

## REGION IX LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

The *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool* demonstrates how the Local Mitigation Plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR §201.6 and offers states and FEMA mitigation planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the community.

- The **Regulation Checklist** provides a summary of FEMA's evaluation of whether the plan has addressed all requirements.
- The **Plan Assessment** identifies the plan's strengths as well as documents areas for future improvement. This section also includes a list of resources for implementation of the plan.
- The **Multi-Jurisdiction Summary Sheet** is a **mandatory** worksheet that is used to document which jurisdictions have participated in the planning process and are eligible to adopt the plan.
- The **Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Matrix** is a tool for plan reviewers to identify if all components of Element B are met.

<b>Jurisdiction:</b> Sonoma County, CA	<b>Title of Plan:</b> Sonoma County Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update	<b>Date of Plan:</b> August 2021
<b>Local Point of Contact:</b> Lisa Hulette	<b>Address:</b> 2550 Ventura Ave Santa Rosa, CA 95403	
<b>Title:</b> Grants Manager		
<b>Agency:</b> Permit Sonoma		
<b>Phone Number:</b> 707.565.3709	<b>E-Mail:</b> <a href="mailto:Lisa.Hulette@sonoma-county.org">Lisa.Hulette@sonoma-county.org</a>	

<b>State Reviewer:</b> Karen McCready-Hoover Ana Miscolta Phillip J. Labra	<b>Title:</b> Emergency Services Coordinator Emergency Services Coordinator Sr. Emergency Services Coordinator	<b>Date:</b> September 1, 2021
<b>Date Received at State Agency</b>	August 6, 2021	
<b>Plan Not Approved</b>		
<b>Plan Approved/Sent to FEMA</b>	September 10, 2021	

<b>FEMA Reviewer:</b> Xing Liu JoAnn Scordino John Powderly	<b>Title:</b> Community Planners	<b>Date:</b> September 10, 2021
<b>Date Received in FEMA Region IX</b>	September 10, 2021	
<b>Plan Not Approved</b>		
<b>Plan Approvable Pending Adoption</b>	September 27, 2021	
<b>Plan Approved</b>	October 7, 2021	

## SECTION 1: REGULATION CHECKLIST

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The Regulation Checklist must be completed by FEMA. The purpose of the Checklist is to identify the location of relevant or applicable content in the plan by element/sub-element and to determine if each requirement has been 'Met' or 'Not Met.' The 'Required Revisions' summary at the bottom of each element must be completed by FEMA to provide a clear explanation of the revisions that are required for plan approval. Required revisions must be explained for each plan sub-element that is 'Not Met.' Sub-elements should be referenced in each summary by using the appropriate numbers (A1, B3, etc.), where applicable. Requirements for each Element and sub-element are described in detail in the *Local Plan Review Guide* in Section 4, Regulation Checklist.

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
<b>ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS</b>				
A1. Does the plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(1))	a. Does the plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared (with a narrative description, meeting minutes, sign-in sheets, or another method)?	Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 3, Pages 3-1 to 3-13, and Appendix A.	X	
	b. Does the plan list the jurisdiction(s) participating in the plan that are seeking approval?	Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 3, section 3.4, Table 3-1, page 3-2. See also, Volume 2 Introduction	X	
	c. Does the plan identify who represented each jurisdiction? (At a minimum, it must identify the jurisdiction represented and the person's position or title and agency within the jurisdiction.)	See Each Jurisdictional Annex (Chapters 1-14, section x.1 of each chapter) In volume 2.	X	

