

# SECTION 10

## PLAN MAINTENANCE

This section discusses how the Wake County Mitigation Strategy and Mitigation Action Plan will be implemented and how the Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan will be evaluated and enhanced over time. This section also discusses how the public will continue to be involved in a sustained hazard mitigation planning process. It consists of the following three subsections:

- ◆ 10.1 Implementation and Integration
- ◆ 10.2 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Enhancement
- ◆ 10.3 Continued Public Involvement

---

### 44 CFR Requirement

#### 44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(i):

The plan shall include a plan maintenance process that includes a section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.

#### 44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(ii):

The plan maintenance process 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.

### 10.1 MONITORING AND EVALUATING THE PREVIOUS PLAN

Since the previous thirteen plans were adopted, each jurisdiction has worked to ensure that mitigation was integrated into local activities and that the mitigation plan was appropriately implemented. Each of the jurisdictions outlined a process in their previous mitigation plans for monitoring and evaluating the plan throughout the interim period between plan updates.

Each jurisdiction was ultimately successful in implementing the monitoring and evaluation processes that were outlined in previous plans as all thirteen jurisdictions held annual meetings to discuss the mitigation plan and the priorities that were outlined in it. Each jurisdiction's specific process is outlined below with an explanation of how the monitoring and evaluating process was carried out as well as any changes that were identified that would be useful to implement during the next update.

#### Wake County

The Wake County Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Environmental Services Director at the request of the County Manager every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Environmental Services Director solicited comments from all affected county departments via the hazard mitigation planning team. The plan was also open to comments from the general public during this timeframe.

## **SECTION 10: PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES**

---

Moreover, the Planning Board and County Board of Commissioners each received an annual report/presentation on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

### **Apex**

The Town of Apex Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Planning Director at the request of the Town Manager every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Planning Director solicited comments from all affected town departments via the hazard mitigation planning team. The plan was also open to comments from the general public during this timeframe.

Moreover, the Planning Board and Town Council each received an annual report/presentation on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

### **Cary**

The Town of Cary Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Planning Director at the request of the Town Manager every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Planning Director solicited comments from all affected town departments via the hazard mitigation planning team. The plan was also open to comments from the general public during this timeframe.

Moreover, the Planning Board and Town Council each received an annual report/presentation on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

### **Fuquay-Varina**

The Town of Fuquay-Varina Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Town Manager or his designee every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Town Manager solicited comments from all affected town departments via the hazard mitigation planning team. The plan was also open to comments from the general public during this timeframe.

## **SECTION 10: PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES**

---

Moreover, the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners each received an annual report/presentation on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

### **Garner**

The Town of Garner Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Town Manager or his designee every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Town Manager solicited comments from all affected town departments via the hazard mitigation planning team. The plan was also open to comments from the general public during this timeframe.

Moreover, the Planning Board and Town Council each received an annual report/presentation on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

### **Holly Springs**

The Town of Holly Springs Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Director of Engineering at the request of the Town Manager every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Director of Engineering solicited comments from all affected town departments via the hazard mitigation planning team. The plan was also open to comments from the general public during this timeframe.

Moreover, the Planning Board and Town Council each received an annual report/presentation on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

### **Knightdale**

The Town of Knightdale Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Planning Director every year since the previous plan was approved and was submitted to the town manager as well as posted on the town's website. During this annual review process, the Planning Director solicited comments from all affected town

departments via the hazard mitigation planning team. The plan was also open to comments from the general public during this timeframe.

Moreover, the review process involved review of the plan by the mitigation planning advisory committee which evaluated the plan and other relevant documents (such as Community Assistance Visit reports). The advisory committee looked in detail at each section of the plan, including the vulnerability assessment and action plan.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

### **Morrisville**

The Town of Morrisville Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Planning Director every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Planning Director prepared a brief report that was distributed to the head of each department, updating the department head of the status of the plan. Each department was then given 30 days to make return comments on the plan. These comments were incorporated into a report for the Town Council.

The Town Council received an annual report on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions. A copy of the plan was also available to the public during this time.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

### **Raleigh**

The City of Raleigh Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Emergency Management Director at the request of the City Manager every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Emergency Management Director solicited comments from all affected city departments via the hazard mitigation planning team. The plan was also open to comments from the general public during this timeframe.

Moreover, the Planning Commission and City Council each received an annual report/presentation on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

**Rolesville**

The Town of Rolesville Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Planning Director at the request of the Town Manager every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Planning Director solicited comments from all affected town departments via the hazard mitigation planning team. The plan was also open to comments from the general public during this timeframe.

Moreover, the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners each received an annual report/presentation on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

**Wake Forest**

The Town of Wake Forest Hazard Mitigation Plan included a two year review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Planning Director at the request of the Town Manager every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Planning Director solicited comments from all affected town departments via the hazard mitigation planning team.

