SECTION 7 – CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

This section of the Plan discusses the capability of the covered localities to implement hazard mitigation activities. It consists of the following five subsections:

- What is a Capability Assessment?
- Updating the Capability Assessment
- Capability Assessment Findings
- Conclusions on Local Capability
- Linking the Capability Assessment, the Risk Assessment, and the Mitigation Strategy

The capability assessment was updated as described below.

What is a Capability Assessment?

The purpose of conducting a capability assessment is to determine the ability of a local jurisdiction to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy, and to identify potential opportunities for establishing or enhancing specific mitigation policies, programs or projects. As in any planning process, it is important to try to establish which goals, objectives and/or actions are feasible, based on an understanding of the organizational capacity of those agencies or departments tasked with their implementation. A capability assessment helps to determine which mitigation actions are practical and likely to be implemented over time given a local government's planning and regulatory framework, level of administrative and technical support, amount of fiscal resources and current political climate.

A capability assessment has two primary components: an inventory of a local jurisdiction's relevant plans, ordinances or programs already in place; and an analysis of its capacity to carry them out. Careful examination of local capabilities will detect any existing gaps, shortfalls or weaknesses with ongoing government activities that could hinder proposed mitigation activities and possibly exacerbate community hazard vulnerability. A capability assessment also highlights the positive mitigation measures already in place or being implemented at the local government level, which should continue to be supported and enhanced if possible through future mitigation efforts.

The capability assessment for the localities covered under this Plan Update serves as a critical planning step and an integral part of the foundation for designing an effective multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation strategy. Coupled with the *Risk Assessment*, the *Capability Assessment* helps identify and target meaningful mitigation actions for incorporation in the *Mitigation Strategy* portion of this Hazard Mitigation Plan. It not only helps establish the goals and objectives for the covered localities to pursue under this Plan, but also ensures that those goals and objectives are realistically achievable under given local conditions.

Updating the Capability Assessment

During the development of the original Plan, a detailed *Capability Assessment Survey* was conducted for each of the participating localities. For those localities, the assessment was updated. As part of the 2102 Plan update and the incorporation of Amelia County's Plan into the overall regional Plan, Amelia County was asked to complete the assessment as well. The assessment sought to gather information on a variety of "capability indicators" such as existing local plans, policies, programs and ordinances that contribute to and/or hinder the community's ability to implement hazard

mitigation actions. Other indicators included information related to each jurisdiction's fiscal, administrative and technical capabilities, such as access to local budgetary and personnel resources for mitigation purposes. Localities were also asked to comment on the current political capability of their jurisdiction to implement hazard mitigation actions, an important consideration for any local planning or decision-making process. This assessment is a critical step to develop a mitigation strategy that meets the needs of each jurisdiction while taking into account their own unique abilities.

At a minimum, this assessment provides an extensive inventory of existing local plans, ordinances, programs and resources currently in place or under development, in addition to their overall effect on hazard loss reduction. The information provided by participating jurisdictions was compiled by CRC staff, working with the project Management Team, and is included in this section. A general scoring methodology was then applied to quantify and rank each jurisdiction's overall capability relative to one another. According to the scoring system, each capability indicator was assigned a point value based on its relevance to hazard mitigation. Additional points were added based on each jurisdiction's self-assessment of their own planning and regulatory capability, administrative and technical capability, fiscal capability and political capability.

A total score and general capability rating of "High," "Moderate" or "Limited" was then determined for each jurisdiction according to the total number of points received. These classifications were updated, based on information provided by participating localities during the update process, and are designed to provide only a general assessment of each individual jurisdiction's local capability relative to one another using a consistent methodology. In combination with the narrative responses provided by local officials, the results of this multi-jurisdictional capability assessment lend critical information for developing an effective and meaningful mitigation strategy.

Capability Assessment Findings

The findings of the updated capability assessment are summarized in this Plan to provide insight into the relevant capacity of the covered localities to implement hazard mitigation activities. All information is based upon the responses provided by local government officials and during meetings of the Project Management Team (including mitigation workshops).

Planning and Regulatory Capability

Planning and regulatory capability is based on the implementation of plans, ordinances and programs that demonstrate a local jurisdiction's commitment to guiding and managing growth, development and redevelopment in a responsible manner while maintaining the general welfare of the community. It includes emergency response and mitigation planning, comprehensive land use planning and transportation planning, in addition to the enforcement of zoning or subdivision ordinances and building codes that regulate how land is developed and structures are built, as well as protecting environmental, historic and cultural resources in the community. Although some conflicts can arise, these planning initiatives generally present significant opportunities to integrate hazard mitigation principles and practices into the local decision making process.

This assessment is designed to provide a general overview of the key planning and regulatory tools or programs in place or under development for the jurisdictions covered in this update, along with their potential effect on loss reduction. This information will

help identify opportunities to address existing gaps, weaknesses or conflicts with other initiatives, in addition to integrating the implementation of this Plan with existing planning mechanisms where appropriate.

Table 7.1 provides a summary of the relevant local plans, ordinances and programs already in place or under development for the participating local governments. A checkmark (✓) indicates that the given item is currently in place and being implemented by the local jurisdiction (or in some cases by the county on behalf of that jurisdiction), and "UD" indicates that it is currently being developed for future implementation. A more detailed discussion on each jurisdiction's planning and regulatory capability follows, along with the incorporation of additional information based on the narrative comments provided by local officials.