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
A2. Does the plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as other interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement §201.6(b)(2))	a. Does the plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local, and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?	See volume 1, Chapter 3, section 3.7, Page 3-3.	X	
	b. Does the plan identify how the stakeholders were invited to participate in the process?	See Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 3, sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7, pages 3-1 to 3-5.	X	
A3. Does the plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1))		Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 3, section 3.9, pages 3-6 to 3-13, and appendix A.	X	
A4. Does the plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))		See Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 3, section 3.8, and Chapter 5 in its entirety. Also, Volume 2 of the plan includes a core capability assessment for each planning partner that looks at the local capabilities under this category.	X	
A5. Is there discussion of how the community(ies) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii))		See Volume 1, Part 3, Chapter 22, section 22.3.7, page 22-6	X	
A6. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a 5-year cycle)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i))	a. Does the plan identify how, when, and by whom the plan will be <b>monitored</b> (how will implementation be tracked) over time?	See Volume 1, Part 3, Chapter 22, section 22.3, and table 22-1	X	
	b. Does the plan identify how, when, and by whom the plan will be <b>evaluated</b> (assessing the effectiveness of the plan at achieving stated purpose and goals) over time?	See Volume 1, Part 3, Chapter 22, section 22.3, and table 22-1	X	
	c. Does the plan identify how, when, and by whom the plan will be <b>updated</b> during the 5-year cycle?	See Volume 1, Part 3, Chapter 22, section 22.3, and table 22-1	X	

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
<b>ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>				
<b>ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT</b>				
(Reviewer: See Section 4 for assistance with Element B)				
B1. Does the plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all-natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction(s)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))	a. Does the plan include a general <b>description</b> of all-natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction?	See Volume 1, Part 2 in its entirety, Chapters 6 to 18	X	
	b. Does the plan provide rationale for the omission of any natural hazards that are commonly recognized to affect the jurisdiction(s) in the planning area?	Volume 1, Part 2, Chapter 6 in its entirety.	X	
	c. Does the plan include a description of the <b>location</b> for all-natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction?	Each hazard profile in Part 2 of Volume 1 includes mapping of extent and location of each hazard profile. See section x.2.2 of Chapters 7 to 15.	X	
	d. Does the plan include a description of the <b>extent</b> for all-natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction?	For this planning effort “extent” has been defined as the location, frequency, severity, warning time, and secondary hazards that can be caused by each hazard of concern. Each hazard profile provided in Part 2; Chapters 7 to 15 has applied this approach to defining the “extent” of each hazard.	X	
B2. Does the plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))	a. Does the plan include information on <b>previous occurrences</b> of hazard events for each jurisdiction?	Each hazard profile includes a discussion on past events. See section x.2.1 of chapters 7 to 15.	X	
	b. Does the plan include information on the <b>probability</b> of future hazard events for each jurisdiction?	Each hazard profile includes a discussion on the frequency of each hazard. See section x.2.3 of chapters 7 to 15.	X	
B3. Is there a description of each identified hazard’s impact on the community as well as an overall summary of the community’s vulnerability for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))	a. Is there a description of each hazard’s <b>impacts</b> on each jurisdiction (what happens to structures, infrastructure, people, environment, etc.)?	For this plan “impacts” are measured by the exposure of general building stock and critical facilities/infrastructure to each hazard of concern as well as the vulnerability of what is exposed. See Part 2, sections x.3 for exposure and x.4 for vulnerability, of Chapters 7 to 15 for each hazard of concern.	X	

<b>1. REGULATION CHECKLIST</b>		<b>Location in Plan</b> (section and/or page number)	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)</b>				
	b. Is there a description of each identified hazard's overall <b>vulnerability</b> (structures, systems, populations, or other community assets defined by the community that are identified as being susceptible to damage and loss from hazard events) for each jurisdiction?	Part 2, Section x.4 of Chapters 8 to 17 Appendix D	X	
B4. Does the plan address NFIP insured structures within the jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))		Volume 1, Part 2, Chapter 10, section 10.2.1, pages 10-7 to 10-8.	X	
<b>ELEMENT B: REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>				
<b>ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY</b>				
C1. Does the plan document each jurisdiction's existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3))	a. Does the plan document each jurisdiction's existing authorities, policies, programs and resources?	Volume 2, Chapters 1-14 All jurisdiction specific components of the plan are housed in Volume 2. Each planning partner has a jurisdiction specific chapter in volume 2. Each chapter includes a core capability assessment for each jurisdiction. Refer to sections x.4, table's x-3, x-4, x-5, x-6, x-7, x-8, x-9 and x-10 for municipalities and section x.2 tables x.2, x.3, x.4, x.5 for special purpose districts of each chapter in volume 2.	X	
	b. Does the plan document each jurisdiction's ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs?	Volume 2, Chapters 1 to 14.	X	
C2. Does the plan address each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))		Volume 2, Chapters 1 to 5, Table x-8 of each chapter. Also, please note that each NFIP participating jurisdiction has identified a mitigation action for the maintenance of compliance under the NFIP.	X	

