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What is Plan Integration?

- A two-way exchange of information between hazard mitigation plans (state and local) and other community plans.
- Specific to your community and depends on the hazards and vulnerability of your built environment to those hazards.
- Blending your community’s plans, policies, codes and programs that guide development and the roles of people and government in implementing these capabilities.
Plan Integration: Linking Local Planning Efforts

- Document completed in December 2014
  - Part 1- Integration of Hazard Mitigation Principles into other Local Planning Mechanisms
  - Part 2- Integration of Hazard Mitigation Principles into Comprehensive Plan elements
  - Part 3- Integration Across Agencies
Plan Integration Document Icons

- **Instructions** to guide the reader through a step-by-step process on how to perform Plan Integration.

- **Examples** show how other communities have performed plan integration. These examples can be considered as best practices in Plan Integration.

- **Illustrations** are provided to assist in developing sections of the Plan Integration document. The language provided may be expanded, deleted, or modified as necessary to fit your community’s situation and requirements.
Integration Questions
Land Use

- Does the future land use plan identify adequate space for projected future growth outside of these high hazard areas?

- Does the plan include policies to restrict the density of new development in high hazard areas or guide new development away from high-hazard areas? Does the plan include policies to relocate vulnerable existing development to less vulnerable areas?

- Does your plan include policies for existing structures and facilities to be strengthened, elevated, or relocated during the redevelopment process?

- Are there any areas in the land use plan where a proposed rezoning would put more people at risk (for example, by allowing higher-density development in the 100-year floodplain)?
Integration Questions
Transportation and Infrastructure

- Is the transportation network developed in a manner that provides redundancy (i.e. alternate routes) if certain key nodes or routes is affected by disaster?

- Are there policies in place to protect transportation facilities such as airports, etc. from hazard events and to locate them outside of high hazard areas?

- Are there any public transit stations/lines and highways in close proximity to flood prone areas?
Integration Questions
Emergency Management

- Has your community adopted an evacuation and shelter plan to deal with emergencies from natural hazards?

- Does your EOP show major evacuation routes that are prone to flooding?

- Has your community prepared a post-disaster redevelopment plan (PDRP) that includes policies reduce the exposure of human life and public and private property to natural hazards after a disaster?

- Does the PDRP include policies to address: short-term repair, clean-up actions needed to protect public health, safety and long-term repair and redevelopment activities; relocation, or structural retrofitting of damaged infrastructure; limiting redevelopment in areas of repeated damage; incorporation of hazard mitigation policies into the short- and long term recovery process?
Integration Questions
Environment and Open Space

- Is there a policy to utilize land that is otherwise unsuitable for development (such as in the floodplain, steep slopes) for recreational purposes thereby lowering the community’s risk?

- Are there policies to encourage development of waterfront areas for recreational purposes to serve as tourist attractions and provide an economic benefit to the community on land prone to hazards?

- Do environmental policies maintain and restore protective ecosystems and provide incentives to development that is located outside protective ecosystems?

- Are the hazard vulnerability implications of land development considered on a regional (or watershed) basis?
Integration Questions
Plan Implementation

- Are there policies to reduce vulnerability to wind, fire, extreme temperatures, etc. through regulating the location, size, design, type, construction methods, and materials used in structures?

- Does the zoning ordinance conform to the comprehensive plan in terms of discouraging development or redevelopment within natural hazard areas and contain natural hazard overlay zones that set conditions for land use within such zones?

- Does the CIP limit expenditures on projects that would encourage new development or additional development in vulnerable areas?

- Do infrastructure policies limit extension of existing infrastructure, facilities that would encourage development in vulnerable areas?
Case Study: Cecil County, MD

- Cecil County and its municipalities’ plans and ordinances were assessed for plan integration.