Table 7.1
Relevant Plans, Ordinances and Programs

Jurisdiction	Hazard Mitigation Plan	Comprehensive Land Use Plan	Floodplain Management Plan	Open Space Management Plan	Stormwater Management Plan	Emergency Operations Plan	SARA Title III Plan	Radiological Emergency Plan	Continuity of Operations Plan	Evacuation Plan	Disaster Recovery Plan	Capital Improvements Plan	Economic Development Plan	Historic Preservation Plan	Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	Zoning Ordinance	Subdivision Ordinance	Unified Development Ordinance	Post-disaster Redevelopment / Recovery Ordinance	Building Code	Fire Code	National Flood Insurance Program
Amelia County	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓				✓	✓			✓		✓
Buckingham County	✓	✓	UD	UD		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	UD	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓
Town of Dillwyn	✓	✓														✓	✓			✓	✓	
Charlotte County	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓		✓						✓	✓			✓	✓	✓
Town of Charlotte C.H.	✓	✓														✓				✓		✓
Town of Drakes Branch	✓	✓													✓	✓				✓		✓
Town of Keysville	✓															✓	✓			✓		
Town of Phenix	✓														✓	✓				✓		✓
Lunenburg County	✓	✓ (UR)	✓			✓ (UR)	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	✓			✓		✓
Town of Kenbridge	✓	✓ (UR)				✓ (UR)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	
Town of Victoria	✓	✓ (UR)	✓			✓ (UR)		✓		✓	✓		✓			✓	✓			✓		
Nottoway County	✓	✓			UD	✓						✓				✓	✓			✓	✓	✓
Town of Blackstone	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Town of Burkeville	✓					✓										✓				✓		✓
Town of Crewe	✓	✓				✓						✓				✓	✓			✓		✓
Prince Edward County	✓	✓				✓	✓		✓	✓	UD				✓	✓	✓			✓		✓
Town of Farmville	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓

UD – Under Development; UR – Under Revision

In addition to the plans, ordinances and programs listed in **Table 7.1**, The Town of Keysville has an agreement with Agility through the Virginia Municipal League to supply generators for the Town's water and wastewater plants in the event of a disaster.

Centra Southside Community Hospital has a Hazardous Vulnerability Assessment which identifies risk and exposure to different types of hazards. The hospital also has plans and procedures in place to mitigate the effects of hazards on their equipment and facilities. Additionally, the hospital is a member of the Central Virginia Healthcare Coalition – a group of 17 facilities formed after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 to coordinate responses to future disasters.

The Virginia Department of Health – Piedmont Health District (PHD) has an emergency response plan to protect the health of the community in the case of an emergency. PHD serves all seven counties in Planning District 14. In January 2017, the program received recognition status from the National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO) after meeting the comprehensive preparedness benchmarks required by Project Public Health Ready, a partnership between NACCHO and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

During the Project Management Team meeting/workshop on July 29, 2016, members of the team noted that preparations for the Vice-Presidential Debate at Longwood University, scheduled for October 4, 2016, has strengthened local capabilities in the region.

Emergency Management

Hazard mitigation is widely recognized as one of the four primary phases of emergency management. Other phases include preparedness, response and recovery. In reality each phase is interconnected with hazard mitigation as **Figure 7.1** suggests. Planning for each phase is a critical part of a comprehensive emergency management program and a key to the successful implementation of hazard mitigation actions. As a result, the *Capability Assessment Survey* gathered information about a range of existing plans in order to assess the jurisdiction's willingness to plan and their level of technical planning proficiency.

Figure 7.1
The Four Phases of Emergency Management

Hazard Mitigation Plan: A hazard mitigation plan represents a community's blueprint for how it intends to reduce the impact of natural and human-caused hazards on people and the built environment. The essential elements of a hazard mitigation plan include a risk assessment, capability assessment and mitigation strategy.

- Prior to the development of the original Plan (and, in the case of Amelia County, their own individual Plan), neither the Commonwealth Regional Council (CRC) nor any of the localities located in Planning District 14 had previously prepared a hazard mitigation plan. The Regional Plan will be maintained and implemented by the CRC and each of the covered counties and towns, and is expected to have a high effect on loss reduction.

Disaster Recovery Plan: A disaster recovery plan serves to guide the physical, social, environmental and economic recovery and reconstruction process following a disaster. In many instances, hazard mitigation principles and practices are incorporated into local disaster recovery plans with the intent of capitalizing on opportunities to break the cycle of repetitive disaster losses.

- The updated capability assessment indicates that six (6) of the jurisdictions in Planning District 14 have a disaster recovery plan, and two (2) have it under development. If deemed necessary, the preparation of a region-wide disaster recovery plan should be considered by the Project Management Team as a potential mitigation action to propose in this Plan's *Mitigation Strategy*. One (1) locality has the development of a local plan listed as a mitigation action in the existing Plan.

Emergency Operations Plan: An emergency operations plan outlines responsibilities and the means by which resources are deployed following an emergency or disaster.

- All counties in the region maintain a countywide Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). The EOP addresses emergency operations, while the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) serves as the hub of operations during a disaster where local government officials and agency representatives from across the county will report to ensure all response efforts are effectively coordinated. County EOPs have been determined to have a moderate effect on loss reduction, as its emphasis focuses on preparedness and response operations versus hazard mitigation activities.

- Though not reflected in the survey result, all of the local municipal jurisdictions are covered by the county Emergency Operations Plans (EOP).

Continuity of Operations Plan: A continuity of operations plan establishes a chain of command, line of succession and plans for backup or alternate emergency facilities in case of an extreme emergency.

