

# PLANNING PROCESS

## 2017 UPDATE

Summaries of each meeting and the procedures followed during the update process were created for each subsection. Summaries of previous planning processes were removed for brevity and because they are available in other plans.

## OVERVIEW OF MITIGATION PLANNING

Local hazard mitigation planning involves the process of organizing community resources, identifying and assessing hazard risks, and determining how to minimize or manage those risks. This process results in a hazard mitigation plan that identifies specific actions designed to meet the goals established by those that participate in the planning process. To ensure the functionality of each mitigation action, responsibility is assigned to a specific individual, department or agency along with a schedule for its implementation. Plan maintenance procedures are established to help ensure that the plan is implemented, as well as evaluated and enhanced as necessary. Developing clear plan maintenance procedures helps ensure that the Hazard Mitigation Plan remains a current, dynamic, and effective planning document over time.

Participating in a hazard mitigation planning process can help local officials and citizens achieve the following results:

- save lives and property;
- save money;
- speed recovery following disasters;
- reduce future vulnerability through wise development and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction;
- enhance coordination within and across neighboring jurisdictions;
- expedite the receipt of pre-disaster and post-disaster grant funding; and
- demonstrate a firm commitment to improving community health and safety.

Mitigation planning is an important tool to produce long-term recurring benefits by breaking the repetitive cycle of disaster loss. A core assumption of hazard mitigation is that pre-disaster investments will significantly reduce the demand for post-disaster assistance by lessening the need for emergency response, repair, recovery, and reconstruction. Furthermore, mitigation practices will enable local residents, businesses, and industries to re-establish themselves in the wake of a disaster, getting the community economy back on track sooner and with less interruption.

The benefits of mitigation planning go beyond reducing hazard vulnerability. Measures such as the acquisition or regulation of land in known hazard areas can help achieve multiple community goals, such as preserving open space, improving water quality, maintaining environmental health, and enhancing recreational opportunities. It is the intent of this document to help identify overlapping community objectives and facilitate the sharing of resources to achieve multiple aims, and to include information wherever possible to demonstrate when the plan is or has been implemented through other planning mechanisms.

## PREPARING THE PLAN

### 44 CFR Requirement

**44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(1):** The plan shall include documentation of the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process and how the public was involved.

The HRPDC used FEMA guidance (FEMA Publication Series 386) to develop and update this Hazard Mitigation Plan. A *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool*, found in Appendix A, provides a detailed summary of FEMA’s current minimum standards of acceptability for compliance with DMA 2000 and notes the location where each requirement is met within the Plan. These standards are based upon FEMA’s Interim Final Rule as published in the Federal Register on February 26, 2002, and October 31, 2007, in Part 201 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

The planning process included eight major steps that were completed during 2015 through 2017; they are shown in green and yellow in **Figure 2.1**. Each of the planning steps illustrated in Figure 2.1 resulted in work products and outcomes that collectively make up the Hazard Mitigation Plan.

**Table 2.1** provides a summary of the National Flood Insurance Program’s Community Rating System (CRS) User’s Manual 10-step guidance for plan preparation and how that guidance fits within the 10-step, 4-phase process advocated by FEMA. This plan strives to accomplish the steps in each of these processes.

TABLE 2.1: FEMA GUIDANCE AND CRS HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING GUIDANCE	
FEMA Guidance	CRS Guidance
<b>Phase I: Organize Resources</b> Step 1. Get Organized Step 2. Plan for Public Involvement Step 3. Coordinate with Other Departments & Agencies	Step 1. Organize Step 2. Involve the Public Step 3. Coordinate
<b>Phase II: Assess Risk</b> Step 4. Identify the Hazards Step 5. Assess the Risks	Step 4. Assess the hazard Step 5. Assess the Problem
<b>Phase III: Develop Mitigation Plan</b> Step 6: Review Mitigation Alternatives Step 7: Draft an Action Plan Step 8: Set Planning Goals	Step 6. Set Goals Step 7. Review Possible Activities Step 8. Draft an Action Plan
<b>Phase IV: Adopt &amp; Implement</b> Step 9: Adopt the Plan Step 10: Implement the Plan	Step 9. Adopt the Plan Step 10. Implement, Evaluate, Revise

**FIGURE 2.1: HAMPTON ROADS HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING PROCESS**



**THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

A community-based planning team made up of local government officials and key stakeholders has continually helped guide the development of this Plan. The committee organized local meetings and planning workshops to discuss and complete tasks associated with preparing the Plan, including reviewing plan drafts and providing timely comments. Additional participation and input from residents and other identified stakeholders was sought through public meetings that described the planning process, the findings of the risk assessment, and the proposed mitigation actions. The committee convened in 2015.