- County Plans and Ordinances
  - 2010 Cecil County Comprehensive Plan
  - 2011 Cecil County Zoning Ordinance
  - 2011 Cecil County Subdivision Regulations

- Municipal Plans and Ordinances
  - 2003 Elkton Downtown Master Plan
  - 2013 Elkton Floodplain Ordinance - Title 15 – Ordinance 5
  - 2013 Port Deposit Floodplain Management Ordinance
  - Port Deposit Comprehensive Plan Water Resource Element
  - Charlestown Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance
  - 2008 Charlestown Comprehensive Plan
  - 2013 Perryville Zoning Ordinance Forest Conversation Chapter 48
  - 2013 Perryville Zoning Ordinance Floodplain Management Chapter 46
Case Study Integration Example

2010 Cecil County Comprehensive Plan

- Add goal – “Encourage Cecil County to become a disaster resistant community that can be prepared for and thrive after a hazard event”.

- Add Objective: Ensure that all new development is resistant to current and future hazards

- Page 3-29 3. Add ‘land use policies require development or redevelopment according to existing codes to reduce impact from hazards. that discourage development or redevelopment within natural hazard areas – steep slopes, coastal areas, 100-year floodplain, wind speed zones over 100mph.

- Page 4-21 – Economic development policies and actions - No. 4 – Provide infrastructure including water sewer and roads to designated employment and mixed use areas with consideration of hazard areas.

- Include on page 5-22 – Other Policies - Develop an emergency access and evacuation network map that identifies the roadways in the county that must be maintained for emergency access and emergency evacuation in case of a major hazard event.
Case Study Integration Example

Charlestown Zoning Ordinance

- Section 175-22 Floodplain District needs to be rewritten based on the 2013 Charlestown Floodplain Ordinance. Also consider the Maryland Model Floodplain Ordinance.

2003 Elkton Downtown Master Plan

- Develop a section on Safety in the Master Plan in 6.9 - Implementing the Master Plan to contain the following:
  - Road systems adequate for evacuation, notification
  - Maintenance of bridges into downtown
  - Historic sites within floodplain – Elk Landing
  - Union Hospital
  - Flooding of Elk Creek
  - Proper siting and design requirements with hazards in mind for redevelopment sites
  - Development of infrastructure – roads, bridges, open spaces and new development with safety in mind
Case Study Lessons Learned

- Local involvement and coordination
  - Tasked with bringing all parties to the table
    - County Planning and Zoning, County Permits and Inspections, County GIS, County DPW, Health Department, Environmental Health Division, Town Municipal Planners, Emergency Managers, Politicians

- Response to Integration
  - County Departments: “We are already integrating, aren’t we?”
  - Local: In agreement, without resources
  - Commonalities: Political restraints, shared resources
Case Study Lessons Learned

- **Workshop Dynamics**
  - Conveying the importance of attendance
  - Participants from various agencies at the same table, for first time meeting
  - Removing defensive posture - open mind for improvement
  - Dialogue between municipalities
  - Identifying “in-house” resources to help with revisions

- **Steps Towards Implementation**
  - Adjusting current plans and ordinances to address future needs and break from past trends (Charlestown and Port Deposit)
  - Impact of public hearings and political opinion
  - Raise awareness of how to address the impact of hazards through the guidance of plans – a continual work in progress
Local Challenges and Barriers

- Lack of support from the local governing body to include hazard mitigation in the comprehensive plan and lack of coordination between the two processes.

- Local capacity limitations - staff volunteers.

- Various plan updates may follow different schedules (e.g. 5 years vs 20 years).

- Some states do not have a state agency to ensure local implementation or provide technical assistance to local governments.

- Lack of state-based funding for cities and counties to carry out their land use planning work and nonexistent budgets for planning staff.

