





D Plan Approval Documentation

The documentation of the **Hazard Mitigation Plan 2024** approvals, the conditional approval awarded by FEMA's Approval Pending Adoption (APA), the Town's signed and sealed Certificate of Adoption, and FEMA's Letter of Formal Approval for the next 5 years are attached.

-  FEMA Approval Pending Adoption (APA) ◇ _____ **12-04-24**
-  Warner Select Board Certificate of Adoption ◇ _____ **12-10-24**
-  FEMA's Letter of Formal Approval ◇ _____ **12-19-24**

The approved regulatory checklist review provided by FEMA is attached which indicates how and where the **2024 Plan** met the federal Plan requirements. The final review tool also suggests improvements for next **2029 Plan**.

-  FEMA Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool ◇ _____ **12-19-24**

Warner Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2024 lapses on **12-18-29**



Stephanie Alexander <saalexander@cnhrpc.org>

HMP Approvable Pending Adoption (APA) Notice: Warner, NH

1 message

Neiderbach, Josiah <josiah.neiderbach@fema.dhs.gov>

Wed, Dec 4, 2024 at 10:08 AM

To: "administrator@warnernh.gov" <administrator@warnernh.gov>, "emd@warnernh.gov" <emd@warnernh.gov>

Cc: FEMA-R1-MitigationPlans <FEMA-R1-MitigationPlans@fema.dhs.gov>, "Doyle, Lynne" <Lynne.E.Doyle@dos.nh.gov>, "DOS: Hazard Mitigation" <NH.HM@dos.nh.gov>, "Brown, Austin" <Austin.T.Brown@dos.nh.gov>, "Norman, Dena" <Dena.N.Norman@dos.nh.gov>, "Markesich, Christopher" <christopher.markesich@fema.dhs.gov>, "saalexander@cnhrpc.org" <saalexander@cnhrpc.org>

Reference: Adoption Required to Finish Local Mitigation Plan Process

Dear Officials:

The FEMA Region 1 Mitigation Division has determined the *Town of Warner, New Hampshire Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2024* meets all applicable FEMA Mitigation Planning requirements (Local Mitigation Planning Policy Guide, effective April 19, 2023), except its adoption by: Town of Warner, NH.

This status is "Approvable Pending Adoption" (APA). Plan adoption is required to receive formal FEMA approval.

Local governments, including special districts, with a plan status of "Approvable Pending Adoption" are not eligible for FEMA mitigation grant programs with a mitigation plan requirement.

The next step in the approval process is to formally adopt the mitigation plan and send a resolution or adoption documentation in accordance with Element F1 of the [Local Mitigation Planning Policy Guide](#) on pages 31-32, to the State for submission to FEMA. A sample adoption resolution can also be found in Appendix B of the Policy Guide.

It is critical for the jurisdiction to adopt the plan as soon as possible. Jurisdictions that adopt the plan more than one year after APA status has been issued must either:

- Validate that their information in the plan remains current with respect to both the risk assessment (no recent hazard events, no changes in development) and their mitigation strategy (no changes necessary); or
- Make the necessary updates before submitting the adoption resolution to FEMA.

An approved local mitigation plan, including adoption by the local government, is one of the conditions for applying for and/or receiving FEMA mitigation grants from the following programs:

- Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC)
- Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA)
- Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)
- HMGP Post-Fire
- If applicable, High Hazard Potential Dams Grant Program (HHPD)

If a plan does not meet the HHPD requirements, then the jurisdiction is not eligible for assistance from the HHPD Grant Program. If any jurisdiction with HHPDs is interested in this assistance, they should contact the FEMA Regional Mitigation Planner listed below to learn more about how to include all dam risks in the plan, or at least their portion of the plan.

We look forward to receiving the adoption resolution/documentation soon and discussing options for implementing this mitigation plan. If we can assist in any way, please contact Jay Neiderbach at 202-285-7769 and josiah.neiderbach@fema.dhs.gov.

Sincerely,

Jay

Josiah (Jay) Neiderbach, Mitigation Planner

Floodplain Management and Insurance Branch | Mitigation Division | DHS / FEMA, Region I

M: 202.285.7769 E: josiah.neiderbach@fema.dhs.gov

Attachment: FEMA Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool

**Warner NH APA Review.docx**
97K

1 PLANNING PROCESS

The Town's Hazard Mitigation Committee reformed in **2023** to update the Plan which included incorporation of the new *FEMA Local Mitigation Planning Policy Guide, effective April 19, 2023* requirements, revising outdated material with current information, and providing the latest **5**-year history of Warner since the last Plan was approved in **June 2019**. A new online community survey was made available to the public for wider input, and the new plan development procedure was documented in the **Methodology** section.