Planning team members were encouraged to make comments regarding the plan and to provide updates to the content of the plan at the committee meetings. In addition, coordination with other town plans was evaluated and the plans were integrated as much as possible.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

**Wendell**

The Town of Wendell Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Planning Director/Town Manager every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Planning Director evaluated the vulnerability assessment and the Town Manager prepared a report summarizing the progress that had been made on the plan.

The Town Board of Commissioners received this report on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions. A copy of the plan was also available to the public during this time.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

**Zebulon**

The Town of Zebulon Hazard Mitigation Plan included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Planning Director at the request of the Town Manager every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Planning Director solicited comments from all affected town departments via the hazard mitigation planning team. The plan was also open to comments from the general public during this timeframe.

Moreover, the Planning Board and Town Council each received an annual report/presentation on the implementation status of the plan which included a review of mitigation actions in the plan and progress that had been made towards completing those actions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the HMP planning team generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

**10.2 IMPLEMENTATION AND INTEGRATION**

Each agency, department, or other partner participating under the Wake County Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is responsible for implementing specific mitigation actions as prescribed in the Mitigation Action Plan. Every proposed action listed in the Mitigation Action Plan is assigned to a specific “lead” agency or department in order to assign responsibility and accountability and increase the likelihood of subsequent implementation.

In addition to the assignment of a local lead department or agency, an implementation time period or a specific implementation date has been assigned in order to assess whether actions are being implemented in a timely fashion. When applicable, potential funding sources have been identified for proposed actions listed in the Mitigation Action Plan.

The participating jurisdictions will integrate this Hazard Mitigation Plan into relevant city and county government decision-making processes or mechanisms, where feasible. This includes integrating the requirements of the Hazard Mitigation Plan into other local planning documents, processes, or mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate. The members of the Wake County Hazard Mitigation Work Groups and Coordinating Committee will remain charged with ensuring that the goals and mitigation actions of new and updated local planning documents for their agencies or departments are consistent, or do not conflict with, the goals and actions of the Hazard Mitigation Plan, and will not contribute to increased hazard vulnerability in Wake County.

Since the previous thirteen plans were adopted, each jurisdiction has worked to integrate the hazard mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms where applicable/feasible. Examples of how this integration has occurred have been documented in the Implementation Status discussion provided for each of the mitigation actions found in Section 9. Specific examples of how integration has occurred include:

- ◆ Integrating the mitigation plan into reviews and updates of floodplain management ordinances;
- ◆ Integrating the mitigation plan into reviews and updates of emergency operations plans;

- ◆ Integrating the mitigation plan into review and updates of building codes; and
- ◆ Integrating the mitigation plan into the capital improvements plan through identification of mitigation actions that require local funding

Opportunities to further integrate the requirements of this Plan into other local planning mechanisms shall continue to be identified through future meetings of the Work Groups and Coordinating Committee and the annual review process described herein. Although it is recognized that there are many possible benefits to integrating components of this Plan into other local planning mechanisms, the development and maintenance of this stand-alone Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is deemed by the Work Groups and Coordinating Committee to be the most effective and appropriate method to implement local hazard mitigation actions at this time.

### **10.3 MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND ENHANCEMENT**

Periodic revisions and updates of the Hazard Mitigation Plan are required to ensure that the goals of the Plan are kept current, taking into account potential changes in hazard vulnerability and mitigation priorities. In addition, revisions may be necessary to ensure that the Plan is in full compliance with applicable federal and state regulations. Periodic evaluation of the Plan will also ensure that specific mitigation actions are being reviewed and carried out according to the Mitigation Action Plan.

When determined necessary, the Regional Work Groups shall meet in March of every year to evaluate the progress attained and to revise, where needed, the activities set forth in the Plan. The findings and recommendations of the regional Work Groups be documented in the form of a report that can be shared with interested City, County, and the Coordinating Committee members. The Regional Work Groups will also meet following any disaster events warranting a reexamination of the mitigation actions being implemented or proposed for future implementation. This will ensure that the Plan is continuously updated to reflect changing conditions and needs within Wake County. The Wake County Emergency Management Coordinator will be responsible for reconvening the Regional Work Groups and the Coordinating Committee for these reviews.

#### ***Five Year Plan Review***

The Plan will be thoroughly reviewed by the Regional Work Groups and Coordinating Committee every five years to determine whether there have been any significant changes in Wake County that may, in turn, necessitate changes in the types of mitigation actions proposed. New development in identified hazard areas, an increased exposure to hazards, an increase or decrease in capability to address hazards, and changes to federal or state legislation are examples of factors that may affect the necessary content of the Plan.

The plan review provides Wake County/municipal officials with an opportunity to evaluate those actions that have been successful and to explore the possibility of documenting potential losses avoided due to the implementation of specific mitigation measures. The plan review also provides the opportunity to address mitigation actions that may not have been successfully implemented as assigned. The Wake County Emergency Management Coordinator will be responsible for reconvening the Regional Work Groups and Coordinating Committee and conducting the five-year review.