**HAMPTON ROADS MITIGATION PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Due to the large geographic area covered and the number of communities participating, the project leaders felt that a Steering Committee was necessary to help more efficiently guide the planning process

and facilitate the numerous Working Group members. Thus, the representatives for the communities and stakeholders were divided into a primary Steering Committee and a Working Group. The division was based on discussions with potential committee members from each community and stakeholders and a determination as to which members were most willing to commit themselves to the entire process, to do the majority of the work, to debate goals and objectives and discuss alternatives, and to report back to their constituencies and Working Group members. The participants listed in **Table 2.2** are the Steering Committee members for the 2017 Hampton Roads Hazard Mitigation Plan Update. Specifically, the tasks assigned to the Steering Committee members included:

- participate in mitigation planning meetings and workshops;
- provide best available data as required for the risk assessment portion of the Plan;
- provide copies of any mitigation or hazard-related documents for review and incorporation into the Plan;
- support the development of the Mitigation Strategy, including the design and adoption of community goals and objectives;
- help design and propose appropriate mitigation actions for incorporation into the Mitigation Action Plan;
- review and provide timely comments on all study findings and draft components of the plan; and
- support the adoption of the Hazard Mitigation Plan by community leaders.

In many cases, the Working Groups for individual communities also met outside of the more official planning process in informal meetings facilitated by Steering Committee members. Additional participation and input from other identified community staff and stakeholders was sought by the Steering Committee during the planning process primarily through e-mails and phone calls. Stakeholder involvement is discussed in more detail later in this section.

TABLE 2.2: HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS		
NAME	COMMUNITY	DEPARTMENT and/or EXPERTISE
Gayle Hicks	City of Hampton	Public Works/ Structural Flood Control Projects
Hui-Shan Walker	City of Hampton	Emergency Management, Public Information
George Glazner	City of Newport News	Emergency Management/Public Information
Louis Bott	City of Newport News	Environmental Services/Property Protection
Michael Bryant	City of Poquoson	Emergency Management, Public Information
Ken Somerset	City of Poquoson	Preventive Measures, Property Protection
Kate Hale	James City County	Emergency Management, Public Information
Darryl Cook	James City County	Capital Projects Engineer/Structural Flood Control Projects
Stephen Kopczynski	York County	Fire Department/Emergency Management, Public Information
Kent Henkel	York County	Property Protection, Natural Resource Protection
Robert Tajan	City of Norfolk	Planning/Preventive Measures, Property Protection
Steven Pyle	City of Norfolk	Emergency Management, Public Information
Meg Pittenger	City of Portsmouth	Environmental Manager/Natural Resource Protection
B.K. Russell	City of Portsmouth	Emergency Management, Public Information
Whitney McNamara	City of Virginia Beach	Planning Department
Erin Sutton	City of Virginia Beach	Emergency Management, Public Information