Certificate of Adoption, 2024

Town of Warner, NH
Select Board
Town Hall
PO Box 265, 5 East Main Street
Warner, NH 03278

A Resolution Adopting the Warner Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2024

WHEREAS, the Town of Warner has historically experienced severe damage from natural hazards and it continues to be vulnerable to the effects of the hazards profiled in the **Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2024** including but not limited to flooding, high wind events, severe winter weather, and fire, resulting in loss of property and life, economic hardship, and threats to public health and safety; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Warner has developed an updated **Plan** and received approval pending adoption (APA) from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for its **Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2024** under the requirements of 44 CFR 201.6; and

WHEREAS, public and Committee meetings were held between **September 2023** through **July 2024** regarding the development and review of the **Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2024**; and

WHEREAS, the **Plan** specifically addresses hazard mitigation strategies, and Plan maintenance procedures for the Town of Warner; and

WHEREAS, the **Plan** recommends several hazard mitigation actions (projects) that will provide mitigation for specific natural hazards that impact the Town of Warner with the effect of protecting people and property from loss associated with those hazards; and

Town of Warner, NH Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2024

1 PLANNING PROCESS

WHEREAS, adoption of this Plan will make the Town of Warner eligible for funding to alleviate the effects of future hazards; now therefore be it

RESOLVED by Town of Warner Select Board:

The **Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2024** is hereby adopted as an official plan of the Town of Warner; The respective officials identified in the mitigation action plan of the Plan are hereby directed to pursue implementation of the recommended actions assigned to them;

Future revisions and Plan maintenance required by 44 CFR 201.6 and FEMA are hereby adopted as a part of this resolution for a period of five (5) years from the date of this resolution; and

An annual report on the progress of the implementation elements of the Plan shall be presented to the Select Board by the Emergency Management Director or designee.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned have affixed their signature and the corporate seal of the Town of Warner this 10th day of December 2024.

Select Board


Harry Seidel, Chair

12/10/24
date


Faith Minton, Vice Chair

12/10/2024
date


Michael Smith, Member

date

ATTEST

SEAL

Town Clerk


Michele Courser, Town Clerk

12/10/2024
date



FEMA

December 19, 2024

Robert M. Buxton, Director
New Hampshire Homeland Security and Emergency Management
33 Hazen Dr.
Concord, NH 03305

Director Buxton:

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Region 1 Mitigation Division has approved the *Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2024, Town of Warner, New Hampshire* effective **December 19, 2024** through **December 18, 2029** in accordance with the planning requirements of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Stafford Act), as amended; the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended; the National Dam Safety Program Act, as amended; and Title 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 201.

With this plan approval, the Town of Warner, NH is eligible to apply to New Hampshire Homeland Security and Emergency Management for mitigation grants administered by FEMA. Requests for funding will be evaluated according to the eligibility requirements identified for each of these programs. A specific mitigation activity or project identified in this community's plan may not meet the eligibility requirements for FEMA funding; even eligible mitigation activities or projects are not automatically approved.

The plan must be updated and resubmitted to the FEMA Region 1 Mitigation Division for approval every five years to remain eligible for FEMA mitigation grant funding.

Thank you for your continued commitment and dedication to risk reduction demonstrated by preparing and adopting a strategy for reducing future disaster losses. Should you have any questions, please contact Jay Neiderbach at (202) 285-7769 or josiah.neiderbach@fema.dhs.gov.

