

APPENDIX E: REVIEW COMMENTS

This section of the Plan includes each of the written comments received by various parties during review of the plan, as well as a response from the primary consultant addressing each comment in detail.

Reviewer: Bill Sammler, National Weather Service**Date: May 3, 2016**

1. Comment: A request for my input on page 43. I would re-word the sentence as follows: "Direct impacts from hurricanes category 3 and 4 intensity are rare in Hampton Roads due to 1). historical tracks remaining offshore or impacting land before reaching Hampton Roads; and cooler Atlantic Ocean water temperatures north of Cape Hatteras, which diminish a storm's ability to maintain intensity, or intensify. A Category 5 hurricane is considered implausible in Hampton Roads due to the cooler water temperatures mentioned above."
Response: Revised
2. Comment: On page 49, the note you have regarding Joaquin. There should be no reference to Joaquin in the document, as Joaquin had no direct impact on Hampton Roads. There should be some info regarding the coastal flooding associated with an anomalously strong/nearly stationary area of high pressure over New England. This produced a prolonged period of NE winds that resulted in the early October coastal flooding.
Response: Revised
3. Page 51 - first paragraph should be rewritten to read: "According to the NWS, tornado wind speeds normally range from 40 to more than 200 mph. The most violent tornadoes (EF5) have rotating winds of 200 mph or more and are capable of causing extreme destruction and turning normally harmless objects into deadly missiles."
Response: Revised
4. Page 51 - second paragraph, last sentence should read: "Highly destructive tornadoes may carve out a path over a mile wide and tens of miles long."
Response: Revised
5. Page 65 - Figure 4-20 - I would suggest deleting in favor of Figure 4-21. I don't see the usefulness of Figure 4-21, given the low resolution of the graphic.
Response: Revised

Reviewer: George Glazner, City of Newport News**Date: May 10, 2016**

1. Comment: Section 5 that the header says "2014 Update". Should this read 2016 instead?
Response: Revised

Reviewer: Sara Ruch, City of Hampton**Date: May 12, 2016**

1. Comment: Hampton Mitigation Action 2. Delete levees and backflow preventers. Modify cost to indicate cost will be based on specific flood protection measures chosen.
Response: Revised
2. Comment: Hampton Mitigation Action 4. Modify funding sources to indicate to be determined.
Response: Revised
3. Comment: Hampton Mitigation Action 6. Modify title to indicate watershed plan.
Response: Revised
4. Comment: Hampton Mitigation Action 7. Modify lead agency to indicate Marketing Inc. Department.
Response: Revised, but removed "Inc."
5. Comment: Hampton Mitigation Action 9. Modify cost to 7.9 million and indicate MS4 permit in comments.

- Response: Revised
6. Comment: Hampton Mitigation Action 12. Keep and modify goals to Goal 1 and estimated cost “to be determined”.
Response: Revised
 7. Comment: Hampton Mitigation Action 14. Modify estimated cost to 2.605 million.
Response: Revised
 8. Comment: Hampton Mitigation Action 15. Remove additional comments.
Response: Revised
 9. Comment: Pg. 4:41 I would combine the 2 Irene sections right now Hurricane Sandy is in the middle of the 2 sections.
Response: Revised
 10. Comment: Pg. 6:12 The second paragraph on the page is talking about Chesapeake’s government structure.
Response: Revised