- The updated capability assessment indicates that five (5) jurisdictions in Planning District 14, two (2) counties and three (3) local municipalities have a continuity of operations plan in place. Each of the other municipal jurisdictions is encouraged to consider preparing their own continuity of operations plans as a possible mitigation action for inclusion in this Plan.

Radiological Emergency Plan: A radiological emergency plan delineates roles and responsibilities for assigned personnel and the means to deploy resources in the event of a radiological accident.

- Four (4) counties and four towns have a Radiological Emergency Plan.

SARA Title III Emergency Response Plan: A SARA Title III Emergency Response Plan outlines the procedures to be followed in the event of a chemical emergency such as the accidental release of toxic substances. These plans are required by federal law under Title III of the Superfund Amendments and Re-Authorization Act (SARA), also known as the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA).

- Five (5) counties and two local municipalities have an Emergency Response Plan for chemical emergencies. A variety of local government officials, chemical industry representatives and media outlets participate in the LEPC planning process per EPCRA requirements.

National Incident Management System (*NIMS*)*:* NIMS was introduced in April 2004 by the Department of Homeland Security. It serves as the Nation's first standardized management plan that creates a unified structure for Federal, state, and local lines of government for incident response.

The completion of NIMS follows the October 2003 nationwide deployment of the Initial National Response Plan (INRP) which represented the first step in aligning incident management response and actions between all Federal, state, tribal, local, and private communities. A final National Response Plan has been completed, and is available on the Internet at http://www.fema.gov/emergency/nrf/.

NIMS strengthens America's response capabilities by identifying and integrating core elements and best practices for all emergency responders and incident managers. Through a balance between flexibility and standardization, and use of common doctrine, terminology, concepts, principles, and processes, execution during a real incident will be consistent and seamless. Responders will be able to focus more on response, instead of organizing the response, and teamwork and assignments among all authorities will be clearly enhanced.

Several officials in the region have received formal training on NIMS.

General Planning

The implementation of hazard mitigation activities often involves agencies and individuals beyond the emergency management profession. Other stakeholders may include local planners, public works officials, economic development specialists and others. In many instances, concurrent local planning efforts will help to achieve or complement hazard mitigation goals even though they are not designed specifically as such. Therefore, the Capability Assessment also sought to determine each jurisdiction's general planning capabilities and to what degree hazard mitigation is integrated into other on-going planning efforts.

Comprehensive Land Use Plan: A comprehensive land use plan establishes the overall vision for what a community wants to be and serves as a guide to future governmental decision making. Typically, a comprehensive plan addresses demographic conditions, land use, transportation elements and community facilities. Given the broad nature of the plan and its regulatory standing in many communities, the integration of hazard mitigation measures into the comprehensive plan can enhance the likelihood of achieving risk reduction goals, objectives and actions.

- The updated capability assessment indicates that 15 jurisdictions in Planning District 14, all seven counties and eight local jurisdictions, are covered under their own comprehensive land use plan. Comprehensive land use plans are required by Virginia state law.

Capital Improvements Plan: A capital improvement plan guides the scheduling of, and spending on, public improvements. A capital improvements plan can serve as an important mechanism to guide future development away from identified hazard areas. Limiting public spending in hazardous areas is one of the most effective long-term mitigation actions available to local governments.

- The updated capability assessment indicates that eight (8) jurisdictions have a capital improvements plan, four counties and four local municipalities.

Historic Preservation Plan: A historic preservation plan is intended to preserve historic structures or districts within a community. An often overlooked aspect of the historic preservation plan is the assessment of buildings and sites located in areas subject to natural hazards, and the identification of the most effective way to reduce future damages. For more information, see *Protecting the Past from Natural Disasters* (1989. Nelson, Carl. National Trust for Historic Preservation: Washington, D.C.). This may involve retrofitting or relocation techniques that account for the need to protect buildings

that do not meet current building standards or are within a historic district that cannot easily be relocated out of harm's way.

- The updated capability assessment indicates that two (2) jurisdictions have a historic preservation plan.

Zoning Ordinances: Zoning represents the means by which land use is controlled by local governments. As part of a community's police power zoning is used to protect the public health, safety and welfare of those in a given jurisdiction that maintains zoning authority. A zoning ordinance is the mechanism through which zoning is typically implemented. Since zoning regulations enable municipal governments to limit the type and density of development, it can serve as a powerful tool when applied consistently in identified hazard areas.

- The updated capability assessment indicates that all of the jurisdictions have a zoning ordinance.

Subdivision Ordinances: A subdivision ordinance is intended to regulate the development of housing, commercial, industrial or other uses, including associated public infrastructure, as land is subdivided into buildable lots for sale or future development. Subdivision design that accounts for natural hazards can dramatically reduce the exposure of future development. For additional information regarding the use of subdivision regulations in reducing flood hazard risk, see *Subdivision Design in Flood Hazard Areas* (1997. Morris, Marya. Planning Advisory Service Report Number 473. American Planning Association: Washington, D.C.).

- The updated capability assessment indicates that 14 jurisdictions, all seven counties and seven local municipalities, have a subdivision ordinance.

Building Codes, Permitting and Inspections: Building Codes regulate construction standards. In many communities, permits are issued for and inspections of work take place on new construction. Decisions regarding the adoption of building codes (that account for hazard risk), the type of permitting process required both before and after a disaster, and the enforcement of inspection protocols all affect the level of hazard risk faced by a community.