**TABLE 2.2: HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

NAME	COMMUNITY	DEPARTMENT and/or EXPERTISE
Martha Burns	City of Chesapeake	Emergency Management, Public Information
Rob Braidwood	City of Chesapeake	Emergency Management, Public Information
Andrea Clontz	Isle of Wight County	Emergency Management, Public Information
Kim Hummel	Isle of Wight County	GIS/Property Protection
Stuart Speitz	Stakeholder: Chesapeake NEMAC, Citizen member	Public Information, Property Protection
Charles Kline	Stakeholder: Va Department of Conservation & Recreation	Preventive Measures, Property Protection
Charley Banks	Stakeholder: Va Department of Conservation & Recreation	Preventive Measures, Property Protection
Bill Sammler	Stakeholder: NOAA National Weather Service	Public Information
Shep Moon	Stakeholder: Va Department of Environmental Quality, Coastal Zone Management Program	Natural Resource Protection
John Sadler	Stakeholder: Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	Emergency Management, Public Information
Ben McFarlane	Stakeholder: Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	Natural Resource Protection, Property Protection
Josh Gillespie	Stakeholder: Fort Monroe Authority	Property Protection
Michelle Hamor	Stakeholder: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Structural Flood Control Projects
Skip Stiles	Stakeholder: Wetlands Watch	Natural Resource Protection
Mary-Carson Stiff	Stakeholder: Wetlands Watch	Natural Resource Protection
Amy Howard	Stakeholder: Va Department of Emergency Management	Emergency Services
Matt Wall	Stakeholder: Va Department of Emergency Management	Emergency Services
Matt McCullough	Stakeholder: FEMA, Region III	Emergency Services
Cynthia Darden	Stakeholder: American Red Cross	Emergency Services
Christine Tombleson	Stakeholder: Virginia Institute of Marine Science	Natural Resource Protection, Public Information
Kenton Towner	Stakeholder: College of William & Mary	Emergency Management, Public Information
Karen Stone	Colonial Williamsburg	Public Information
Leigh Chapman	Stakeholder: Salter's Creek Consulting, Inc.	Preventive Measures, Property Protection
Chris Harvey	Stakeholder: MITRE	Emergency Services
Emily Frye	Stakeholder: MITRE	Emergency Services
Patrick Lewis	Stakeholder: Chesapeake Regional Medical Center	Public Information

## 2015/2016 COMMUNITY MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS

Below is a summary of the key meetings and community workshops during the 2015/2016 update process. Routine discussions and additional meetings were held by local officials to accomplish planning tasks specific to their department or agency. A consultant (Salter's Creek Consulting, Inc., of Hampton, Virginia) was hired with grant funds to update the hazard identification and vulnerability analysis, to guide the committee through the planning process based on the revised information and to assist each community with adoption of the final plan. All meeting summary information is included in Appendix C, which includes committee and public meeting minutes, attendance sheets, and correspondence with committee members and stakeholders.

### FEBRUARY 2, 2015: PROJECT KICKOFF MEETING

Participants in the Kickoff Meeting discussed the overall approach to updating the Hazard Mitigation Plan, including strategies for outreach and public participation, as well as the steps necessary to meet the requirements of the DMA 2000, and the CRS of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The consultant initiated data collection efforts at the meeting and reviewed the existing list of hazards with the representatives present.

The group discussed project schedule, CRS requirements and discussed potential stakeholders and how they would be asked to participate, including tasks such as: reviewing drafts, participating on the committee, and/or attending public meetings. Due the large land area encompassed by the Plan, the group and the consultant decided that each of the main three meetings would be held in three different locations, providing opportunity for each community to travel to the location closest or most convenient to their location and schedule.

### OCTOBER 21, 22 AND 23, 2015: FIRST PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The consultant provided an overview of the proposed update approach to committee members. The Committee reviewed the Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Assessment information updated by the consultant prior to this meeting. Committee members discussed the hazards of most critical concern to the region, and concurred to adjust the names of several hazards, removed several hazards and added hazards.

The committee members present voted on their mitigation priorities and ranked hazards using the methodology described in Section 5. The committee considered a list of hazards that included flood, sea level rise, tropical storm, severe thunderstorm, tsunami, urban fire, winter storm/nor'easter, drought, dam failure, tornado, extreme heat, earthquake, wildfire, erosion, sinkhole, mosquito diseases, hazardous materials incidents, terrorism, biological threats, radiological threats, and pandemic flu.



*Members of the Hazard Mitigation Committee discuss the Hazard Identification and Risk Analysis for the 2016 update at the October 21, 2015 meeting in Virginia Beach.*

The committee reviewed and discussed manmade (or man-influenced) and technological hazard planning as it was incorporated into the existing plans. The Committee agreed to focus this plan on natural hazards because the manmade hazard identification and vulnerability analyses contain a great deal of protected data. The public, and even some committee members, cannot view this data and therefore cannot participate in the planning process for updating the manmade hazard portion contained in some of the existing plans. Another significant consideration was that previous mitigation action items to address manmade hazards were either excerpted from or incorporated into other types of community plans already in existence, such as Emergency Operation Plans, SARA Title III Emergency Response Plans, existing state plans for radiological emergencies, and the Hampton Roads Homeland Security Strategy. In addition, DMA 2000 specifically requires mitigation planning for *natural hazards*, but not for manmade hazards. The manmade hazards examined and discussed during this planning process included: Hazardous Materials Incidents, Terrorism, Biological Threats, Radiological Threats, Pandemic Flu and Electro-Magnetic Pulse/sustained power disruption. While these hazards were determined to be outside the scope of this Committee's work, the group acknowledged that these threats do exist in Hampton Roads, but felt that existing plans are sufficient at this time. The exception was Hazardous Materials Incidents, which the Committee determined has enough overlap with natural hazards to warrant consideration as part of the Plan.