<b>1. REGULATION CHECKLIST</b>		<b>Location in Plan</b> (section and/or page number)	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)</b>				
C3. Does the plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))		Volume 1, Part 3, Chapter 19 in its entirety.	X	
C4. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))	a. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range (different alternatives) of specific mitigation actions and projects to reduce the impacts from hazards?	A catalog of mitigation best management practices by scale was utilized by the Planning Partnership to inform and frame action. See part 3, Chapter 20 in its entirety. Also, once the action plan was completed and prioritized, each action was categorized under 8 mitigation categories by all planning partners. See Volume 2, Table x-16 of Chapters 1 to 14.	X	
	b. Does the plan identify mitigation actions for every hazard posing a threat to each participating jurisdiction?	Yes. See Volume 2, Chapters 1 to 14.	X	
	c. Do the identified mitigation actions and projects have an emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure?	Yes. See Volume 2, Chapters 1 to 14. See table x-14 of each chapter.	X	
C5. Does the plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including cost benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii))	a. Does the plan explain how the mitigation actions and projects will be prioritized (including cost benefit review)?	Yes. See Volume 1, Chapter 21, section 21.2 and Volume 2, introduction.	X	
	b. Does the plan identify the position, office, department, or agency responsible for implementing and administering the action/project, potential funding sources and expected timeframes for completion?	Yes. See Volume 2, Chapters 1 to 14. See table x-14 of each chapter.	X	
C6. Does the plan describe a process by which local governments will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or	a. Does the plan identify the local planning mechanisms where hazard mitigation information and/or actions may be incorporated?	See Volume 1, Part 3, Chapter 22, section 22.3.4. Also, the core capability assessment (Chapters 1 -14 of Volume 2) identifies "integration opportunities" for each legal/regulatory capability assessed.	X	

<b>1. REGULATION CHECKLIST</b>		<b>Location in Plan</b> (section and/or page number)	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)</b>				
capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii))	b. Does the plan describe the community's process to integrate the data, information, and hazard mitigation goals and actions into other planning mechanisms?	See Volume 1, Part 3, Chapter 22, section 22.3.4	X	
	c. The updated plan must explain how the jurisdiction(s) incorporated the mitigation plan, when appropriate, into other planning mechanisms as a demonstration of progress in local hazard mitigation efforts.	Yes. See Volume 2, Chapters 1 to 14, section x.5.1 of each chapter.	X	
<b>ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>				
<b>ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION</b> (Applicable to plan updates only)				
D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Volume 1, part 1, Chapter 2, section 2.2.1. Additionally, each municipal planning partner was asked to review their permit history for the performance period of the prior plan. See table x-2 of chapters 1 to 5 of volume 2. See also the jurisdictional annex template instruction included in appendix C of volume 2 that shows how each planning partner was directed in the development of their action plan.		X	
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Each planning partner was asked to review and comment on the status of all prior actions. See section x.8 or x.9 of each chapter in volume 2. See also the jurisdictional annex template instruction included in appendix C of volume 2 that shows how each planning partner was directed in the development of their action plan.		X	

