

F. FEMA 2012 Recommendations for Improvements and 2017 Updates



FEMA

William L. Stubblefield
Commission President
Berkeley County
400 West Stephen Street, Suite 201
Martinsburg, West Virginia 25401

MAY 22 2012

Dear Mr. Stubblefield:

Berkeley County, West Virginia's adoption of the Region 9 Planning and Development Council Hazard Mitigation Plan dated April 12, 2012 has been received by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The plan is now approved with the receipt and acceptance of the formal adoption resolution. As such, Berkeley County is now eligible to apply for federal disaster assistance until the Region 9 Planning and Development Council Hazard Mitigation Plan expires on January 9, 2017.

We reviewed the plan based on the criteria contained in 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 201, as authorized by the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA2K). These criteria address the planning process, risk assessment (including hazard identification), mitigation strategy and plan maintenance process requirements.

The Region 9 Planning and Development Council Hazard Mitigation Plan received a "satisfactory" rating for all required criteria. However, the DMA2K also includes a provision to encourage communities to continuously strive to improve their plans and resulting mitigation actions. Therefore, the plan must be reviewed, revised if appropriate, and resubmitted for approval within five years of the initial approval date of January 9, 2012 in order to continue to be eligible for federal disaster assistance.

We encourage you to participate in the expansion and documentation of the plan's assessment and analysis of mitigation measures. We also encourage you to follow the schedule for regular evaluation, updating, and monitoring, and have enclosed a list of specific recommendations for improving the plan.

If you have questions, please contact Roger Jefferson, West Virginia State Hazard Mitigation Planner, at (304) 957-2572.

I commend you for your dedication demonstrated in preparing and adopting a strategy to reduce future disaster losses.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eugene K. Gruber", is written over a circular stamp or seal.

Eugene K. Gruber
Mitigation Division Director

Enclosure

cc: Timothy Keaton, West Virginia State Hazard Mitigation Officer

Recommendations for Improvements
Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
West Virginia - Region III

Berkley County West Virginia Hazard Mitigation Plan
PDC 9

1. Future plan updates should better identify the makeup of the planning committee. Identify changes of committee members and identify roles in the plan development.
2. Future plan updates might better capture if the original plan public participation efforts were successful. Did the planned public activities work, what has been changed to obtain more public participation? Have other changes been made; plan in library, fliers in Grocery stores, senior citizen center, etc.
4. Future plan updates should better describe how the jurisdiction reviewed and integrated information in the plan from existing plans, studies, reports, and technical documents
5. Dam inundation maps could be included in the updated plan.
7. If possible, longer intervals for event history for each hazard should be included in the plan. The longer the interval of previous events, the more accurate the probability of future events can be determined.
8. A more detailed summary of past hazard events for each hazard needs to be added; including dollar losses, number of buildings affected etc.
9. A better description of planned development in hazard areas needs to be included in the next plan update.
10. A more detailed description of the jurisdictions participation in the NFIP is needed. Items that could be included in the plan are for example: how the inspection on new construction occurs to ensure compliance with the floodplain ordinance, how residents are assisted in floodplain questions, how the jurisdictions review development plans to ensure compliance with the NFIP, how violations are dealt with in the jurisdictions.
11. A complete report on the progress in implementing mitigation actions needs to be included when the plan is updated.
12. The committee should consider developing specific mitigation actions for vulnerable structures, infrastructure and other facilities and include these potential mitigation actions in the next updated plan.
12. Data from the State of West Virginia all hazard mitigation plan should be included in the plan when it is updated next.

2017 Updates Addressing 2012 Recommendations

1. Section 3.1 and 3.2 describe the role of the steering committee and its members. It also addresses how the update process was structured (pg. 22-27).
2. Public participation efforts were seen as successful. The public survey received 129 total responses from the public and identified the most significant concerns within the community. There were also four articles published discussing the HMP in local newspapers and two radio discussions. The public was also invited to attend two of the HMP meetings. Invited stakeholders attended these meetings and gave their feedback. See Section 3.4 (pg. 30-31).
3. Section 5.2.1 (pg. 170-174) discusses the existing plans and planning documents reviewed during the HMP update. Some of these plans and documents are also individually cited in text throughout the HMP. Section 5.2.5 (pg. 178-179) describes how the HMP can be integrated into these plans, studies, and ordinances in future.
4. The data needed to produce dam inundation maps was not available during the development of the 2017 HMP. An effort to include these maps should be made during the 2022 HMP update. A map of dam locations and their corresponding hazard levels is included in Figure 4.3.15-2 (pg. 131).
5. An effort was made when the information was available to provide a history of previous disaster occurrences. This can be seen within the hazard profiles, Section 4.3 (pg. 43-160). Examples of this effort can be seen in Table 4.3.14-1 (pg. 125), Table 4.3.5-1 (pg. 75), and Table 4.3.14-1 (pg. 125).
6. A detailed summary of the magnitude of past hazard events was included when the information was available. This can be seen throughout Section 4.3 (pg. 43-160), and is also addressed in Section 4.4.3, (pg. 166-169).
7. Future development within hazard areas is addressed in Section 2.4 (pg. 18) and Section 4.4.4 (pg. 169). The HMP should be integrated into planning documents developed by Berkeley County, Morgan County, and municipalities that address future development.
8. A description of the NFIP within Berkeley and Morgan County can be seen as it relates to flooding hazard profile in Section 4.3.5 (pg. 79-81). The NFIP in regards to local mitigation capability can be seen in Section 5.2.1 (pg. 173-174).
9. A full review of the mitigation actions listed in the 2012 HMP was conducted. The current status of each action is detailed in Table 6.1-2 (pg. 183-187).
10. New mitigation actions were developed for the 2017 HMP, including some referring to mitigation for vulnerable structures or infrastructure. The Mitigation Action Plan can be seen in Section 6.4 (pg. 192-208).
11. The WV Statewide Standard HMP was used as a reference throughout the 2017 HMP. The WV Statewide Standard HMP is specifically referenced on page 53, page 84, and page 171.