## NOVEMBER 17, 18, AND 19, 2015: SECOND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The second Planning Committee meeting was the beginning of the "Mitigation Strategy Workshop." The meeting began with a detailed presentation on how a complete capability assessment contributes to identification of effective mitigation strategies. The discussion focused on local capabilities, the capability matrix each community was asked to complete, and updated information regarding completed mitigation actions in each community.

The consultant helped Committee members review several documents in preparation for the goal setting exercise which was the focus of the workshop. This background helped Committee members maintain continuity between various local, regional, and state planning efforts.

Data, documents, plans and procedures reviewed as part of the planning process included:

- Each community's Comprehensive Plan goal statements and Land Use plans –
  - These goals were reviewed during the meeting to update goals and objectives to determine community priorities primarily for future land use planning and capital improvement projects.
- Each community's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) -
  - Familiarity with these plans on behalf of the emergency managers on the committee was used primarily during the development of the Mitigation Action Plan and tying the mitigation priorities to the response and preparedness activities in the EOP.
- *2013 Commonwealth of Virginia Hazard Mitigation Plan* goals and objectives –
  - These items were reviewed by committee members prior to the work on updating the goals and objectives to help ensure that the regional plan supports and does not contradict the State's goals and objectives.
- Virginia *Governor's Commission on Climate Change Final Report*, December 2008 –
  - The conclusions of this report, while slightly dated, represent some level of State opinion on sea level rise and what the Commonwealth can do to address the issue. The conclusions were reviewed by committee members again to help provide linkages between the regional mitigation goals and the State's approach.
- *Mitigation Ideas: A Resource for Reducing Risk to Natural Hazards*, FEMA January 2013
- Hampton Roads Planning District Commission three-part study entitled "Climate Change in Hampton Roads"
  - Impacts and Stakeholder Involvement (Phase I, released in February 2010)
  - Storm Surge Vulnerability and Public Outreach (Phase II, released June 2011)
  - Sea Level Rise in Hampton Roads, Virginia (Phase III, released July 2012)

- *Recommendations to the Secure Commonwealth Panel on the Issue of Sea Level Rise and Recurrent Flooding in Coastal Virginia*, September 5, 2014, by the Recurrent Flooding Sub-Panel
- *VDEM 2015 Report on the Status of Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness Efforts in the Commonwealth*, December 2015
- Each of the six existing plan's Goals and Objectives –
  - As discussed in the next paragraph, this plan is an update to six separate plans and common ground between the plans' goals and objectives was a necessary starting point to the update process.
- Each community's:
  - Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and Flood Insurance Study (FIS) – used in the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment section to determine high flood risk areas;
  - floodplain management regulations – reviewed by the consultant to highlight community capabilities and possible mitigation opportunities;
  - site plan review process – reviewed by the consultant to highlight possible mitigation opportunities; and,
  - permitting procedures - reviewed by the consultant to highlight possible mitigation opportunities.

The group was provided a list of potential, broad community goal key words extracted from the existing plans in order to encourage brainstorming about revising the goal statements. The members also reviewed existing goal statements from the current plan and other plans pertinent to the region. The group chose their top key phrases, and then went to work carefully reviewing the existing mitigation plan goal statements. At each of the three workshops, each subgroup was encouraged to critique each word in light of the goal key words identified earlier. The facilitator reworked, grouped together, and presented the revised goals and objectives at the final two meetings so that each group could arrive at a consensus on the broader mitigation goals and objectives associated with the updated mitigation plan.

## DECEMBER 9, 10 AND 11, 2015: THIRD MITIGATION PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The consultant shared additional review notes on floodplain management regulations, as well as other capabilities of note, and suggested numerous possible mitigation actions based on capability gaps and other observations. The group again reviewed a general list of potential mitigation actions categorized by type.