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Each action identified for this plan was prioritized according to the methodology outlined in the introduction section of volume 2. This prioritization methodology was completely different from that utilized for the prior plan update. Since each planning partner was asked to review all prior actions, any action that was carried over to this plan from the prior plan had the opportunity to have its priority reviewed and if necessary, changed. So therefore, every action in this plan, whether new or carried over from the prior plan was prioritized as described in the introduction section of volume 2.	X		
Vol 1, Section 2.1, Executive Summary, Table ES-1				
<b>ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>				
<b>ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION</b>				
E1. Does the plan include documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	Formal adoption records have been received by FEMA.	X		
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	To be provided following APA.			X
<b>ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>				
<b>ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS</b> (Optional for State Reviewers only; not to be completed by FEMA)				
F1.	N/A			
F2.	N/A			



1. REGULATION CHECKLIST	Location in Plan	Met	Not
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)	(section and/or page number)		Met
<b><u>ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u></b>			

## **SECTION 2:**

### **PLAN ASSESSMENT**

#### **A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement**

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas where these could be improved beyond minimum requirements.

##### **Element A: Planning Process**

###### **Strengths:**

- 1) The planning process employed a variety of creative tools and resources (such as the community survey and the Story Map and virtual public outreach meeting) to engage the wider community and solicit input.
- 2) The community profile included meaningful discussions of vulnerabilities within the demographics of the planning area and provides a valuable connection to the vulnerability assessment in the risk assessment portion of the plan.
- 3) The jurisdiction does well in involving various programs and divisions within the jurisdiction during the update for this plan. And, they provided an array of opportunities for the participating jurisdictions, public, and external stakeholders to participate and provide feedback.

###### **Opportunities for Improvement:**

- 1) To address jurisdiction-specific vulnerabilities for special districts, try to build a stronger tie-in between the exposure analysis and the district-owned assets so that the vulnerabilities to these assets are better supported by data.
- 2) For the majority of the special district, FEMA recommends you have a larger planning team for the next update. This would allow for wider participation of knowledgeable persons from key departments within your organization.

##### **Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment**

###### **Strengths:**

- 1) Not only did the plan do a solid job of describing and profiling hazards and analyzing the intersection of community assets and hazards, it went on to provide an excellent summary of the issues specific to each hazard within the planning area, which informs subsequently proposed mitigation actions.
- 2) Vulnerable community assets and populations were placed front and center in the risk and vulnerability assessment and analyzed/categorized thoroughly for the planning area.
- 3) The plan provides an extensive list of critical facilities and assets in Volumes 1, as well as within Volume 2 within the annexes.
- 4) The plan provides concise and clear tables for capability assessment, hazard risk rating and status of current and past mitigation actions.

**Opportunities for Improvement:**

- 1) Even though the plan provides a thorough account of the repetitive loss history in Sonoma County, it could go further into describing the home elevation mitigation projects that have been taking place along the Russian River over the past decade. These projects have gone a long way towards reducing risk to repetitive loss properties in the County and should be recognized as a mitigation success.
- 2) Although speed of onset is one way to address extent for severe weather, the plan would be greatly strengthened by adding information about baseline temperatures for extreme heat, and the NWS Heat Index. It would also be helpful to add some additional narrative about extent for storms.
- 3) One way that hail can be measured for extent is by the size of the pellet. The larger the hail size is, the more destructive it can be and this can be taken into consideration when developing mitigation actions for hail. The National Weather Service provides a hail size table at <https://www.weather.gov/boi/hailsize>.
- 4) Consider what the average high heat temperature for a planning area, and then ten degrees higher can be considered extreme heat. Also consider including a heat index like the one by the National Weather Service at [https://www.weather.gov/arx/heat\\_index](https://www.weather.gov/arx/heat_index)

**Element C: Mitigation Strategy****Strengths:**

- 1) In addition to the common areas of capabilities that LHMPs typically look into capturing, this plan also evaluates each jurisdiction's adaptive capabilities (ability to adapt to future conditions) as well as participation in other resilience programs (Firewise, Storm Ready, etc.)
- 2) It is such a brilliant idea to turn opportunities to expand mitigation capabilities into mitigation actions- this helps with local mitigation capacity building and is something that you can use to evaluate progress with.
- 3) Turning the Story Map into an implemented mitigation action was a creative way to leverage the planning process to improve upon existing community mitigation awareness and capabilities.

