AGENDA

<u>HAZARD MITIGATION COMMITTEE MEETING</u> <u>WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 10th 2025 AT 6:00 P.M.</u> TOWN BUILDING - 2 CASTLE VALLEY DR.

This meeting will be a hybrid meeting held electronically by Zoom and also in person at the anchor site the Town Building. If you have comments or concerns for the Committee please attend or email prior to the Meeting: townclerk@castlevalleyutah.com or call 259-9828 M-W 9AM-1PM. Thank you!

PLEASE NOTE: ** HOW TO JOIN THE ZOOM CONFERENCE CALL**

Meeting ID: 660 541 0108 Passcode: 84532

Option 1 Dial-in phone number (US): (253) 215-8782 follow prompts.

Option 2 Join the online meeting (must have computer speakers and microphone): https://zoom.us/j/6605410108?pwd=Q05sYm5qQ0lpNlY5TVp2bTU5VnZjQT09

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1. Open Public Comment

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from:

October 9th 2024

August 26th, 2025

November 12th, 2025

3. Discussion and possible action: Completion of the Plan Review Tool.

ADJOURNMENT

PRE-HAZARD MITIGATION COMMITTEE MEETING

DRAFT MINUTES

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 9th 2024 AT 6:00 P.M. TOWN BUILDING - 2 CASTLE VALLEY DR.

This meeting was a hybrid meeting held electronically by Zoom and also in person at the anchor site the Town Building.

Present the anchor site: Mayor Duncan, Dorje Honer, Egmont Honer, Pamela Gibson, Alice Drogin, Scott Crueger, Bob Lipman, Mary O'Brien, Linda Skogard, Bruce Keeler, Greg and Karen Nunn, Brook Williams.

On Zoom: Les Bolton, Bob O'Brien, Cora Philips, Colleen Thompson and Rich Carr.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

M Duncan called the Meeting to order at 6:00 PM, Buck did roll call

- 1. Open Public Comment: None
- 2. Forming the Hazard Committee for the 2025 Plan Update.

M Duncan explained the last update was in 2020. It is time to re-establish the Committee for the 2025 Plan. So far members are M Duncan, Les Bolton CV Emergency Manager, Dorje Honer Roads Manager and unfortunately several of the other potential member Ron Drake, Jeff Whitney Cora Phillips, Rand y Ward are not able to be here tonight.

- 3. Scheduling the 2025 Meeting Dates . We will need to get the official Committee together in order proceed and agreed on a monthly meeting night. So we will skip #3 Items.
- 4. Public Discussion on the 2024 Flood Events and future plans.

M Duncan explained that we will have to address more of the flooding issues in to the Hazard Mitigation Plan.

D Honer gave an over view of the flood repairs, basically getting all resident access to their homes, lots of work still needs to happen on the roads and drainages. Currently the Road Department is working on keeping road equipment running and the permitting processes and waivers to be able to work in flood prone drainages. This involves the Department of Water Rights, Bureau of Land Management, Army Corp of Engineers as well as private landowners. The culvert at Castle Creek and Castle Valley drive has sustained flood damage and will need to be replaced in the near future. The plan is to fix Shafer as a potential all season road so we can use that an alternate/ detour road for when the Castle creek culvert project occurs.

Castle Valley Drive drainages are priority. Greg Nunn talked about damages and drainage issues on lower Holyoak. Honer spoke that they will be removing silty material from flooded roads to get them back to stable road surfaces. Issues have come up

Mary O'Brien questioned how berms created by landowners will affect changes in flood flows and how the Town will address those, particularly on lower Pope. Honer stated he has been trying to check out all the new/ existing berms and so far none of them are detrimental. Discussion continued on berms on Pope and Holyoak that residents thought should be adjusted before more flooding. The Town is working to get town wide dirt moving permit process in place to be able to monitor drainage issues.

Mary O'Brien asked what the Town's long term plan is for flooding. M Duncan explained that is part of the Hazard Mitigation Planning process. Philips added that currently the State is doing Lidar flood mapping in several Counties, it may be several years before Grand County mapping and modeling is completed.