Committee members worked carefully through a review of the list of existing mitigation actions from their existing plan, deciding which actions to modify or delete based on their progress toward completion. The group then selected and discussed priorities for several new proposed actions. The consultant discussed a variety of mitigation categories for considering and evaluating possible mitigation action alternatives appropriate to each community.

## INFORMAL COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC WORKING GROUP MEETINGS

Several communities involved in the plan, including Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Virginia Beach, and Chesapeake held informal meetings at the community level to discuss their final Mitigation Action Plan. Additional information on these meetings, including dates and attendance, are available from the Emergency Managers in those communities.

## INVOLVING THE PUBLIC

### 44 CFR Requirement

**Part 201.6(b)(1):** The planning process shall include an opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval.

Individual citizen involvement provides the planning committee with a greater understanding of local concerns and increases mitigation success by developing community “buy-in” from those directly affected by public policy and planning decisions. As citizens become more involved in decisions that affect their life and safety, they are more likely to gain appreciation of the natural hazards present in their community and take personal steps to reduce hazard impacts. Public awareness is a key component of an overall mitigation strategy aimed at making a home, neighborhood, school, business or city safer from the effects of natural hazards.

Public input was initially sought using three primary methods: (1) open public meetings advertised in local newspapers with highest circulation; (2) HRPDC web site posting regarding committee meetings (which were open to the public, but not advertised via newspaper); and, (3) the posting of the draft Hazard Mitigation Plan on the HRPDC web site. Public meetings were held at two stages of the planning process; early in the process to introduce the plan update process, and after the planning committee workshops, but well prior to adoption by governing bodies.

### 2015/2016 Public Meetings

Seven open public meetings were held to present the planning process and to review mitigation actions to be included in the Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The first public meeting to be held was scheduled and advertised for February 26, 2015, in Hampton. Unfortunately, due to inclement weather, the meeting facility was closed and the meeting was cancelled and not rescheduled because two other meetings being held the following week were deemed sufficient by project leaders. The second and third public meetings were held March 2, 2015 in Smithfield, and March 3, 2015, in Norfolk.

The meetings were advertised twice each in *The Virginian-Pilot* (weekday circulation 300,000), *The Daily Press* (weekday circulation 55,000), *The Tidewater News* (circulation 5,000), and the *New Journal and Guide*. These publications have local and regional circulation which ensured local officials, residents, businesses, and other public and private interests in the region, including neighboring communities, were notified on how to be involved in the local mitigation planning process. Additionally, HRPDC and several communities advertised the meetings on their web sites. The public meeting advertisements are included in Appendix C, which also includes all committee and public meeting minutes, attendance sheets, and invitation correspondence.



*Participants in the March 2, 2015 Public Meeting listen to information regarding the planning process.*

Upon completion of a draft Plan, the Committee held three open public meetings on the draft Hazard Mitigation Plan on May 31, June 2 and June 9, 2016. The meetings were advertised in the same manner, and provided further opportunities for the public and identified stakeholders to review and comment on the draft plan (minus Appendix D). At least two communities, Williamsburg and Chesapeake, advertised the public meetings and provided a link to the plan on their community web sites (see Appendix C for

screenshots). The plan was posted on the HRPDC web site on May 24, 2016, and contact information for the HRPDC Emergency Management Division was provided if the public needed instructions for submitting comments. The meetings and initial 2-week review period after the June 9 meeting, provided citizens with an opportunity to review the content of the Plan's sections. In response to a citizen's request, the review period was extended by an additional week.

Despite the best intentions of the committee, resulting public feedback was far less than anticipated, and less than seen in similar, previous regional planning efforts; there was also public concern on this topic. As a result, in early summer 2016, the Steering Committee committed to provide additional opportunities for:

- guided committee member assessment of the draft plan based on compiled public input (see Appendix H);
- public input via posting of the Public Participation Survey on Survey Monkey in coordination with community's Public Information Officers, or equivalent staff;
- reposting of the plan draft for public input in coordination with community's Public Information Officers, or equivalent staff; and,
- readvertising and conduct of an additional feedback session held on September 27, 2016.