**Opportunities for Improvement:**

- 1) While the plan does a good job of listing the local plans that the LHMP has been integrated with, in future updates, consider providing a bit more detail on what planning elements were included in the integration effort for each jurisdiction.
- 2) Timbercove Fire Protection District- Have your action items be more mitigation driven and/or tie the preparedness, response and recovery actions to mitigation driven purposes.
- 3) It would be helpful to provide a more explicit narrative about expansion for capabilities that acknowledges that jurisdictions considered all four categories and, where they decided they did not have the ability to expand, provide an explanation.

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

### Strengths:

1) The provides a great summary of the status of the previous plan's mitigation actions. The table format was a good choice as the information is clearly laid out. Furthermore, it provided a reflection on why actions were dropped, completed, or carried through to the new plan.

### Opportunities for Improvement:

- 1) Please note that in the next plan update, all participating jurisdictions, including the jurisdictions of the 2005 ABAG regional hazard mitigation plan will be required to provide updates and reflect progress in local mitigation efforts stated in this plan, as required by Element D2 (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)).
- 2) While development and growth trends were adequately described for each participating jurisdiction, in future plan updates please invest a little more in a discussion of whether these trends increase or decrease a jurisdiction's vulnerability to specific hazards.
- 3) In future plan updates, please consider addressing changes in jurisdictional priorities in a more explicit way.

## B. Resources for Implementing and Updating Your Approved Plan

This resource section is organized into three categories:

- 1) Guidance and Resources
- 2) Training Topics and Courses
- 3) Funding Sources

### Guidance and Resources

Local Mitigation Planning Handbook

<https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/31598>

Beyond the Basics

<http://mitigationguide.org/>

Mitigation Ideas

<https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/30627>

Plan Integration: Linking Local Planning Efforts

<https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/108893>

Integrating Disaster Data into Hazard Mitigation Planning

<https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/103486>

Integrating Historic Property and Cultural Resource Considerations into Hazard Mitigation Planning

<https://www.fema.gov/ar/media-library/assets/documents/4317>

Community Rating System User Manual

<https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/8768>

U.S. Climate Resilient Toolkit

<https://toolkit.climate.gov/>

## 2014 National Climate Assessment

<http://nca2014.globalchange.gov/>

## Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation

[http://ipcc-wg2.gov/SREX/images/uploads/SREX-All\\_FINAL.pdf](http://ipcc-wg2.gov/SREX/images/uploads/SREX-All_FINAL.pdf)

## FY15 Hazard Mitigation Assistance Unified Guidance

<https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/103279>

## Climate Resilient Mitigation Activities for Hazard Mitigation Assistance

<https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/110202>

### **Training**

More information at <https://training.fema.gov/emi.aspx> or through your State Training Officer