- All of the seven counties and eight of the local municipalities have building codes. Many of the local jurisdictions rely on the counties to provide building code enforcement and inspections.

The adoption and enforcement of building codes by local jurisdictions is routinely assessed through the Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS) program developed by the Insurance Services Office, Inc. (ISO). Participation in BCEGS is voluntary and may be declined by local governments if they do not wish to have their local building codes evaluated. Under the BCEGS program, ISO assesses the building codes in effect in a particular community and how the community enforces its building codes, *with special emphasis on mitigation of losses from natural hazards*. The results of BCEGS assessments are routinely provided to ISO's member private insurance companies, which in turn may offer ratings credits for new buildings constructed in communities with strong BCEGS classifications. The concept is that communities with

well-enforced, up-to-date codes should demonstrate better loss experience, and insurance rates can reflect that. In conducting the assessment, ISO collects information related to personnel qualification and continuing education as well as number of inspections performed per day.

Jurisdictions that have building codes should verify their BCEGS rating and determine where any improvements can be made.

Floodplain Management

Flooding represents the greatest natural hazard facing the nation. At the same time, the tools available to reduce the impacts associated with flooding are among the most developed when compared to other hazard-specific mitigation techniques. In addition to approaches that cut across hazards, such as education, outreach, and the training of local officials, the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) contains specific regulatory measures that enable government officials to determine where and how growth occurs relative to flood hazards. Participation in the NFIP is voluntary for local governments, but the program is promoted by FEMA as a first step for implementing and sustaining an effective hazard mitigation program. Therefore, it is used as a key indicator for measuring local capability as part of this assessment.

In order for a county or municipality to join the NFIP, they must adopt a local flood damage prevention ordinance that requires jurisdictions to follow established minimum building standards in the floodplain. These standards require that all new buildings and substantial improvements to existing buildings will be protected from damage by the 100-year flood, and that new floodplain development will not aggregate existing flood problems or increase damage to other properties.

Another key service provided by the NFIP is the mapping of identified flood hazard areas. Once prepared, the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) are used to assess flood hazard risk, regulate construction practices and set flood insurance rates. FIRMs are an important source of information to educate residents, government officials and the private sector about the likelihood of flooding in their community.

Table 7.2 summarizes NFIP participation for each of the localities located in Planning District 14.

Table 7.2
NFIP Participation in Planning District 14

Jurisdiction	NFIP Entry Date	Current Effective Map (revised/digitized)*
Amelia County	09/01/1987	04/16/2009
Buckingham County	07/17/1978	06/17/2008
Town of Dillwyn	12/03/2008	06/17/2008
Charlotte County	11/01/1997	07/20/2009
Town of Charlotte Court House	05/13/2009	07/20/2009
Town of Drakes Branch	06/11/1982	07/20/2009
Town of Keysville	NP	07/20/2009
Town of Phenix	02/25/1983	07/20/2009
Lunenburg County	02/25/1983	07/20/2009
Town of Kenbridge	NP	07/20/2009
Town of Victoria	NP	07/20/2009
Nottoway County	09/01/1987	06/02/2009
Town of Blackstone	11/03/2008	06/02/2009
Town of Burkeville	2/13/2009	06/02/2009
Town of Crewe	04/16/1998	06/02/2009
Prince Edward County	07/01/1978	10/02/2009
Town of Farmville	09/01/1978	10/02/2009

Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency/Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation

An additional indicator of floodplain management capability is the active participation of local jurisdictions in the *Community Rating System* (CRS). The CRS is an incentive-based program that encourages counties and municipalities to undertake defined flood mitigation activities that go beyond the minimum requirements of the NFIP, adding extra local measures to provide protection from flooding. All of the 18 creditable CRS mitigation activities are assigned a range of point values. As points are accumulated and reach identified thresholds, communities can apply for an improved CRS class.

Class ratings, which run from 10 to 1, are tied to flood insurance premium reductions as shown in **Table 7.3**. As class ratings improve (number decreases), the percent reduction in flood insurance premiums for NFIP policyholders in that community increases.

Table 7.3
CRS Premium Discounts, By Class

CRS Class	Premium Reduction
1	45%
2	40%
3	35%
4	30%
5	25%
6	20%
7	15%
8	10%
9	5%
10	0

Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency

Community participation in the CRS is voluntary. Any community that is in full compliance with the rules and regulations of the NFIP may apply to FEMA for a CRS classification better than class 10. The CRS application process has been greatly simplified over the past several years based on community comments to make the CRS more user friendly as possible, and extensive technical assistance is also available for communities who request it.

- According to FEMA, there are currently no CRS communities in the region.

Floodplain Management Plan: A floodplain management plan (or a flood mitigation plan) provides a framework for action regarding the corrective and preventative measures in place to reduce flood-related impacts.

- The updated capability assessment indicates that five jurisdictions have prepared a floodplain management plan and one has it under development.

Stormwater Management Plan: A stormwater management plan is designed to address flooding associated with stormwater runoff. The stormwater management plan is typically focused on design and construction measures that are intended to reduce the impact of more frequently occurring minor urban flooding.

- The updated capability assessment indicates that two jurisdictions have prepared a storm water management plan and one has it under development.