The session on September 27, 2016 was termed the "Feedback Forum" in an effort to solicit public comment and feedback on the draft plan. Once again, the committee relied on the efforts of multiple community Public Information Officers, web masters, and other communication specialists to use a variety of sources to spread the word about the planning effort. Because newspaper advertisement of public meetings had resulted in limited turnout previously, project leaders attempted alternative methods of social media advertisement and terminology in order to attract more citizen involvement in the Feedback Forum. Records of these advertisements and solicitations for involvement are included in Appendix C (meeting minutes), Appendix D (public survey response summaries), Appendix E (responses to public comments), and Appendix H (Committee Assessment of Public Input forms).

Additionally, the plan was reviewed and presented to each community's elected officials at a public hearing prior to adoption. Though the plan was in its final format for these meetings, this did provide additional opportunity to answer questions and present findings to the public and elected officials. The resolution of adoption by each community is included in Appendix B. Adoption dates are shown in **Table 2.3**.

**TABLE 2.3: DATE OF PLAN ADOPTION BY ELECTED OFFICIALS**

SUBREGION	COMMUNITY	DATE OF PLAN ADOPTION
Peninsula	City of Hampton	February 22, 2017
	City of Newport News	January 10, 2017
	City of Poquoson	February 27, 2017
	City of Williamsburg	January 12, 2017
	James City County	March 14, 2017
	York County	March 21, 2017
Southside	City of Norfolk	March 28, 2017
	City of Portsmouth	February 28, 2017
	City of Suffolk	February 15, 2017
	City of Virginia Beach	March 7, 2017
	City of Chesapeake	February 14, 2017
Western Tidewater	Isle of Wight County	February 16, 2017
	Town of Smithfield	February 7, 2017
	Town of Windsor	March 14, 2017
	City of Franklin	February 27, 2017
	Southampton County	January 23, 2017
	Town of Boykins	February 14, 2017
	Town of Branchville	February 20, 2017
	Town of Capron	March 6, 2017
	Town of Courtland	February 14, 2017
	Town of Ivor	February 13, 2017
Town of Newsoms	March 6, 2017	

### Public Survey

A public survey was distributed at all public meetings to solicit additional feedback from attendees. As indicated above, the public survey was also distributed online via Survey Monkey in Summer 2016 as part of the committee's effort to improve and use public feedback. The results of a total 1,115 responses collected over the planning period are summarized in Appendix D. Appendix H details how the communities assessed all of the public feedback and used it in their review and analysis of various sections of the plan.

### HRPDC Web Site

Throughout the planning process, HRPDC maintained a web site at <http://www.hrpdcva.gov/departments/emergency-management/hampton-roads-hazard-mitigation-plan/> that provided a description of the planning process and posted meeting information. The page posted a copy of the draft plan prior to the final Public Meetings to provide the public an opportunity to comment. Those comments are addressed through the standard comment/response format documented in Appendix E. The web site was also used in summer and fall 2016 to post information related to the additional public comment period and public survey data collection effort.

## INVOLVING STAKEHOLDERS

### 44 CFR Requirement

**Part 201.6(b)(2):** The planning process shall include an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process.

A range of stakeholders, including neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, hospitals, and other interested parties were invited and encouraged to participate in the development of the Hazard Mitigation Plan. Stakeholder involvement was encouraged through notifications and invitations to agencies or individuals to participate in Planning Committee meetings and the Mitigation Strategy Workshops.

In addition to the Planning Committee meetings, the committee encouraged open and widespread participation in the mitigation planning process through the design and publication of newspaper advertisements that promoted the open public meetings. These media advertisements and the HRPDC web page postings provided opportunities for local officials, residents, and businesses to offer input.

During the 2015/2016 update process, additional stakeholders were invited to participate in one of three ways: 1) attend and participate in Committee meetings; 2) attend and participate in the Public Meetings; and/or 3) review draft documents and provide comments and critique. The additional stakeholders invited included:

- State agency representatives;
- HRPDC;
- Neighboring jurisdictions;
- Representatives from colleges and universities in the region;
- the National Weather Service;
- Representatives from utilities servicing the region;
- Representatives from military bases in the region; and,
- Representatives from the medical community.

The stakeholders identified as such in **Table 2.2** responded to a more formal request to serve as stakeholders and to participate in the planning process through one of the methods identified above.