Reviewer: Jim Redick, City of Norfolk

Date: May 16, 2016

1. Comment: No reference to the [National Disaster Mitigation Framework](#) in Introduction or throughout. This Framework is part of FEMA’s National Preparedness Goal and deserves mention.
Response: Revised in section 1 and section 6 to include mention and discussion.
2. Comment: Surge flooding (p. 4:10) is no longer associated with the Saffir-Simpson Wind scale. Here are a couple articles: http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/weather/storms/hurricanes/2010-05-12-storm-surge-hurricane-scale_N.htm and <https://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/perspective/7834/hurricane-storm-surge-category-its-own>.
Response: Concur and the Saffir Simpson table indicates this. However discussion on 4:10 is about the SLOSH model and our understanding is that the model still associates the surge and wind for modeling purposes.
3. Comment: Sea Level Rise and Land Subsidence section starting at p. 4:25:
 - a. Maybe cite some local sources like [ODU](#) and possibly the [State report](#) on Recurrent Flooding. DHS has also conducted a study on the potential impacts to critical infrastructure due to SLR.
 - b. I don’t recall seeing anything about the impacts of increased wave activity due to greater amounts of inundation.
 - c. Perhaps some of Norfolk’s objectives might also come from the [State report](#)? As well as [Vision2100](#)? The Resilience Office and HUD grant objectives?
 Response: Revised section 5 on pages 5:26 and 5:27 to include added effects from ODU site. Added localized impacts to section 4 at 4:26. See p. 4:25, paragraph 2 (added) and paragraph 4 (previously included discussion about wave activity). Objectives in this plan are regionwide and the committee worked through developing them as a group. Revisions specifically for Norfolk would have to be added by Norfolk in an appendix at a later date.
4. Comment: Per comment on p. 4:49, Norfolk did experience shoreline erosion during Joaquin / Noreaster last October.
Response: Revised
5. Comment: Worth referencing the 2012 Regional THIRA for Hurricane?
Response: Revised in section 6, page 6:5.
6. Comment: Mention Commodity Flow Study for Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth and Suffolk as a shared objective for HazMat Incident? And maybe the process by which the VEOC makes contact with the appropriate locality(ies) when they are notified of inbound Hazardous Materials?
Response: Included as Regional Mitigation Action #4

7. Comment: While discussing NFIP properties, it might be worth mention these are the ones we know about... that there are likely uninsured properties in under-resourced neighborhoods which also experience damage due to flooding. Possible to reference and cite Dr. Behr's and Dr. Diaz's study from ODU?
Response: Revised section 5 discussion.
8. Comment: P. 5:15 – a goal should be to update HAZUS with more accurate data as to better reflect more accurate cost impacts.
Response: Revised Regional Mitigation Action #3.
9. Comment: P. 5:17 – Who's map is this? Maybe use HRPDC's maps? Maybe somewhere list the different flood impact viewer tools for each locality?
Response: Map pertains to wildfire not flood. Flood map property viewers for each locality added to section 4.
10. Comment: Capability Assessment (P. 6:1) – mention the Region V Measures? Also, on what standards is Table 6.1 based? NFPA 1600? EMAP? CRS?
Response: Unsure what "Region V measures" are. Table 6.1 is based on amalgamation of various documents over the past 10 years as used by consultant.
11. Comment: Table 6.3 – In the spirit of whole-of-community, wouldn't *access* to people/resources suffice rather than actual City staff?
Response: Revised table before sentence to clarify that this was approach used.
12. Comment: P. 6:16, second bullet for Norfolk – The city has also acquired Everbridge, calling it Norfolk Alert, which will be used to alert those properties in flood-prone areas of the need to evacuate, etc.
Response: Revised
13. Comment: P. 6:17, next to last bullet for Norfolk, change "Public Works" to "The city..." Also, Norfolk GIS developed another tool called TITAN ([Tidal Inundation Tracking Application for Norfolk](#)) which shows potential flooding based on current tide projections or hypothetical scenarios. Note: a small MLLW to NAVD88 conversation of -1' must be used for better accuracy.
Response: Revised without the note.
14. Comment: Norfolk Mitigation Actions (p. 7:89)
 - a. #3 – I believe this to be completed with the procurement of Everbridge / NorfolkAlert.
 - b. #4 and #5 – Rather than limiting the resources to just CERT, perhaps say stakeholder agencies (all who have a role to play in flood management and response and can disseminate flood-related information).
 - c. #6 – Perhaps list inclusion in the [USACE EPFAT program](#) as the desired goal first while funding is being sought for generators?
 - d. #10 – Along with recommendation, another consideration might be to have volunteers identified, trained and used to capture and submit high-water marks for inclusion in data mapping as well as damage assessments to the state.
 - e. #12 – Instead of identifying if and how a property has been mitigated, how about *changing* it to decrease the number of SLR and RL properties?Response: Revised
15. Comment: I wonder if under Mitigation Strategy (p. 7:1), consideration should be coordination with and/or projects in line with Virginia's State Resilience Officer and VDEM State Resilience Officer in the region and/or the soon-to-be updated [Floodplain Management Plan for the Commonwealth of Virginia](#).
Response: It is the consultant's hope that the VDEM input over several meetings, emails and reviews will help provide this coordination. Discussions with VDEM officials at project onset helped set the stage.
16. Comment: Additional mitigation actions for Norfolk:
 - a. Develop and implement a Post-Incident Data Collection Plan - deploy volunteers, damage assessment teams, low-cost sensors and community (via social media) to capture high water data and marks.