Table 7.4 outlines what actions each locality takes with regard to the NFIP. The information is based on a table that each locality was asked to complete for the Plan, and asked the following questions:

FLOODPLAIN IDENTIFICAITON AND MAPPING

- Does the municipality maintain accessible copies of an effective Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)/Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map (DFIRM)? Does the municipality maintain accessible copies of the most recent Flood Insurance Study (FIS)?
- Has the municipality adopted the most current DFIRM/FIRM and FIS?
- Does the municipality support request for map updates?
- Does the municipality share with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) any new technical or scientific data that could result in map revisions within 6 months of creation or identification of new data?
- Does the municipality provide assistance with local floodplain determinations?
- Does the municipality maintain a record of approved Letters of Map Change?

FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT

- Has the municipality adopted a compliant floodplain management ordinance that, at a minimum, regulates the following:
    - Does the municipality issue permits for all proposed development in the Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs)?
    - Does the municipality obtain, review, and utilize any Base Flood Elevation (BFE) and floodway data, and/or require BFE data for subdivision proposals and other development proposals larger than 50 lots or 5 acres?
    - Does the municipality identify measures to keep all new and substantially improved construction reasonably safe from flooding to or above the BFE, including anchoring, using flood-resistant materials, and designing or locating utilities and service facilities to prevent water damage?
    - Does the municipality document and maintain records of elevation data that document lowest floor elevation for new or substantially improved structures?
- If a compliant floodplain ordinance was adopted, does the municipality enforce the ordinance by monitoring compliance and taking remedial action to correct violations?
- Has the municipality considered adopting activities that extend beyond the minimum requirements? Examples include:
    - Participation in the Community Rating System
    - Prohibition of production or storage of chemicals in SFHA
    - Prohibition of certain types of structures, such as hospitals, nursing homes, and jails in SFHA
    - Prohibition of certain types of residential housing (manufactured homes) in SFHA

FLOOD INSURANCE

- Floodplain ordinances that prohibit any new residential or nonresidential structures in SFHA
- Does the municipality educate community members about the availability and value of flood insurance?

- Does the municipality inform community property owners about changes to the DFIRM/FIRM that would impact their insurance rates?
- Does the municipality provide general assistance to community members regarding insurance issues?

A checkmark (✓) indicates that the given item is currently being implemented by the local jurisdiction (or in some cases by the county on behalf of that jurisdiction). More detailed information on each locality can be found in their respective appendix

Table 7.4
Actions Relevant to the NFIP (based on completed surveys from localities)

Jurisdiction	Maintain Accessible Copies of FIRM/DFIRM	Adopted the Most Current FIRM/DFIRM and FIS	Support Requests for Map Updates	Share New Data with FEMA That Could Result in Map Revisions	Provide Assistance with Local Floodplain Determinations	Maintain Records of Approved Letters of Map Change	Adopted a Compliant Floodplain Management Ordinance that regulates:	1) Issuing Permits for development in Flood Hazard Areas	2) Obtain, review, and Analyze Flood Elevation Data	3) ID Measures to Keep New/Improved Construction Safe from Flooding	4) Document and Maintain Records of elevation Data	Does Locality Enforce Ordinance?	Has Locality Considered Adopting Activities That Exceed Minimum Requirements?	Educated Community Members About Flood Insurance	Inform Property Owners About Changes to FIRM/DFIRM	Provide General Assistance to Community About Insurance
Amelia County	✓	✓			✓	✓						✓				
Buckingham County	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓
Town of Dillwyn		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓
Charlotte County	✓		✓		✓	✓										
Town of Charlotte C.H.																
Town of Drakes Branch	✓	✓			✓		✓					✓				
Town of Keysville																
Town of Phenix							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Lunenburg County	✓				✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓				
Town of Kenbridge	✓				✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓				
Town of Victoria	✓				✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓				
Nottoway County	✓	✓			✓		✓					✓				
Town of Blackstone	✓		✓	✓								✓			✓	✓
Town of Burkeville																
Town of Crewe																
Prince Edward County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓
Town of Farmville	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Administrative and Technical Capability

The ability of a local government to develop and implement mitigation projects, policies and programs is directly tied to its ability to direct staff time and resources for that purpose. Administrative capability can be evaluated by determining how mitigation-related activities are assigned to local departments and how adequate the personnel resources are for carrying the activities out. The degree of intergovernmental coordination among departments will also affect administrative capability for the implementation and success of proposed mitigation activities. Technical capability can generally be evaluated by assessing the level of knowledge and technical expertise of local government employees, such as personnel skilled in using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to analyze and assess community hazard vulnerability.

The *Capability Assessment Survey* was used to capture information on administrative and technical capability through the identification of available staff and personnel resources. **Table 7.5** provides a summary of the results for each jurisdiction in Planning District 14. A checkmark (✓) indicates that the given local staff member(s) is maintained through each particular jurisdiction's local government resources.

Table 7.5
Relevant Staff/Personnel Resources

Jurisdiction	Planners with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Engineers or professionals trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural and/or human-caused hazards	Emergency manager	Floodplain manager	Land surveyors	Scientist familiar with the hazards of the community	Staff with education or expertise to assess the community's vulnerability to hazards	Personnel skilled in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and/or HAZUS	Resource development staff or grant writers
Amelia Co.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		
Buckingham Co.	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Dillwyn										
Charlotte Co.	✓	✓		✓						✓
Charlotte C.H.										
Drakes Branch										
Town of Keysville										
Town of Phenix										
Lunenburg Co.	✓	✓		✓						✓
Kenbridge										
Victoria										
Nottoway Co.	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓	✓
Blackstone	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Burkeville										✓
Crewe										
Prince Edward Co.	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓			
Farmville	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Fiscal Capability

The ability of a local government to take action is often closely associated with the amount of money available to implement policies and projects. This may take the form of outside grant funding awards or locally-based revenue and financing. The costs associated with mitigation policy and project implementation vary widely. In some cases, policies are tied primarily to staff or administrative costs associated with the creation and monitoring of a given program.