During the five-year plan review process, the following questions will be considered as criteria for assessing the effectiveness and appropriateness of the Plan:

- ◆ Do the goals address current and expected conditions?
- ◆ Has the nature or magnitude of risks changed?
- ◆ Are the current resources appropriate for implementing the Plan?
- ◆ Are there implementation problems, such as technical, political, legal or coordination issues with other agencies?
- ◆ Have the outcomes occurred as expected?
- ◆ Did County departments participate in the plan implementation process as assigned?

Following the five-year review, any revisions deemed necessary will be summarized and implemented according to the reporting procedures and plan amendment process outlined herein. Upon completion of the review and update/amendment process, the Wake County Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan will be submitted to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer at the North Carolina Division of Emergency Management (NCEM) for final review and approval in coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Because the plan update process can take several months to complete, and because Federal funding may be needed to update the plan, it is recommended that the five-year review process begin at the beginning of the third year after the plan was last approved. This will allow the participants in the Wake County Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan to organize in order to seek Federal funding if necessary and complete required plan update documentation before the plan expires at the end of the fifth year.

**Disaster Declaration**

Following a disaster declaration, the Wake County Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan will be revised as necessary to reflect lessons learned, or to address specific issues and circumstances arising from the event. It will be the responsibility of the Wake County Emergency Management Coordinator to reconvene the Regional Work Groups and Coordinating Committee and ensure the appropriate stakeholders are invited to participate in the plan revision and update process following declared disaster events.

**Reporting Procedures**

The results of the five-year review will be summarized by the Regional Work Groups in a report that will include an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Plan and any required or recommended changes or amendments. The report will also include an evaluation of implementation progress for each of the proposed mitigation actions, identifying reasons for delays or obstacles to their completion along with recommended strategies to overcome them.

**Plan Amendment Process**

Upon the initiation of the amendment process, representatives from Wake County and the participating municipalities will forward information on the proposed change(s) to all interested parties including, but not limited to, all directly affected County/municipal departments, residents, and businesses. Information will also be forwarded to the North Carolina Division of Emergency Management. This information will be disseminated in order to seek input on the proposed amendment(s) for no less than a 45-day review and comment period.

At the end of the 45-day review and comment period, the proposed amendment(s) and all comments will be forwarded to the Regional Work Groups and the Coordinating Committee for final consideration. The Regional Work Groups and the Coordinating Committee will review the proposed amendment along with the comments received from other parties, and if acceptable, the committee will submit a recommendation for the approval and adoption of changes to the Plan.

In determining whether to recommend approval or denial of a Plan amendment request, the following factors will be considered by the Regional Work Groups and the Coordinating Committee:

- ◆ There are errors, inaccuracies, or omissions made in the identification of issues or needs in the Plan.
- ◆ New issues or needs have been identified which are not adequately addressed in the Plan.
- ◆ There has been a change in information, data, or assumptions from those on which the Plan is based.

Upon receiving the recommendation from the Regional Work Groups and the Coordinating Committee, and prior to adoption of the Plan, the participating jurisdictions will hold a public hearing, if deemed necessary. The governing bodies of each participating jurisdiction will review the recommendation from the Regional Work Groups and the Coordinating Committee (including the factors listed above) and any oral or written comments received at the public hearing. Following that review, the governing bodies will take one of the following actions:

- ◆ Adopt the proposed amendments as presented;
- ◆ Adopt the proposed amendments with modifications;
- ◆ Refer the amendments request back to the Regional Work Groups and the Coordinating Committee for further revision; or
- ◆ Defer the amendment request back to the Regional Work Groups and the Coordinating Committee for further consideration and/or additional hearings.

## **10.4 CONTINUED PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

<b>44 CFR Requirement</b>
<b>44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(iii):</b> The plan maintenance process shall include a discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

Public participation is an integral component to the mitigation planning process and will continue to be essential as this Plan evolves over time. As described above, significant changes or amendments to the Plan shall require a public hearing prior to any adoption procedures.

Other efforts to involve the public in the maintenance, evaluation, and revision process will be made as necessary. These efforts may include:

- ◆ Advertising meetings of the Regional Work Groups and the Coordinating Committee in local newspapers, public bulletin boards and/or County and municipal office buildings;

## SECTION 10: PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES

---

- ◆ Designating willing and voluntary citizens and private sector representatives as official members of the Regional Work Groups and the Coordinating Committee;
- ◆ Utilizing local media to update the public on any maintenance and/or periodic review activities taking place;
- ◆ Utilizing the websites of participating jurisdictions to advertise any maintenance and/or periodic review activities taking place; and
- ◆ Keeping copies of the Plan in public libraries.