- b. Have projects / designs / applications prepared in advance for potential, unannounced, short-fused funding opportunities.
- c. In coordination with Chief Marketing Officer, establish communication / information sharing plans and coordinate outreach materials - all using the same information and/or consolidating into one effort.
- d. Partner with higher education and Norfolk Public Schools and invest in the education of Norfolk's youth and college graduates – the city and region's future scientists and planners.

Response: These items were reviewed and incorporated with the assistance of Robert Tajan, City of Norfolk. In some cases, they were incorporated as aspects of other mitigation actions rather than as completely separate actions.

Reviewer: Pat Dent, City of Williamsburg

Date: May 17-18, 2016

1. Comment: I question Williamsburg's Repetitive Loss information on 5:9. Based on our previous discussions where the properties were located and the information for the claim was not accurate. However, I guess that is the information on file.
Response: Revised table to indicate City's stance on the data. The data still exist in NFIP database, so unless City submits AW-501 to have properties removed or changed, this issue will likely arise with each update to the plan.
2. Comment: Williamsburg Action #2, revise funding sources, lead agency and implementation schedule to focus on Public Works.
Response: Revised
3. Comment: Williamsburg Action #7, revise lead agency to indicate Human Services.
Response: Revised
4. Comment: page 4:11, Lake Matoaka is in the City of Williamsburg not James City County. Waller Mill Dam is operated and maintained by the City of Williamsburg, but is actually within the boundaries of York County.
Response: Revised
5. Comment: section 6. Revise matrix/tables as shown in attached.
Response: Revised

Reviewer: Darryl Cook, James City County

Date: May 18, 2016

1. Comment: Section 4, Figure 4.1. James City County now does have VE zones on both the James and York Rivers as a result of the FEMA coastal study. [not current flood data]
Response: Revised map to reflect current flood data, but HAZUS modeling was done at project outset and, out of necessity, was based on current effective flood data.
2. Comment: Section 4, Table 4.2. All the dams in JCC are earth dams.
Response: Revised.
3. Comment: Table 5.3. JCC Current Effective map date – 12/16/2015
Response: Revised.
Comment: JCC Mitigation Action 4. Cost is \$90,000 per structure, not per year.
Response: Revised.

Reviewer: Andrea Clontz, Isle of Wight County**Date: May 19, 2016**

1. Comment: IOW Mitigation Action #14 – last sentence under additional comments section – change City to County
Response: Revised

Reviewer: Meg Pittenger, City of Portsmouth**Date: May 19, 2016**

1. Comment: Section 3 page 2 – Seems like the wrong size in the chart for Franklin.
Response: Revised.
2. Comment: Section 4 page 2 – The nor'easter in 2009 was in November instead of December.
Response: This was the date of the declaration, not the event. Clarified column title.
3. Comment: Section 4 page 8 – These appear to be the wrong flood maps for Portsmouth. It looks like the 2009 maps instead of the 2015 maps.
Response: Revised map to reflect current flood data, but HAZUS modeling was done at project outset and, out of necessity, was based on current effective flood data.
4. Comment: Section 6 page 6 – Portsmouth has adopted the 2012 USBC.
Response: Revised
5. Comment: Section 6 page 11 & 12 – These sections seem to only reference Chesapeake. Certainly, those do not apply to the other localities.
Response: Revised
6. Comment: Section 6 page 14 – Under “Regional Activities”, the CRS Workgroup is the Coastal Virginia
Response: Revised
7. Comment: Section 7 – Mitigation Actions - #9 – I agree with that change (removal of “citizen actions”) - #14 – “Implement” seems like a good option there.
Response: Revised

Reviewer: Whitney McNamara, City of Virginia Beach**Date: May 19, 2016**

1. Comment: Page 4.8, Figure 4.2 does not fully show Virginia Beach or Chesapeake
Response: Revised these figures.
2. Comment: Table 4.2 is missing the high hazard dams in Virginia Beach – I think there are 3 (Stumpy Lake for sure)
Response: Revised to add dams with limited data from DCR; however, map cannot be revised until the National Inventory of Dams is updated to include all cities in Virginia. This will be done prior to plan publication.
3. Comment: Page 6.6 references the 2009 VA USBC, however, the 2012 VA USBC went into effect in 2014
Response: Revised
4. Comment: Page 6.11 only references Chesapeake, not the broader region in the text.
Response: Revised

Reviewer: Shar Mohammed, City of Newport News**Date: May 20, 2016**

1. Comment: In the Introduction section, page 1:2, first paragraph, line 6, I think we should clarify the word (Elevation) and making it elevation changing.