M Duncan added that after the floods the Town has been working with the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) to get grant funding. So far they have come out on fieldtrips and estimate the project could cost upwards of \$2.5 Million. If we do get an NRCS grant that would cover the engineering and some infrastructure protection/ armoring but not culverts. So for the Castle Creek culvert the Town would have to pay for the culvert and its construction/ installation as well as 25% of the armoring of the headwall. That project would be about all the Town could afford. We can use some in kind match but that still uses the Town Roads Budget funds. Repairs for other areas damaged by flooding could be used as a match so we don't want to work in those areas until we know if it is a potential match. NRCS pointed out on their various fieldtrips that the Town of our size and budget should not expect all of the roads to be open during a flood but to be able to open the roads after a flood event. Honer showed on Google Earth what drainages, culverts etc. that were included on the NRCS fieldtrips. The BLM will not do any flood mitigation work; the Town will need permits to do the work in the Castle and Placer Creek drainages on BLM land. The attendees were encouraged to look on Google Earth to compare changes in the drainages over time. Honer did explain that most of the 24"culverts around the Valley are inadequate and low water crossing would be a more efficient alternative.

When the Castle Creek Culvert project happens the Castle Valley Drive will be closed and Shafer will be the detour route, the Town will notify residents and services in advance and there may be some limits to the size and lengths of trucks.

There was further discussion on how little property tax money the Town actually receives compared to the County. M Duncan stated that we have to be realistic in a Town of 350 people come here not for the curb and gutter or the ease of life. She is expecting to raise property taxes in her next term to help pay for road work / repair expenses. Philips explained the way the State disaster declaration works in order the get emergency funds. The Town will be reviewing the National Flood Insurance Program once the Town is Lidar mapped/ modelled about 5-7 years out. R. O'Brien explained a Town representative should join Moab, Grand County and the BLM working with Headwaters Economics for help with engineering, design and grants for flood mitigation. Headwater Economics is currently working towards a fire wise plan for Grand County. Holland volunteered to be the Town's liaison.

Honer and Duncan agreed that the Town's major focus is keeping the roads passable for residents and planning for the possibilities of more intense flooding in the future. There was discussion on the new ordinance requiring permits for earth moving/ disturbance. This process will help the Town monitor potential flood mitigation work. Hazard Mitigation Committee will start work on the Plan update in January there will be monthly meetings and opportunities for input.

ADJOURNMENT

M Duncan adjourned the Meeting at 7:20PM

Approved:	Attested:
Jazmine Duncan, Mayor	Jocelyn Buck, Town Clerk
Committee Chair	Date:

HAZARD MITIGATION COMMITTEE MEETING DRAFT MINUTES

TUESDAY AUGUST 26th 2025 AT 6:00 P.M. TOWN BUILDING - 2 CASTLE VALLEY DR.

This meeting was a hybrid meeting held electronically by Zoom and also in person at the anchor site the Town Building.

Committee Members Present: Mayor Duncan, Dorje Honer, Ron Drake, Colleen Thompson and

Egmont Honer.

Members/ Officials on Zoom: None

Members Absent: None

Residents present at Anchor site: None

Residents on Zoom: 1-435-220-0979 unknown

M Duncan called the Meeting to order and called role at 6:00 PM.

1. Open Public Comment: None

2. Discussion and possible action: Review all Risk Assessments and Mitigation Strategies with the scales agreed upon in July. And add responsible entities.

The Committee reviewed all the Hazard Mitigation strategies and discussed at length and updated the scales. They added "less than" > and "greater than" < to the scale values. "Public support" was a much more explanatory and replaced "Political viability". The scale definitions were added after each strategy. i. e.

Scale:

Percentage of the Town population to benefit; 1= <25% 2=25% 3=50% 4=75% 5=100%

Potential Cost: 1= less than \$600 2= up to \$5000 3= \$5000-\$20,000 4= \$20,000-\$75,000 5= over \$100,000.00 grant(s) required.

Public Support: 1= 100% resistance 2=25% 3=50 % 4= 75% 5= 100% support/no resistance

Next they went through the Hazard Probability Analyses and filled in the entities/agencies responsible boxes.

- 3. Discussion and possible action: Divide up 2025 Recommended Priority "Action" Projects The Committee briefly reviewed the Priority Projects and discussed and updated the location, timeframe and costs boxes. Priority Project #1 was narrowed down to evacuation routes only D. Honer will work on that. The Committee decided to narrow down the projects so we have a better chance to get them completed in a specific timeframe. Egmont will work on #3 and #5.
- 4. Discuss timeline to get #3 works done and other Plan requirements.