In other cases, direct expenses are linked to an actual project such as the acquisition of flood-prone homes, which can require a substantial commitment from local, state and federal funding sources.

Gaining access to federal, state or other sources of funding is often an overriding factor driving the development of hazard mitigation plans. However, an important objective of local governments seeking a more sustainable future is the concept of self-reliance.

Over time, counties and municipalities should seek the means to become less dependent on federal assistance, developing a more diversified approach that assesses the availability of federal, state and locally-generated funding to implement mitigation actions. Additional assistance may be available from the business and corporate sector as well as certain non-profit groups. This should be coupled with an attempt to identify mitigation measures that cost little or no money, yet may compliment the larger array of actions identified in the plan.

The *Capability Assessment Survey* was used to capture information on each jurisdiction's fiscal capability through the identification of locally available financial resources.

Table 7.6 provides a summary of the results for each jurisdiction covered under this update. A checkmark (✓) indicates that the given fiscal resource is locally available for hazard mitigation purposes (including as match funds for state and federal mitigation grant funds).

Table 7.6
Relevant Fiscal Resources

Jurisdiction	Capital Improvement Programming	Community Development Block Grants	Special Purpose Taxes	Gas / Electric Utility Fees	Water / Sewer Fees	Storm water Utility Fees	Development Impact Fees	General Obligation Bonds	Revenue Bonds	Special Tax Bonds
Amelia County	✓	✓			✓					
Buckingham County	✓	✓		✓	✓					
Town of Dillwyn										
Charlotte County	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		
Town of Charlotte Court House				✓	✓					
Town of Drakes Branch				✓	✓					
Town of Keysville										
Town of Phenix		✓	✓							
Lunenburg County	✓			✓				✓		
Town of Kenbridge		✓	✓	✓	✓					
Town of Victoria		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Nottoway County	✓	✓								
Town of Blackstone	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		
Town of Burkeville		✓			✓			✓		
Town of Crewe		✓			✓					
Prince Edward County	✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	
Town of Farmville	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		

Political Capability

One of the most difficult capabilities to evaluate is the political will of a jurisdiction to enact meaningful policies and projects designed to reduce the impact of future hazard events. Hazard mitigation may not be a local priority, or could mistakenly be seen as an impediment to other goals of the community such as growth and economic development. The local political climate must be considered in designing mitigation strategies as it could be the most difficult hurdle to overcome in accomplishing their adoption or implementation.

The *Capability Assessment Survey* was used to capture information on each jurisdiction's political capability. Survey respondents were asked to identify some general examples of political capability for their jurisdiction, such as guiding development away from identified hazard areas, restricting public investments or capital improvements within hazard areas, or enforcing local development standards that go beyond minimum state or federal requirements (e.g. building codes, floodplain management, etc.). **Table 7.7** provides a summary of the individual responses for each participating jurisdiction (updated by each locality during the Plan update process).

Table 7.7
Political Capability

Jurisdiction	Comments
Amelia County	Local zoning and building codes historically have been based on minimum state and federal requirements. Historically, county government has not chosen to enact local ordinances that force requirements beyond the minimum required by state or federal guidelines.
Buckingham County	The County will comply with the State Code as it pertains to buildings located within the flood plain.
Town of Dillwyn	No comments.
Charlotte County	Historically, Charlotte County's local ordinances have been based on minimum state and federal requirements. County officials promote and implement hazard mitigation actions through cooperative planning with town officials; utilization of grant funding opportunities; and sharing information with other agencies, the private sector, and the general public.
Town of Charlotte Court House	No comments.
Town of Drakes Branch	No comments.
Town of Keysville	No comments.
Town of Phenix	We comply with state regulations regarding water.
Lunenburg County	Livestock Ordinance: challenges intensive livestock operations. Biosolids: publishes names and addresses of areas to be spread with biosolids prior to spreading in the local newspaper, example of public information/awareness.
Town of Kenbridge	No comments.
Town of Victoria	No comments.
Nottoway County	No comments.
Town of Blackstone	No comments.
Town of Burkeville	No comments.
Town of Crewe	No comments.
Prince Edward County	In Prince Edward County most hazards that we can do a lot about have already been addressed, such as floods with a floodplain ordinance. Most other hazards are more difficult to prepare for, but the [County] Board of Supervisors does have the political will to enact projects or laws that will protect both life and property.
Town of Farmville	Our Council has always been very receptive and ready to enact policies and programs that reduce hazard vulnerabilities. Examples of past actions include: adoption of emergency ordinances in drought situations, approval of storm water management project through EPA funding, enforcement of local building and floodplain ordinances, and approval of studies for alternative water supplies in the event of further drought situations.

Many communities did not comment on their current political capability. Those communities that have previously undertaken mitigation actions showed a willingness to pursue hazard mitigation actions.

County and Municipal Self Assessment

In addition to the inventory and analysis of specific local capabilities, each locality was asked to update its *Capability Assessment* – a self-assessment of the local government's capability to implement hazard mitigation activities. As part of this process, county and municipal officials were encouraged to consider the barriers to implementing proposed mitigation strategies in addition to the mechanisms that could enhance or further such strategies.