Response: Revised to clarify, but used different wording than suggested.

2. Comment: Section 7, Mitigation Strategy, Page 33, Shoreline and Roadway along Chesapeake Ave, the proposed amount was \$20M not \$1M. Also, we should add a line item stating that this proposed project was not approved or selected by HUD for Newport News (they announced it on January 21, 2016).

Response: Revised

Reviewer: Vince Holt, City of Franklin

Date: May 20, 2016

1. Comment: Table 3.1 shows the City of Franklin being 42 square miles. It is actually 8.75 square miles.

Response: Revised

Reviewer: Kim Hummel, Isle of Wight County

Date: May 20, 2016

1. Comment: Table 3.2, the temperature and precipitation statistics for the region. The maximum temperature data looked off to me, since summertime temperatures can easily rise into the 90s and sometimes even the 100s. Why would the table list maximum temperatures in the 70s? That just doesn't jive with my experience here in Isle of Wight County. Is the table inaccurate or am I misinterpreting the data?

Response: Doublechecked the data from the source and then requested clarification from NWS. Response from Bill Sammler: "Those numbers look correct to me, Leigh. One must remember that these are annual averages, and not averages for a particular season or month. Basically, winter "cancels out" summer (from a practical perspective), and the spring/autumn averages are close to the annual average."

Reviewer: Brian Donegan, Norfolk Resident

Date: June 27, 2016

Note: The full text of Mr. Donegan's comments is available upon request from the HRPDC. The following are his Conclusions and Recommendations.

1. Comment: HRPDC's attempts at conducting public outreach for and incorporating public feedback into the HRHMP planning process were so ineffective as to obstruct meaningful public participation.
Response: Steering Committee members and other consultants nationwide note that public participation is generally low for similar planning efforts unless a recent disaster has brought mitigation issues to the forefront of the public conscious. While the committee felt that our *efforts* were worthwhile, the results were admittedly less than desired. An additional effort was made to gather public feedback in summer 2016 and the results have been documented in Section 2 and the appendices.
2. Comment: HRPDC efforts produced no public participation of significance and generated scant public feedback in time to affect the substantive decision making and planning processes.
Response: Concur. As stated above, additional efforts were made to gather public feedback in summer 2016, edit the plan as indicated, and the results have been documented in Section 2 and the appendices.
3. Comment: Although HRPDC had limited public feedback in its possession, it withheld this from the Planning Committee during decision-making and planning sessions.
Response: Information obtained from public comment was utilized in both presentations to the planning committee and drafting of the plan. Additionally, in July 2016, we reached back out to the committee with all of the public feedback received and asked that each community reconvene

their subgroup to discuss the public feedback and report back to the PDC whether the information resulted in recommended changes to any sections of the plan, including Sections 4 and 5.