- In small communities: city clerks, city treasurers, and city engineers serve as planners, who may not be experienced to develop plans.
Phase 2 of Plan Integration Pilot

- In 2016 and 2017, Region III Community Planners will be working with a local community in each state in the Region.
  - Different geographies, demographics, and planning mechanisms
  - Allows for a variety of plan integration efforts and ideally lessons learned for future projects
Phase 2 of Plan Integration Pilot

- First jurisdiction to go through integration will be District of Columbia
  - Provides a unique opportunity to integrate city, state, and Federal level planning mechanisms
  - Many different stakeholders and interests
  - DC’s State Hazard Mitigation Plan is currently being updated so this also provides a good opportunity to implement suggestions made
Phase 1 - Technical Workshops (Local)

- Create an awareness of plan integration and bring local jurisdictions on board with the concept of plan integration.

- Improve coordination between municipalities and counties and between counties and State.

- Incorporate input from the local plan integration workshops into the Maryland State Plan Integration element.

- Conduct one full-day workshop at five locations - northern, southern, eastern, western, and central parts of the state.

Phase 2 - State Technical Workshops (State)

- MAC Workshop 1- Promote intergovernmental coordination and identify synergies between various state agencies with respect to the following plans and ordinances.

- MAC Workshop 2- Focus on integration of hazard mitigation principles into the comprehensive plan and other state planning mechanisms.

- Deliverables:
  - Identify 5-7 items that the State is interested in pursuing, in light of hazard mitigation
  - Identify ways to achieve these recommendations
  - Identify departments for coordination and implementation
State of Maryland HMP 2016 Update Document Review

- Plan Maryland 2012 (MDP)
- Smart Growth and Priority Funding Areas (MDP)
- Maryland's Model Floodplain Ordinance (MDE)
- 2009 Maryland Stormwater Management Ordinance (MDE)
- 2012-2016 MEMA Strategic Plan (MEMA)
- Emergency Operations Plan (MEMA)
- Continuity of Operations Plan (MEMA)
- 2008 Climate Action Plan (DNR)
- Maryland's 2013 Plan to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MDE)
- Climate Change and Coast Smart Construction Executive Order (2012)
- Climate Change and Coast Smart Construction: Infrastructure and Design Guidelines (2014)
## Plan Integration Pilot

### Obstacles and Potential Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration Obstacles</th>
<th>Potential Integration Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsure of what hazard mitigation is and how it can be used</td>
<td>Education and outreach about how mitigation can be done on a daily basis using existing processes and creative funding sources, not just after a disaster occurs or by using FEMA funding. Demonstrate how mitigation projects can save the community money in the long run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding about how local government, businesses, and organizations can integrate hazard mitigation on a daily basis</td>
<td>Provide outreach and education to community stakeholders about what mitigation involves and how they can help reduce risk (e.g., stormwater management, construction using less or no pervious surface, including mitigation into routine maintenance or new construction using capital improvement funds).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (or not enough) funding, capacity, or resources to implement mitigation measures</td>
<td>Explore other ways to mitigate, other than land use measures (e.g., project identification, outreach and education for business and residents, interdepartmental coordination). It can also be a factor in redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard mitigation is not a priority because of other pressing needs</td>
<td>Provide sample business continuity plans and conduct workshops on the benefit of having a plan to reduce business interruption after a disaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misperception that hazard mitigation is the role of emergency management</td>
<td>Include businesses in the local hazard mitigation planning process and invite them to submit project ideas. Show how mitigation is a way to protect investments and reduce interruption to businesses after hazard events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough inter-community coordination or sharing of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community is fully built out and land use changes are not realistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of how mitigation can be integrated in community initiatives other than local comprehensive (land use) planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The possible perception that hazard mitigation is not business-friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits of Plan Integration

Enhances risk reduction through community-wide planning by:

- Improving inter-departmental coordination
- Developing specific recommendations for integration into community-wide plans
- Compiling existing plan measures to include in your Hazard Mitigation Plan to illustrate that integration is being performed and meeting the Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool requirement to integrate hazard mitigation, per Elements A4 and C6
  - A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Req. §201.6(b)(3))
  - 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 capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Req. §201.6(c)(4)(ii))
Q&A

plan mitigation hazard