Buck hoped to get these updates/ edits wrapped up by September 10th to send to Kemp to get his feedback by the next meeting at the end of September.

Attested:

Meeting adjourned at 8:09 PM

Approved:

Jazmine Duncan, Mayor	Jocelyn Buck, Town Clerk
Committee Chair	Date:

HAZARD MITIGATION COMMITTEE MEETING DRAFT MINUTES

WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 12th 2025 AT 6:00 P.M. TOWN BUILDING - 2 CASTLE VALLEY DR.

This meeting was a hybrid meeting held electronically by Zoom and also in person at the anchor site the Town Building.

Committee Members Present: Mayor Duncan,	Ron Drake, Collee	n Thompson and Egmont
--	-------------------	-----------------------

Honer.

Members/ Officials on Zoom: Dorje Honer

Members Absent: None

Residents present at Anchor site: Mike Carlyle

Residents on Zoom: None

M Duncan called the Meeting to order and called role at 6:00 PM.

1. Open Public Comment: None

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 8, 2025.

<u>Thompson moved to approve the Minute from October 8, 2025, D. Honer seconded motion passed</u> unanimously.

3. Discussion and possible action: Comments on latest Draft Plan.

Buck had updated the Plan from Kemp's comments. The Committee had a few small edits. M Duncan wanted added that Fire and Flood were probably the most likely of all the Town hazards and that is why there were more strategies and projects for those hazards. Several of the Priority Action Projects concerning communications and/or evacuations could be important for multiple hazards. Thompson wanted to add the Town website and audio recording to all information resources throughout the Plan. And Wi-Fi Calling was re-added to the Communication section.

4. Discussion and possible action: Adding a 2025 Priority Action Project.

Buck had added a Water Contamination Priority Project the Committee finished. It was decided as several of the Priority Action projects work for multiple hazards adding more projects were not necessary.

5 .Discussion and possible action: Plan Review Checklist

The Committee divided up the Review sections. The plan is next week to have the edits done and for Thompson to do formatting and correct the table of contents. That way the page numbers will be correct for the review tool. The Goal would be to get the Plan to the Committee for them to work on their sections at the end of next week. The Review tool work should be done by the beginning of December.

Element A: Planning Process- Dorje Honer

Element B: Risk Assessment - Colleen Thompson

Element C: Mitigation Strategy-Egmont Honer

Element E: Plan Update-Ron Drake

Meeting adjourned at 6:44 PM

Element F: Plan Adoption-Jazmine Duncan Element D: Plan Maintenance- Jocelyn Buck

Approved:	Attested

Jazmine Duncan, Mayor Committee Chair

Jocel	yn	Buck,	Town	Clerk
Date	:			

Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool

Cover Page

The Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool (PRT) demonstrates how the local mitigation plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR § 201.6 and offers states and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the local governments, including special districts.

- 1. The Multi-Jurisdictional Summary Sheet is a worksheet that is used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of the plan elements (Planning Process; Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Maintenance; Plan Update; and Plan Adoption).
- 2. The Plan Review Checklist summarizes FEMA's evaluation of whether the plan has addressed all requirements.

For greater clarification of the elements in the Plan Review Checklist, please see Section 4 of this guide. Definitions of the terms and phrases used in the PRT can be found in Appendix E of this guide.

	Plan Information
Jurisdiction(s)	Town of Castle Valley
Title of Plan	Castle Valley 2025 Hazard Mitigation Plan
New Plan or Update	Update
Single- or Multi-Jurisdiction	Single-jurisdiction
Date of Plan	12/15/2025
	Local Point of Contact
Title	Town Clerk
Agency	Town of Castle Valley
Address	2 Castle Valley Drive, Castle Valley. Utah 84532
Phone Number	435-259-9828
Email	townclerk@castlevalleyutah.com

	Additional Point of Contact
Title	Click or tap here to enter text.
Agency	Click or tap here to enter text.
Address	Click or tap here to enter text.
Phone Number	Click or tap here to enter text.
Email	Click or tap here to enter text.