Sincerely,

Christopher Markesich
Floodplain Management and Insurance Branch Chief
Mitigation Division | DHS, FEMA Region 1

cc: Austin Brown, Mitigation & Recovery Section Chief, NH HSEM
Lynne Doyle, State Planner, NH HSEM
Dean Savramis, Mitigation Division Director, DHS, FEMA Region 1
Josiah (Jay) Neiderbach, Hazard Mitigation Community Planner, DHS, FEMA Region 1

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 Warner, NH
Title of Plan	Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2024, Town of Warner, New Hampshire
New Plan or Update	Update
Single- or Multi-Jurisdiction	Single-jurisdiction
Date of Plan	9/27/2024
Local Point of Contact	
Title	Kathleen Frenette, Town Administrator
Agency	Town Hall, Town of Warner, New Hampshire
Address	PO Box 265 East Main Street, Warner, NH 03278
Phone Number	(603) 456-2298
Email	administrator@warnernh.gov

Additional Point of Contact	
Title	Edward Mical, Emergency Management Director
Agency	Fire Department EOC, Town of Warner, New Hampshire
Address	148 West Street, Warner, NH 03278
Phone Number	(603) 748-0560
Email	emd@warnernh.gov

Additional Point of Contact	
Title	Stephanie Alexander, Senior Planner
Agency	Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission (CNHRPC)
Address	28 Commercial Street, Suite 3, Concord, NH 03301
Phone Number	(603) 226-6021
Email	salexander@cnhrpc.org

Review Information	
State Review	
State Reviewer(s) and Title	Lynne Doyle, State Hazard Mitigation Planner Lynne.e.doyle@dos.nh.gov
State Review Date	10/29/2024
FEMA Review	
FEMA Reviewer(s) and Title	Jane Nicholson, Hazard Mitigation Program Manager Jay Neiderbach, FEMA R1 Community Planner
Date Received in FEMA Region	10/29/2024
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption	12/4/2024; Signed adoption received 12/18/2024
Plan Approved	12/19/2024; (HHPD is not included in this approval)

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?	Ch. 1, pp. 7-9	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?	Ch. 1, p. 3, App. C	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?	Ch. 1, pp. 11-12; App. C	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))		
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?	Ch. 1, p. 4, pp. 9-15; App. C; App. F	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?	Ch. 2, pp. 22-29; Ch. 4, p. 151; Ch. 5, pp. 250-251; Ch. 6, pp. 269-277; References throughout the plan	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?	Ch. 3, pp. 56-62; Ch. 4, p. 143	Met
B1-b. Does the plan include information on the location of each identified hazard?	Ch. 3, pp. 68-83	Met
B1-c. Does the plan describe the extent for each identified hazard?	Ch. 4, pp. 145-218	Met
B1-d. Does the plan include the history of previous hazard events for each identified hazard?	Ch. 3, pp. 84-143; App. E	Met
B1-e. Does the plan include the probability of future events for each identified hazard? Does the plan describe the effects of future conditions, including climate change (e.g., long-term weather patterns, average temperature and sea levels), on the type, location and range of anticipated intensities of identified hazards?	Ch. 2, pp. 30-54 Ch. 4, pp. 62-67, pp. 145-218	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?	This is a single jurisdiction plan.	N/A
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?	Ch. 4, pp. 68-83 Ch. 5, pp. 219-240; App. A	Met
B2-b. For each participating jurisdiction, does the plan describe the potential impacts of each of the identified hazards on each participating jurisdiction?	Ch. 2, pp. 36-40; pp. 49-53	Met

Element B Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
B2-c. Does the plan address NFIP-insured structures within each jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods?	Ch. 5, p. 253	Met
ELEMENT B REQUIRED REVISIONS		
Required Revision:		

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

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?	Ch. 6, pp. 268 – 296 (Existing building codes / regulatory – Ch. 2, p. 29; Ch. 6, pp. 268 – 277)	Met
C1-b. Does the plan describe each participant's ability to expand and improve the identified capabilities to achieve mitigation?	Ch. 6, pp. 268 - 296	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?	Ch. 5, pp. 254-258	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?	Ch. 3, pp. 58-59	Met

Element C Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not 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?	Ch. 8, pp. 314- 341	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?	Ch. 8, pp. 314-341, pp. 348-349	Met
C5. Does the plan contain an action plan that describes how 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))		
C5-a. Does the plan describe the criteria used for prioritizing actions?	Ch. 8, pp. 342-344	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?	Ch. 8, pp. 314-341, 345-346	Met
ELEMENT C REQUIRED REVISIONS		
Required Revision:		

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))		
D1-a. Does the plan describe how communities will continue to seek future public participation after the plan has been approved?	Ch. 9, pp. 357-359, pp. 368-369; App. B	Met