4. Comment: The HRHMP presents a narrative surrounding public outreach, participation, feedback collection and incorporation, and communication with the public that is so inaccurate it distorts the facts to the point an external reviewer cannot effectively evaluate 44 CFR §201.6 compliance.
Response: While we do not concur that the Section 2 narrative is fundamentally inaccurate, nor that it hinders evaluation against 44 CFR §201.6, we have made minor revisions to the descriptions as suggested, in an effort to address the stated concerns.
5. Comment: As a result, the 2016 Hampton Roads Hazard Mitigation Plan does not comply with requirements 44 CFR §201.6 as interpreted and articulated in FEMA Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide, October 1, 2011. The plan appears to be noncompliant with Element A.3 and only partially compliant with Element A.1
Response: Element A1 requires documenting the planning process and indicating how the public was involved as we have done in Section 2. Element A3 requires that the planning process include an opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during drafting stage and prior to plan approval. We have hosted and adequately advertised 5 public meetings, regionally distributed throughout the planning area, to gather public comment, and have added an additional meeting in September and more outreach in summer 2016. It is our opinion that this amount of public outreach is ample. Plan adoption will not occur until later fall 2016, so all of this outreach happened prior to adoption by communities.
6. Recommendation: HRPDC should attempt to achieve full compliance with Element A.1 of the Guide by implementing the recommendations provided above to correct the misrepresentations in the HRHMP regarding public outreach, participation, feedback collection and incorporation, and communication with the public.
Response: As indicated in 4 above, we have made revisions to the descriptions in Section 2 in an effort to address the stated concerns.
7. Recommendation: As described in the above section regarding Incorporation of Public Feedback, the only point in the HRHMP development process [where] substantive public feedback could be practically incorporated in a meaningful way was during the Planning Committee meetings of late 2015. After those meetings, the decision-making and planning processes were so advanced that to incorporate substantive public comment would require reconvening the Planning Committee to develop new elements of the plan from new entering arguments. Such activity would be a misuse of grant funding, taxpayer dollars and municipal staff time. At this point in the plan development process there is no reasonable, cost effective, action to remediate the omission of public feedback. As a result, conducting additional public outreach to collect feedback that may alter the structure of the plan is not recommended.
Response: We have delayed the review and adoption process by several weeks to make additional efforts to seek committee feedback on previously-obtained public comment, to obtain additional public comment, to repost the hazard mitigation plan, to host another public meeting and to again ask for committee feedback on public comments.
8. Recommendation: HRPDC should seek agreement with state and federal regulators to move forward with the plan while noting its non-compliance with Element A.3. HRPDC should propose that this deficiency be remediated by the development of detailed corrective action plan. The detailed corrective action itself should be the focus of a concerted effort to generate public involvement. This corrective action plan should be used as the basis for structuring the Continued Public Involvement section of the HRHMP.
Response: We disagree that the plan does not comply with Element A3 as noted in 5 above. We will restructure the Continued Public Involvement subsection in Section 8 to include more detail on the recommended strategies. The HRPDC cannot, however, dictate or mandate how individual communities implement the plan during the 5 years after adoption. The strategies are simply actions that may have proven effective for other communities in the past. We have added an Opportunities for Improvement subsection in Section 8 to identify possible methods for improving public outreach in future updates to the plan.
9. Recommendation: The current Continued Public Involvement section of the HRHMP should be replaced with a new section that incorporates the corrective action plan described above. This section, in its current form, is not credible given the dearth of public involvement achieved during

18 months of supposedly dedicated effort. It is impossible to forecast the success of planned actions such as:

- Advertising meetings of the committee in the local newspaper, public bulletin boards, web sites, social media and City buildings;
- Designating willing citizens and private sector representatives as official members of the planning committee;
- Using local media to update the public about any maintenance or periodic review activities taking place;
- Using questionnaires and Open Houses to obtain public comments on the Plan and its implementation;
- Using community web sites to advertise any maintenance or periodic review activities taking place; and
- Maintaining copies of the Plan in public libraries, on the web, or other appropriate venues. (HRHMP 8:4)

Response: Public involvement during the 5-year period between plan updates is up to the discretion of each community's committee and, for this reason, is not specified or required in detail in the plan. In Section 8, the plan provides some guidance for ideas that have worked in the past for Hampton Roads or other communities and provides some ideas for involving the public. Again, these are strategies and ideas, not mandates. We will investigate other methods that have worked nationwide and add detail or other options to this section.

10. Recommendation: However, it clear that similar aspirations expressed during the past 18 months did not produce any meaningful public involvement. Therefore, HRPDC should conduct a thorough examination to determine how such poor participation was tolerated during the current effort and what best practices could be applied to generate meaningful public participation during HRHMP maintenance and 2021 revision. This examination should be the precursor to and should inform the development of, the corrective action plan.

Response: See 8 above for actions that we will take to modify the plan in response to this comment.

Reviewer: Carole Garrison, Hampton Resident

Date: August 4, 2016

1. Comment: I am concerned because in the chart 4.8 the Ocean and Lake surf events Hampton is only listed on the final event of last year. That is incorrect. Strong waves hit the beaches and flooded neighborhoods on the following dates which already have other cities listed for these events: 1) Oct 2006; 2) Nov 2006; 3) Nov 2009; 4) Oct 2012. Also no area is listed as being effected for surf during Isabel Sept 2003. That caused massive flooding and damage in the whole region. The current was so strong it blew an opening in the beach at Factory Point which needed to be repaired. I thought maybe it was left off because it was a named storm but then realized you had already listed Sandy which was also a named storm. Thank you for looking into this matter I do not want it to appear Hampton does not have issues resulting from waves.