	Review Information
	State Review
State Reviewer(s) and Title	Click or tap here to enter text.
State Review Date	Click or tap to enter a date.
	FEMA Review
FEMA Reviewer(s) and Title	Click or tap here to enter text.
Date Received in FEMA Region	Click or tap to enter a date.
Plan Not Approved	Click or tap to enter a date.
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption	Click or tap to enter a date.
Plan Approved	Click or tap to enter a date.

Multi-Jurisdictional Summary Sheet

In the boxes for each element, mark if the element is $\operatorname{met}(Y)$ or not $\operatorname{met}(N)$.

10	9	00	7	0	ъ	4	ω	2	Н	#
						***************************************			N/A	
	TATOLINA AND CONTRACTOR OF THE PERSON					***************************************		OCCUPANT DESCRIPTION		J
						***************************************		***************************************		risdicti
								00000000000000000000000000000000000000		Jurisdiction Name
						e anny (Anna de Propinsion de		Objection (OO) to the section of the		
						THE CONTRACT OF THE CONTRACT O		TO THE PARTY OF TH		A. Planning Process
						e de la constitución de la const	Property of the latest and the lates			B. Rísk Assessment
						Brisine and Protest and American				C. Mitigation Strategy
							V			D. Plan Maintenance
						The state of the s	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	The second secon		E. Plan Update
							and the second second second second			F. Plan Adoption
						фринфузургалиямий физический делигий де		- Opening order (opening order)		G. HHPD Requirements
radynisiaeio(čeisionáe						00-100-00000-0-100				H. State Requirements

Plan Review Checklist

The Plan Review Checklist is completed by FEMA. States and local governments are encouraged, but not required, to use the PRT as a checklist to ensure all requirements have been met prior to submitting the plan for review and approval. The purpose of the checklist is to identify the location of relevant or applicable content in the plan by element/sub-element and to determine if each requirement has been "met" or "not met." FEMA completes the "required revisions" summary at the bottom of each element to clearly explain the revisions that are required for plan approval. Required revisions must be explained for each plan sub-element that is "not met." Sub-elements in each summary should be referenced using the appropriate numbers (A1, B3, etc.), where applicable. Requirements for each element and sub-element are described in detail in Section 4: Local Plan Requirements of this guide.

Plan updates must include information from the current planning process.

If some elements of the plan do not require an update, due to minimal or no changes between updates, the plan must document the reasons for that.

Multi-jurisdictional elements must cover information unique to all participating jurisdictions.

Element A: Planning Process

Element A Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
A1. Does the plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(1))		
A1-a. Does the plan document how the plan was prepared, including the schedule or time frame and activities that made up the plan's development, as well as who was involved?	Pg.9-12	Met
A1-b. Does the plan list the jurisdiction(s) participating in the plan that seek approval, and describe how they participated in the planning process?	Pg 9-12 only Town of CV seeks approval	Met

Element A Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
A2. Does the plan document 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? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(b)(2))		
A2-a. Does the plan identify all stakeholders involved or given an opportunity to be involved in the planning process, and how each stakeholder was presented with this opportunity?	Pg. 10	Met
A3. Does the plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(b)(1))	and light to be to a	
A3-a. Does the plan document how the public was given the opportunity to be involved in the planning process and how their feedback was included in the plan?	Pg. 10	Met
A4. Does the plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(b)(3))		
A4-a. Does the plan document what existing plans, studies, reports and technical information were reviewed for the development of the plan, as well as how they were incorporated into the document?	Pg. 10	Met
ELEMENT A REQUIRED REVISIONS		
Required Revision: Click or tap here to enter text.		