Local officials classified each of the aforementioned capabilities as either "limited," "moderate" or "high." **Table 7.8** summarizes the results of the updated self-assessment for each jurisdiction in Planning District 14. An "L" indicates limited capability; an "M" indicates moderate capability; and an "H" indicates high capability.

Table 7.8
Self-Assessment of Local Capability

Jurisdiction	Planning and Regulatory Capability	Administrative and Technical Capability	Fiscal Capability	Political Capability	Overall Capability
Amelia County	M	L	L	L	L
Buckingham County	L	M	L	L	L
Town of Dillwyn	M	L	L	L	L
Charlotte County	M	L	L	L	L
Town of Charlotte Court House	M	M	M	M	M
Town of Drakes Branch	L	L	L	L	L
Town of Keysville	L	L	L	L	L
Town of Phenix	L	L	M	L	M
Lunenburg County	M	M	M	M	M
Town of Kenbridge	H	H	M	H	H
Town of Victoria	M	L	L	L	M
Nottoway County	M	M	L	M	L
Town of Blackstone	M	M	L	M	M
Town of Burkeville	L	L	L	L	L
Town of Crewe	L	M	L	M	M
Prince Edward County	M	M	L	M	L
Town of Farmville	H	M	M	M	M

Review and Incorporation of Existing Plans, Studies, Reports and Technical Information

As part of the updated *Capability Assessment Survey*, each locality was asked to provide updated information on whether or not they have adopted certain ordinances, implemented certain plans or performed various studies, reports or technical studies. In addition, they were asked to evaluate the effectiveness on loss reduction for each (High, Moderate or Low). The results of the survey are found in **Table 7.9**.

Table 7.9
Impact on Loss Reduction of Existing Plans, Studies, Reports and Technical Information

Jurisdiction	Plans, Policies, Studies and their Current Impact on Loss Reduction
Amelia County	Hazard Mitigation Plan (High)*, Local Emergency Operations Plan (Medium)
Buckingham County	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Low), Floodplain Management Plan (Low), Open Space Management Plan (Low), Emergency Operations Plan (Moderate), SARA Title III/Hazardous Materials Facility Emergency Response Plan (Moderate), Radiological Emergency Plan (Low), Continuity of Operations Plan (Low), Capital Improvements Plan (Low), Economic Development Plan (Low), Floodplain Ordinance (Moderate), Zoning Ordinance (Low), Subdivision Ordinance (Low), Building Code (Moderate)
Town of Dillwyn	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Zoning Ordinance (Moderate), Subdivision Ordinance (Moderate)
Charlotte County	Hazard Mitigation Plan (High), Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Moderate), Emergency Operation Plan (Moderate), SARA Title III/Hazardous Materials Facility Emergency Response Plan (Moderate), Floodplain Ordinance (High), Zoning Ordinance (Moderate), Subdivision Ordinance (Low), Building Code (Moderate), Fire Code (Moderate), National Flood Insurance Program (Moderate)
Town of Charlotte C.H.	No information
Town of Drakes Branch	No information
Town of Keysville	No information
Town of Phenix	No information
Lunenburg County	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Updated Water Supply Plan (High)
Town of Kenbridge	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Updated Water Supply Plan (High), Plans to extend sewer to annexed areas of Town (High)
Town of Victoria	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Emergency Operations Plan (Moderate), Economic Development Plan (Moderate), Zoning Ordinance (Moderate), Subdivision Ordinance (Moderate), Building Code (moderate), Updated Water Supply Plan (High)
Nottoway County	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Emergency Operations Plan (Low), Building Code (Moderate), Zoning Ordinance (Moderate), Subdivision Ordinance (Low), National Flood Insurance Program (High), Comprehensive land Use Plan (Low), Floodplain Ordinance (Moderate)
Town of Blackstone	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Emergency Operations Plan (Low), Building Code (Moderate), Zoning Ordinance (Moderate), National Flood Insurance Program (High), Floodplain Ordinance (Moderate)
Town of Burkeville	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Emergency Operations Plan (Low), Building Code (Moderate), Zoning Ordinance (Moderate), Wellhead Protection Plan (Moderate)
Town of Crewe	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Emergency Operations Plan (Low), Building Code (Moderate), Zoning Ordinance (Moderate), National Flood Insurance Program (High), Floodplain Ordinance (Moderate)

Prince Edward County	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Low), Emergency Operations Plan (Low), SARA Title III/Hazardous Materials Facility Emergency Response Plan (Low), Continuity of Operations Plan (Low), Disaster Recovery Plan (Low), Floodplain Ordinance (High), Zoning Ordinance (Low), Subdivision Ordinance (Low), Building Code (Moderate), National Flood Insurance Program (High)
Town of Farmville	Hazard Mitigation Plan (Moderate), Emergency Operations Plan (Moderate), Comprehensive Plan (Moderate), Floodplain Ordinance (High), Zoning Ordinance (Moderate), Subdivision Ordinance (moderate), Building Code (High), National Flood Insurance Program (High)

Based upon the identification and review of effectiveness of existing plans, studies, reports and technical information, jurisdictions were able to identify certain improvements that can be made to the various planning tools. Some recommendations identified by localities have been converted into mitigation actions that can be found in *Appendix A*.

Conclusions on Local Capability

In order to form meaningful conclusions on the assessment of local capability, a quantitative scoring methodology was designed and applied to results of the updated *Capability Assessment*. This methodology, further described below, attempts to assess the level of capability for each jurisdiction in Planning District 14 by determining a general capability rating for each.