Element D Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not 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))		
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?	Ch. 9, pp. 357-359; App. B	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.	Ch. 9, pp. 360-362 App. B	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?	Ch. 9, pp. 360-363 App. B	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?	Ch. 9, pp. 364-367	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?	Ch. 9, pp. 364-367	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?	This is a single jurisdiction plan.	N/A
ELEMENT D REQUIRED REVISIONS		
Required Revision:		

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))		
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?	Ch. 1, pp. 24-25	Met
E2. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities and progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement 44 CFR § 201.6(d)(3))		
E2-a. Does the plan describe how it was revised due to changes in community priorities?	Ch. 2, pp. 37-38; p. 54, p. 58 Ch. 7, pp. 297-312; Ch. 9, pp. 353-356	Met
E2-b. Does the plan include a status update for all mitigation actions identified in the previous mitigation plan?	Ch. 7, pp. 297-312	Met
E2-c. Does the plan describe how jurisdictions integrated the mitigation plan, when appropriate, into other planning mechanisms?	Ch. 9, pp. 364 – 367	Met
ELEMENT E REQUIRED REVISIONS		
Required Revision:		

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))		
F1-a. Does the participant include documentation of adoption?	pp. 1-2	Met

Element F Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
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))		
F2-a. Did each participant adopt the plan and provide documentation of that adoption?	This is a single jurisdiction plan.	N/A
ELEMENT F REQUIRED REVISIONS		
Required Revision:		

Element G: High Hazard Potential Dams (Optional) – Not submitted for HHPD review

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.
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.

HHPD Requirements	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met / Not Met
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:		

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

- The main body of the plan refers to the appendices. This makes it easy for the reader to find the materials that expand on what is in the plan.
- The updated parts of the plan are clearly marked. It is easy to see how the community's risk assessment and mitigation strategy have changed.
- The town did an excellent job integrating graphic (graphs, charts, etc.) into the body of the document, when appropriate.
- The planning process narrative is detailed. There are details on the events and meetings that were part of the plan's development.
- The plan includes in-depth records of the planning process. The meeting agendas, meeting minutes, sign-in sheets, and public notices support the narratives in this section. This will also help guide future updates.
- The planning team used a range of studies, reports and plans. The plan draws from local, state, federal and other resources. It is in-depth.
- Community officials and leaders from the town of Warner were engaged in the planning process. This helps the plan reflect how vulnerable the planning area is to hazard impacts. The plan can also reflect the area's capabilities and concerns.
- A wide range of stakeholders were engaged in the planning process. This meant the plan could capture a lot of viewpoints from those in and around the planning area.
- The plan includes a summary of public and stakeholder feedback and how the plan accounts for it. This shows the planning team valued the insights gathered during the planning process.
- The planning process was equitable. The planning committee reached out to the public in a purposeful way. Inviting all members of the public is a best practice, as is using equity-driven engagement methods.
- The town clearly captured the barriers to climate resilience in Warner, including challenges for vulnerable populations. The town acknowledges the most socially vulnerable groups that have limited or no technology compounded by reduced cell/radio communications. Along with directly engaging diverse populations through one-on-one correspondence, the town did a good job providing multiple survey platforms (online, paper, and QR code) to reach broad consensus.
- Underserved and vulnerable populations were directly involved in the planning process. These groups can be more vulnerable to hazard impacts; engaging them allows their needs to be heard.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Engage with Community Lifelines during the planning process. Lifelines are the most fundamental services in the community that, when stabilized, enable all other aspects of society

to function. Factoring Community Lifelines into mitigation planning can prevent impacts to them. This lets the planning area build back stronger and smarter after a hazard event.

