** of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?				
B Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on **new** buildings and infrastructure?				
C. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on **existing** buildings and infrastructure?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

15. Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Compliance

Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(ii): *[The mitigation strategy] must also address the jurisdiction's participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate.*

Element	**Location in the Plan** (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the new or updated plan describe the jurisdiction (s) participation in the NFIP?		***Note: This requirement becomes effective for all local mitigation plans approved after October 1, 2008.***		
B. Does the mitigation strategy identify, analyze and prioritize actions related to continued compliance with the NFIP?		***Note: This requirement becomes effective for all local mitigation plans approved after October 1, 2008.***		
		SUMMARY SCORE		

16. Implementation of Mitigation Actions

Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(iii): *[The mitigation strategy section **shall** include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization **shall** include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.*

Element	**Location in the Plan** (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** mitigation strategy include how the actions are **prioritized**? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)				
B. Does the **new or updated** mitigation strategy address how the actions will be implemented and administered, including the responsible department , existing and potential resources and the timeframe to complete each action?				
C. Does the **new or updated** prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a **cost-benefit review** to maximize benefits?				
D. Does the **updated** plan identify the completed, deleted or deferred mitigation actions as a benchmark for progress, and if activities are unchanged (*i.e.*, deferred), does the updated plan				

describe why no changes occurred?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

17. Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): *For multi-jurisdictional plans, there* ***must*** *be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.*

Element	**Location in the Plan** (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A Does the **new or updated** plan include identifiable **action items** for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?				
B. Does the **updated** plan identify the completed, deleted or deferred mitigation actions as a benchmark for progress, and if activities are unchanged (*i.e.*, deferred), does the updated plan describe why no changes occurred?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

18. Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): *[The plan maintenance process* ***shall*** *include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.*

Element	**Location in the Plan** (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan describe the method and schedule for **monitoring** the plan, including the responsible department?				
B. Does the **new or updated** plan describe the method and schedule for **evaluating** the plan, including how, when and by whom (*i.e.* the responsible department)?				
C. Does the **new or updated** plan describe the method and schedule for **updating** the plan within the five-year cycle?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

19. Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): *[The plan **shall** include 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.*

Element	**Location in the Plan** (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan identify other local planning mechanisms available for incorporating the mitigation requirements of the mitigation plan?				
B. Does the **new or updated** plan include a process by which the local government will incorporate the mitigation strategy and other information contained in the plan (*e.g.*, risk assessment) into other planning mechanisms, when appropriate?				
C. Does the **updated** plan explain how the local government incorporated the mitigation strategy and other information contained in the plan (*e.g.*, risk assessment) into other planning mechanisms, when appropriate?				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

Continued Public Involvement

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): *[The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.*

Element	**Location in the Plan** (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE N	SCORE S
A. Does the **new or updated** plan explain how **continued public participation** will be obtained? (For example, will there be public notices, an on-going mitigation plan committee, or annual review meetings with stakeholders?)				
		SUMMARY SCORE		

MATRIX A: PROFILING HAZARDS

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure that their plan addresses each natural hazard that can affect the jurisdiction. **Completing the matrix is not required**.

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each *applicable* ***hazard. An "N" for any element of any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.***

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)	A. Location		B. Extent		C. Previous Occurrences		D. Probability of Future Events	
	Yes	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S
Avalanche	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Erosion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Storm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Dam Failure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Drought	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Earthquake	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Expansive Soils	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Levee Failure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Flood	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hailstorm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hurricane	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Land Subsidence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Landslide	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Severe Winter Storm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tornado	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tsunami	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Volcano	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Wildfire	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Windstorm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

To check boxes, double click on the box and change the default value to "checked."

Legend:

§201.6(c)(2)(i) Profiling Hazards

A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (*i.e.*, geographic area affected) of each hazard addressed in the **new or updated** plan?

B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (*i.e.*, magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the **new or updated** plan?

C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each natural hazard addressed in the **new or updated** plan?

D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (*i.e.*, chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?

MATRIX B: ASSESSING VULNERABILITY

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure that the new or updated plan addresses each requirement. **Completing the matrix is not required**.

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each ***applicable*** *hazard. An "N" for any element of any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk. Note: Receiving an N in the shaded columns will not preclude the plan from passing.*

To check boxes, double click on the box and change the default value to "checked."

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)	§201.6(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability: Overview	A. Overall Summary Description of Vulnerability		B. Hazard Impact		§201.6(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures	A. Types and Number of Existing Structures in Hazard Area (Estimate)		B. Types and Number of Future Structures in Hazard Area (Estimate)		§201.6(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses	A. Loss Estimate		B. Methodology	
	Yes		N	S	N	S		N	S	N	S		N	S	N	S
Avalanche	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Erosion	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Storm	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Dam Failure	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Drought	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Earthquake	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Expansive Soils	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Levee Failure	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Flood	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Hailstorm	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Hurricane	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Land Subsidence	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Landslide	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Severe Winter Storm	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Tornado	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Tsunami	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Volcano	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Wildfire	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Windstorm	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐

Legend:

§201.6(c)(2)(ii) Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

A. Does the **new or updated** plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?

B. Does the **new or updated** plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?

§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A) Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

A. Does the **new or updated** plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?

B. Does the **new or updated** plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?

§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B) Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

A. Does the **new or updated** plan estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?

B. Does the **new or updated** plan describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?

MATRIX C: IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF MITIGATION ACTIONS

This matrix can assist FEMA and the State in scoring each hazard. Local jurisdictions may find the matrix useful to ensure consideration of a range of actions for each hazard. **Completing the matrix is not required.**

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

Note: First, check which hazards are identified in requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i). Then, place a checkmark in either the N or S box for each ***applicable*** *hazard. An "N" for any identified hazard will result in a "Needs Improvement" score for this requirement. List the hazard and its related shortcoming in the comments section of the Plan Review Crosswalk.*

Hazard Type	Hazards Identified Per Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)	A. Comprehensive Range of Actions and Projects	
	Yes	N	S
Avalanche	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Erosion	☐	☐	☐
Coastal Storm	☐	☐	☐
Dam Failure	☐	☐	☐
Drought	☐	☐	☐
Earthquake	☐	☐	☐
Expansive Soils	☐	☐	☐
Levee Failure	☐	☐	☐
Flood	☐	☐	☐
Hailstorm	☐	☐	☐
Hurricane	☐	☐	☐
Land Subsidence	☐	☐	☐
Landslide	☐	☐	☐
Severe Winter Storm	☐	☐	☐
Tornado	☐	☐	☐
Tsunami	☐	☐	☐
Volcano	☐	☐	☐
Wildfire	☐	☐	☐
Windstorm	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐
Other _____	☐	☐	☐

To check boxes, double click on the box and change the default value to "checked."

Legend:
§201.6(c)(3)(ii) Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions
A. Does the **new or updated** plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?