Points System for Capability Ranking

SCORING:

0-19 points = Limited overall capability
20-44 points = Moderate overall capability
45-77 points = High overall capability

I. Planning and Regulatory Capability (Up to 41 points)

Yes=3 points Under Development or Under County Jurisdiction=1 No=0 points

- Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Comprehensive Land Use Plan
- Floodplain Management Plan
- Participation in CRS Program

Yes=2 points Under Development or Under County Jurisdiction=1 No=0 points

- Open Space Management / Parks & Rec. Plan
- Post Disaster Recovery Plan
- Stormwater Management Plan
- Emergency Operations Plan
- SARA Title III
- Radiological Emergency Plan
- Continuity of Operations Plan
- Evacuation Plan
- Disaster Recovery Plan
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance

Yes=1 point No=0 points

- Capital Improvements Plan

- Economic Development Plan
- Historic Preservation Plan
- Zoning Ordinance
- Subdivision Ordinance
- Unified Development Ordinance
- Building Code
- Fire Code
- Participate in NFIP Program

II. Administrative and Technical Capability (Up to 15 points)

Yes=2 points No=0 points

- Planners with knowledge of land development and land management practices
- Engineers or professionals trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure
- Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural and/or human-caused hazards
- Emergency manager
- Floodplain manager

Yes=1 point No=0 points

- Land surveyors
- Scientist familiar with the hazards of the community
- Staff with education or expertise to assess the community's vulnerability to hazards
- Personnel skilled in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and/or HAZUS
- Resource development staff or grant writers

III. Fiscal Capability (Up to 11 points)

Yes=1 point No=0 points

- Capital Improvement Programming
- Community Development Block Grants
- Special Purpose Taxes
- Gas / Electric Utility Fees
- Water / Sewer Fees
- Stormwater Utility Fees
- Development Impact Fees
- General Obligation Bonds
- Revenue Bonds
- Special Tax Bonds
- Other

IV. Self-Assessment of Overall Capability (Up to 10 points)

High=2 points Moderate=1 points Low=0 points (Self-ranked by jurisdiction)

- Technical Capability
- Fiscal Capability
- Administrative Capability
- Political Capability
- Overall Capability

Note: This methodology is based on best available information. If a jurisdiction does not provide information on any of the above items, a point value of zero (0) will be assigned for that item.

Table 7.10 shows the results of the capability assessment using the scoring methodology described above. According to the assessment, the average local capability score for all local governments in the region is **26.1**.

Table 7.10
Capability Assessment Results

JURISDICTION	CAPABILITY SCORE	CAPABILITY RATING
Amelia County	40	Moderate
Buckingham County	40	Moderate
Dillwyn	10	Limited
Charlotte County	29	Moderate
Charlotte Court House	12	Limited
Drakes Branch	9	Limited
Keysville	5	Limited
Phenix	19	Limited
Lunenburg County	39	Moderate
Kenbridge	28	Moderate
Victoria	29	Moderate
Nottoway County	28	Moderate
Blackstone	47	High
Burkeville	11	Limited
Crewe	18	Limited
Prince Edward County	34	Moderate
Farmville	45	High

The capability of local governments in this region varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In general, the counties have higher capabilities than the local municipalities with the exception of the **Town of Farmville** (the largest municipality in the study area) and the **Town of Blackstone**. The comments received on the political capability of jurisdictions indicate an acceptance of the ideas behind hazard mitigation planning and a willingness to implement actions. At a minimum, jurisdictions indicate that they are interested in gathering more information during this update process so that additional appropriate hazard mitigation actions can be incorporated into this and future Plan updates.

An important consideration for the local governments in the region is to work with each other to apply this coordination to hazard mitigation. This Hazard Mitigation Plan provides a vehicle to begin this process. However, in order to succeed, it will require clearly articulating the benefits of participating in and sustaining the countywide mitigation planning process. One of the best ways to obtain local buy-in and long-term success is to identify and implement achievable mitigation actions (as listed in each jurisdictions' individual Mitigation Action Plans) that will facilitate continued intergovernmental coordination not only across the county, but with state and federal agencies as well.

Linking the Capability Assessment, the Risk Assessment, and the Mitigation Strategy

The conclusions of the *Capability Assessment* and *Risk Assessment* serve as the foundation for a meaningful hazard mitigation strategy. During the process of identifying the goals, objectives and mitigation actions, each jurisdiction must consider not only their level of hazard risk but also their existing capability to minimize or eliminate that risk. **Figure 7.2** shows a *Risk vs. Capability Matrix* that is used to illustrate each jurisdiction's overall hazard risk in comparison to their overall capability.

Overall hazard risk was determined for each jurisdiction using the results of the risk assessment (estimated losses for all natural hazards) combined with specific information on the following factors: total population, population growth rate, land area, historical disaster declarations, unique hazard risks, NFIP participation and the value of existing Pre-FIRM structures.

Figure 7.2
Risk vs. Capability Matrix

		HAZARD RISK		
		Limited	Moderate	High
OVERALL CAPABILITY	High			
	Moderate			
	Limited			

In jurisdictions where the overall hazard risk is considered to be HIGH, and local capability is considered LIMITED, then specific mitigation actions that account for these conditions should be considered. This may include less costly actions such as minor ordinance revisions or public awareness activities. Further, if necessary, specific capabilities may need to be improved in order to better address recurring threats. Similarly, in cases where the hazard vulnerability is LIMITED and overall capability is HIGH, more emphasis can be placed on actions that may impact future vulnerability such as guiding development away from known hazard areas.