Element B: Risk Assessment

Element B Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
B1. Does the plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction? Does the plan also include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(2)(i))		
B1-a. Does the plan describe all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction(s) in the planning area, and does it provide the rationale if omitting any natural hazards that are commonly recognized to affect the jurisdiction(s) in the planning area?	Overview p. 15. Details pp. 16, 23, 29, 34, 38, 42, 45, 49, 55, 59, 61.	Met
B1-b. Does the plan include information on the location of each identified hazard?	pp. 20, 27, 32, 36, 40, 43, 47, 52, 57, 60, 63.	Met
B1-c. Does the plan describe the extent for each identified hazard?	As "Potential magnitude (area involved)" pp. 20, 27, 32, 36, 40, 43, 47, 52, 57, 60, 62.	Met
B1-d. Does the plan include the history of previous hazard events for each identified hazard?	pp. 17, 24, 30, 34, 38, 42, 45, 49, 56, 59, 61.	Met
B1-e. Does the plan include the probability of future events for each identified hazard, including the type, location and range of anticipated intensities?	pp. 20, 27, 32, 36, 40, 43, 47, 52, 57, 60, 62.	Met
B1-f. For participating jurisdictions in a multi-jurisdictional plan, does the plan describe any hazards that are unique to and/or vary from those affecting the overall planning area?	n/a. Not multi- jurisdictional.	Met
B2. Does the plan include a summary of the jurisdiction's vulnerability and the impacts on the community from the identified hazards? Does this summary also address NFIP-insured structures that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(2)(ii))		
B2-a. Does the plan provide an overall summary of each jurisdiction's vulnerability to the identified hazards?	Summary p. 15. Resources/assets p. 13.	Met

Element B Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
B2-b. For each participating jurisdiction, does the plan describe the potential impacts of each of the identified hazards on each participating jurisdiction?	pp. 20, 27, 32, 36, 40, 43, 47, 52, 57, 60, 63.	Met
B2-c. Does the plan address NFIP-insured structures within each jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods?	n/a. No NFIP-insured structures.	Met
ELEMENT B REQUIRED REVISIONS		
Required Revision:		-44-

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

Click or tap here to enter text.

Element C Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
C1. Does the plan document each participant's existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3))		
C1-a. Does the plan describe how the existing capabilities of each participant are available to support the mitigation strategy? Does this include a discussion of the existing building codes and land use and development ordinances or regulations?	Resources Pg.6 Pg. 13-14	Met
C1-b. Does the plan describe each participant's ability to expand and improve the identified capabilities to achieve mitigation?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Not Met
C2. Does the plan address each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(ii))		
C2-a. Does the plan contain a narrative description or a table/list of their participation activities?	Pg. 24	Met

Element C Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
C3. Does the plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(i))		
C3-a. Does the plan include goals to reduce the risk from the hazards identified in the plan?	In each Hazard except Water Contamination	Met
C4. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(ii))		
C4-a. Does the plan include an analysis of a comprehensive range of actions/projects that each jurisdiction considered to reduce the impacts of hazards identified in the risk assessment?	Listed in each Hazard	Met
C4-b. Does the plan include one or more action(s) per jurisdiction for each of the hazards as identified within the plan's risk assessment?	Listed in each and priority projects	Met
C5. Does the plan contain an action plan that describes how	Pg.65-59	
the actions identified will be prioritized (including a cost- benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii))	Priority projects	
C5-a. Does the plan describe the criteria used for prioritizing actions?	Pg. 12	Met
C5-b. Does the plan provide the position, office, department or agency responsible for implementing/administrating the identified mitigation actions, as well as potential funding sources and expected time frame?	Each Hazard body Hazard Probability, Analysis priorities	Met
ELEMENT C REQUIRED REVISIONS		
Required Revision:		
Click or tap here to enter text.		

Element D: Plan Maintenance

Element D Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
D1. Is there discussion of how each community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(4)(iii))	PG 75	Met
D1-a. Does the plan describe how communities will continue to seek future public participation after the plan has been approved?	PG 75	Met
D2. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle)? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(4)(i))	PG 75	Met
D2-a. Does the plan describe the process that will be followed to track the progress/status of the mitigation actions identified within the Mitigation Strategy, along with when this process will occur and who will be responsible for the process?	PG 75	Met
D2-b. Does the plan describe the process that will be followed to evaluate the plan for effectiveness? This process must identify the criteria that will be used to evaluate the information in the plan, along with when this process will occur and who will be responsible.	PG 75	Met
D2-c. Does the plan describe the process that will be followed to update the plan, along with when this process will occur and who will be responsible for the process?	PG 75	Met
D3. Does the plan describe a process by which each community will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(4)(ii))		
D3-a. Does the plan describe the process the community will follow to integrate the ideas, information and strategy of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms?	PGs 65-69 Within each 2025 Action Projects – Objectives	Met
D3-b. Does the plan identify the planning mechanisms for each plan participant into which the ideas, information and strategy from the mitigation plan may be integrated?	PG 65-69	Met