Element B. Risk Assessment

Strengths

- The hazard profiles are well-defined. There is a lot of detail about the context of the hazard and the risk it presents.
- The history of hazards is wide-ranging. It gives a sense of the hazard's extent in the area, as well as the impacts of past events.
- The plan does a great job of showing how the likelihood or effects of future hazard events may change due to climate change. Included in this is an in-depth evaluation of past and current weather changes in the town.
- The plan clearly details the state and federal disaster declarations that have included the planning area. Historical events that have led to a disaster declaration can be referenced; they note the location, extent and potential impacts of a severe hazard event.
- The plan describes extent through the use of scientific scales that are relative to the planning area. Using widely recognized scales paints a clear picture of an event's effects. It also shows how the scale can apply to past hazard events. This makes the plan more useful to the community.
- The plan includes a community profile. The profile has demographic information, development trends and landscape features. This makes community assets and vulnerabilities clear.
- The plan has a thorough hazard identification and risk assessment. When there were no quantitative data at the local level, the plan used data from the county or state and added a qualitative discussion.
- Using problem statements is a great way to sum up the vulnerabilities listed in the risk assessment. They can also help pinpoint actions to include in the mitigation strategy. This links the two sections of the plan together.
- The vulnerability assessment includes a thorough discussion of how hazards affect the underserved and vulnerable populations in the planning area. It also discusses risks to structures, systems, and natural and cultural resources.
- The town does an excellent job at stating why each asset is vulnerable followed by a detailed problem statement and evaluation that answers what the problem is, the natural hazard addressed, the location, and the impact. An inventory with specific information on each of the town's assets and associated problem statement with hazard risk is tabulated in Appendix A. Further, the Hazard Mitigation Committee worked together to evaluate each asset and its vulnerability with supporting data, signifying the collaborative approach to the assessment.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Point out the data gaps in the studies, reports and datasets used for the risk assessment. That can help update the plan when there is new information. That way, the plan can stay up to date.

Element C. Mitigation Strategy

Strengths

- The plan gives a detailed description of the community's programs, plans and policies to reduce risks.
- The plan assesses current capabilities. It looks at how to expand them to further reduce risk.
- The plan lists other plans that already account for mitigation. It includes who oversees those updates and the time frame they must follow.
- The plan includes action steps to grow each capability.
- The description of how participants carry out their floodplain regulations is detailed and clear. This includes how they carry out their substantial damage provisions.
- The plan does a great job of noting where current capabilities can be expanded. There are also narratives on how new capabilities can be added to the community's toolkit.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Name the person/department that oversees regulations, the steps to carry them out, and any limitations.
- Name alternative funding sources for projects. Think about resources you may use through FEMA, other federal agencies, state programs, regional planning agencies, nonprofits, etc. Look into how grant programs for related issues, such as water quality, can help reduce risks.
- Make sure that the mitigation strategy focuses on mitigation, not preparedness. Mitigation actions reduce long-term risk. They are not the same as actions taken to prepare for or respond to hazard events. Mitigation activities lessen the need for preparedness or response resources in the future. If there are preparedness actions, explain how they address specific vulnerabilities, too.

Element D. Plan Maintenance

Strengths

- The plan lists creative ways to keep the public involved in mitigation efforts. These efforts include personal invitations to stakeholders, opportunities for new representatives in public involvement, and a new section of the town website dedicated to Hazard Mitigation Committee activities.
- The plan details how the planning team will include the public when it carries out the plan.
- The steps to update the plan are described clearly. This will make the plan update process easy.
- The plan explains how the previous plan's maintenance strategy shaped the one proposed for the next five years. Using lessons learned and successes from the last plan will help carry out the monitoring, evaluating and updating efforts.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Think of more ways to include the public in the implementation phase. Communities have presented to schools or other local groups, sent out yearly surveys, run tables at festivals and other events, and developed websites.

- Describe how the planning team will directly engage with underserved and vulnerable populations during the next five years. An equitable public outreach strategy does not end when the plan is adopted.
- Include more details on how the town of Warner planning team will know the plan has worked.

Element E. Plan Update

Strengths

- The plan clearly describes changes in the community's development since the last update.
- The plan includes a projection of planned or potential future development.
- The development section of the plan explains the community's zoning and permitting process (and any recent changes to it).
- The development section includes details on how land use and economic patterns in the community have changed.
- Progress on mitigation actions is clear and in-depth.
- The plan includes success stories about the key mitigation actions from the last plan. The plan takes time to acknowledge the steps the community took to boost its resiliency to hazards.
- Priorities are based on the current conditions and vision of the community. This way, the plan is truly the community's plan.
- The plan has details on how the hazard mitigation data, goals, actions and other elements were included in other plans and planning processes. It shares successes that were achieved through that integration.
- Hazard mitigation was integrated into many other plans and strategies.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Describe general land use changes in nearby areas that may affect the community's risk.
- Expand on the changes the community has seen since the last plan was developed. Discuss how the needs of underserved communities or gaps in social equity have shifted in the planning area.
- Add lessons learned about carrying out mitigation actions. This would strengthen the plan. A short narrative on some "success stories" would also help.