Response: Thank you for the careful review of the table. We have added this information to Table 4:8.

Reviewer: Ryan M. Kmetz

Date: August 31, 2016

1. Comment: Overall- There does not seem to be any sensitivity analysis of the potential effects of climate change. While all the references are best practices - they primarily focus on historical data. Many municipalities and regions in the Northeast have recognized this and have included this analysis in the HMP updates (e.g. Manchester-by-the-Sea, MA).

Response: Climate change is a sensitive political topic and attempting to have all of the elected officials in Hampton Roads agree on the potential effects of climate change would likely have become a strong focus of the plan, thereby detracting from the necessary focus on mitigation

actions. By focusing on historical impacts in Section 5, and providing just one potential scenario as selected from the sensitivity analysis which is included in the 2012 report referenced (*Climate Change in Hampton Roads, Phase III: Sea Level Rise in Hampton Roads, Virginia*), we felt that the vulnerability was sufficiently described in enough detail for the committee and the public to prepare associated mitigation actions.

2. Comment: Frictional Effects - How valid are the model outputs if the data inputs are based on the NLCD data from 2001? In addition to significant anthropogenic land use changes, we have had at least one major hurricane (Isabel). One would assume that this storm would have significantly altered the land cover.

Response: Individual model components and data inputs to FEMA's HAZUS program are many, complicated and slow to change. It was not until 2015 that the model incorporated data from the 2010 Census, and the model still runs on outdated versions of the requisite GIS software. However, HAZUS is the only tool we know that provides useful hurricane vulnerability numbers for planning purposes such as this. Our HAZUS consultants indicate that the apparent focus of recent updates to HAZUS have been making certain that the building and population data are as up to date as possible.

Reviewer: Linda Killebrew via email

Date: September 21, 2016

1. Keep the drains cleared in the ravines behind people's houses.

Response: Drainage system maintenance is a component for many communities covered under this plan. Your comment was forwarded and reviewed by the committee to determine if changes to the mitigation action plan were necessary.

Reviewer: Patricia VonOhlen, Newport News Resident

Date: September 21, 2016

1. I would like to see more flood prevention strategies used: living shorelines, more green spaces, and other strategies to help shoreline residency, green infrastructure that slows storm water from delivery to our waterways so that rain can soak in and natural filtering occurs, find/fix bacteria leaks.

Response: Your comment was forwarded and reviewed by the Newport News committee members to determine if changes to the mitigation action plan were called for. We also contacted VDEM to determine fairly recent changes to the hazard mitigation funding programs that involve green infrastructure in order to guide our inclusion of this in the plan. Several actions were updated to indicate that green infrastructure considerations may change the benefits cost ratio and increase available funding sources.

Reviewer: unknown

Date: September 27, 2016

1. Sec 5, p. 33. Figure 5.17 the colors are not useful or visible for colorblind people.

Response: While we appreciate your comment and are happy to accommodate your needs upon request, we find it is impractical to alter all of the figures in this document to be black and white.

Reviewer: unknown

Date: September 27, 2016

1. Include information about how to get hazard mitigation assistance for homes and companies.

Response: We appreciate your comment, but this task is outside the scope of this plan. The plan is geared toward identifying actions communities should take with regard to hazard

mitigation. Please note that many communities have included public information campaign actions to do precisely as you have indicated.

Reviewer: Robert Lane, Williamsburg Resident

Date: September 29, 2016

1. I live in Williamsburg and received an email from the City asking me to provide feedback to you on the working draft. I spent some time with it, (can't say I read it all), and was quite impressed with the amount and organization of the information. I did not review the Appendices. I don't have any specific comments and I didn't see anything that appeared to me to be in error. I could suggest that the overall conclusions be collected and summarized either at the beginning or the end, (even though this would mean most would only read that section). Otherwise, it is a bit voluminous to be an effective working document. Although on second thought, perhaps this is more an umbrella document for all the various municipality implementation plans addressing the hazards as they pertain to their locality. Overall, it seems thorough and well thought out.
Response: The hazard mitigation strategies in Section 7 are the result and thus the main conclusion of the document. These are specific to each of the 22 communities, thus it is difficult to summarize them in an effective way.