Element D Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
D3-c. For multi-jurisdictional plans, does the plan describe each participant's individual process for integrating information from the mitigation strategy into their identified planning mechanisms?	N/A	Choose an item.
ELEMENT D REQUIRED REVISIONS		

Required Revision:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Element E: Plan Update

Element E Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
E1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(d)(3))	No	Not Met
E1-a. Does the plan describe the changes in development that have occurred in hazard-prone areas that have increased or decreased each community's vulnerability since the previous plan was approved?	No	Not Met
E2. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities and progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(d)(3))	Yes, PGs 65-69 PG 70-74	Met
E2-a. Does the plan describe how it was revised due to changes in community priorities?	Yes PG s 11,12	Met
E2-b. Does the plan include a status update for all mitigation actions identified in the previous mitigation plan?	PGs 70-74	Met
E2-c. Does the plan describe how jurisdictions integrated the mitigation plan, when appropriate, into other planning mechanisms?	PG 10 last paragraph	Met
ELEMENT E REQUIRED REVISIONS		

Required Revision:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Element F: Plan Adoption

Element F Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
F1. For single-jurisdictional plans, has the governing body of the jurisdiction formally adopted the plan to be eligible for certain FEMA assistance? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(5))	PG 12	Met
F1-a. Does the participant include documentation of adoption?	Pending	Choose an item.
F2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has the governing body of each jurisdiction officially adopted the plan to be eligible for certain FEMA assistance? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(c)(5))	N/A	
F2-a. Did each participant adopt the plan and provide documentation of that adoption?	N/A	Choose an item.
ELEMENT F REQUIRED REVISIONS		
Required Revision: Click or tap here to enter text.		

Element G: High Hazard Potential Dams (Optional)

HHPD Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
HHPD1. Did the plan describe the incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports and technical information for HHPDs?		
HHPD1-a. Does the plan describe how the local government worked with local dam owners and/or the state dam safety agency?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose an item.
HHPD1-b. Does the plan incorporate information shared by the state and/or local dam owners?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose an item.
HHPD2. Did the plan address HHPDs in the risk assessment?		
HHPD2-a. Does the plan describe the risks and vulnerabilities to and from HHPDs?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose an item.
HHPD2-b. Does the plan document the limitations and describe how to address deficiencies?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose an item.

HHPD Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
HHPD3. Did the plan include mitigation goals to reduce long- term vulnerabilities from HHPDs?		
HHPD3-a. Does the plan address how to reduce vulnerabilities to and from HHPDs as part of its own goals or with other long-term strategies?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose an item.
HHPD3-b. Does the plan link proposed actions to reducing long-term vulnerabilities that are consistent with its goals?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose an item.
HHPD4-a. Did the plan include actions that address HHPDs and prioritize mitigation actions to reduce vulnerabilities from HHPDs?		
HHPD4-a. Does the plan describe specific actions to address HHPDs?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose an item.
HHPD4-b. Does the plan describe the criteria used to prioritize actions related to HHPDs?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose an item.
HHPD4-c. Does the plan identify the position, office, department or agency responsible for implementing and administering the action to mitigate hazards to or from HHPDs?	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose an item.
HHPD Required Revisions		
Required Revision: Click or tap here to enter text.		and the second s

Element H: Additional State Requirements (Optional)

Element H Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
This space is for the State to include additional requirements.		
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose an item.

Plan Assessment

These comments can be used to help guide your annual/regularly scheduled updates and the next plan update.

Element A. Planning Process

Strengths

[insert comments]

Opportunities for Improvement

[insert comments]

Element B. Risk Assessment

Strengths

[insert comments]

Opportunities for Improvement

[insert comments]

Element C. Mitigation Strategy

Strengths

[insert comments]

Opportunities for Improvement

[insert comments]

Element D. Plan Maintenance

Strengths

[insert comments]

Opportunities for Improvement

[insert comments]

Element E. Plan Update

Strengths

[insert comments]

Opportunities for Improvement

[insert comments]

Element G. HHPD Requirements (Optional)

Strengths

[insert comments]

Opportunities for Improvement

[insert comments]

Element H. Additional State Requirements (Optional)

Strengths

[insert comments]

Opportunities for Improvement

[insert comments]