### **Mitigation Planning**

IS-318 Mitigation Planning for Local and Tribal Communities

<https://training.fema.gov/is/courseoverview.aspx?code=is-318>

IS-393 Introduction to Hazard Mitigation

<https://training.fema.gov/is/courseoverview.aspx?code=is-393.a>

G-318 Preparing and Reviewing Local Plans

G-393 Mitigation for Emergency Managers

### **Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) Grant Programs**

IS-212.b Introduction to Unified HMA

<http://www.training.fema.gov/is/courseoverview.aspx?code=IS-212.b>

IS-277 Benefit Cost Analysis Entry Level

<http://www.training.fema.gov/is/courseoverview.aspx?code=IS-277>

E-212 HMA: Developing Quality Application Elements

E-213 HMA: Application Review and Evaluation

E-214 HMA: Project Implementation and Programmatic Closeout

E-276 Benefit-Cost Analysis Entry Level

### **GIS and Hazus-MH**

IS-922 Application of GIS for Emergency Management

<http://www.training.fema.gov/is/courseoverview.aspx?code=IS-922>

E-190 ArcGIS for Emergency Managers

E-296 Application of Hazus-MH for Risk Assessment

E-313 Basic Hazus-MH

### **Floodplain Management**

E-273 Managing Floodplain Development through the NFIP

E-278 National Flood Insurance Program/ Community Rating System

### **Potential Funding Sources**

#### **Hazard Mitigation Grant Program**

POC: FEMA Region IX and State Hazard Mitigation Officer

Website: <https://www.fema.gov/hazard-mitigation-grant-program>

#### **Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program**

POC: FEMA Region IX and State Hazard Mitigation Officer

Website: <https://www.fema.gov/pre-disaster-mitigation-grant-program>

Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program

POC: FEMA Region IX and State Hazard Mitigation Officer

Website: <https://www.fema.gov/flood-mitigation-assistance-grant-program>

Emergency Management Performance Grant Program

POC: FEMA Region IX

Website: <https://www.fema.gov/emergency-management-performance-grant-program>

### SECTION 3: MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL SUMMARY SHEET

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For multi-jurisdictional plans, this summary sheet must be completed by listing each participating jurisdiction that is eligible to adopt the plan.

MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET					
#	Jurisdiction Name	Jurisdiction Type	Eligible to Adopt the Plan?	Plan POC	Email
1	Sonoma County	County	Yes	Lisa Hulette	Lisa.Hulette@sonoma-county.org
2	Cotati	City	Yes	Katie Duran	<a href="mailto:kduran@cotaticity.org">kduran@cotaticity.org</a>
3	Santa Rosa	City	Yes	Shari Meads	<a href="mailto:smeads@srcity.org">smeads@srcity.org</a>
4	Sonoma	City	Yes	Dave Jeffries	<a href="mailto:dave@jeffriespsc.com">dave@jeffriespsc.com</a>
5	Windsor	Town	Yes	Kimberly Jordan	<a href="mailto:kjordan@townofwindsor.com">kjordan@townofwindsor.com</a>
6	CLOVERDALE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	District	Yes	Jason Jenkins	<a href="mailto:jenkins@cloverdalefire.org">jenkins@cloverdalefire.org</a>
7	North Sonoma Coast Fire Protection District	District	Yes	Susie Gilley	<a href="mailto:sgilley@tsra.org">sgilley@tsra.org</a>
8	Northern Sonoma County Fire Protection District	District	Yes	Marshall Turbeville	<a href="mailto:mturbeville@nosocofire.com">mturbeville@nosocofire.com</a>
9	Rancho Adobe Fire Protection District	District	Yes	Andy Taylor	<a href="mailto:ataylor@rafd.org">ataylor@rafd.org</a>
10	Sonoma Valley Fire District	District	Yes	Trevor Smith	<a href="mailto:trevors@svfra.org">trevors@svfra.org</a>
11	TIMBER COVE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	District	Yes	Sharon Lynn	<a href="mailto:tcfpd4500a@gmail.com">tcfpd4500a@gmail.com</a>
12	Gold Ridge RCD	District	Yes	Brittany Jensen	<a href="mailto:brittany@goldridgercd.org">brittany@goldridgercd.org</a>
13	Sonoma RCD	District	Yes	Valerie Quinto	<a href="mailto:vminton@sonomarc.org">vminton@sonomarc.org</a>
14	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation District	District	Yes	Sheri Emerson	<a href="mailto:sher.emerson@sonoma-county.org">sher.emerson@sonoma-county.org</a>
15					
16					
17					
18					

#### SECTION 4:

#### HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX (*OPTIONAL*)

---

**INSTRUCTIONS:** This matrix can be used by the plan reviewer to help identify if all of the components of Element B have been met. List out natural hazard names that are identified in the plan in the column labeled “Hazards” and put a “Y” or “N” for each component of Element B.