

## SECTION 7 – CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

This section of the Plan discusses the capability of the jurisdictions in Planning District 14 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 in Planning District 14 and its municipalities 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 localities in Planning District 14 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 Plan update process, 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

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

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 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 localities in Planning District 14 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 in Planning District 14, along with their potential effect on loss reduction. This information

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

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 Planning District’s 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         | ✓                      |                             |                            |                            |                            |                           |                     |                             |                               |                 |                        |                           |                           |                            | ✓                                 | ✓                |                       |                               |  |               |           | ✓                                |
| Cumberland County      | ✓                      | ✓                           | ✓                          | UD                         | ✓                          | ✓                         | ✓                   | ✓                           |                               | ✓               | ✓                      | ✓                         | UD                        |                            | ✓                                 | ✓                | ✓                     |                               |  | ✓             | ✓         | ✓                                |
| Lunenburg County       | ✓                      | ✓                           | ✓                          |                            |                            | ✓                         | ✓                   | ✓                           | ✓                             | ✓               | ✓                      |                           |                           |                            | ✓                                 | ✓                | ✓                     |                               |  | ✓             | ✓         | ✓                                |
| Town of Kenbridge      | ✓                      | ✓                           |                            |                            |                            | ✓                         |                     | ✓                           | ✓                             | ✓               | ✓                      | ✓                         | ✓                         | ✓                          |                                   | ✓                | ✓                     |                               |  | ✓             | ✓         |                                  |
| Town of Victoria       | ✓                      | ✓                           | ✓                          |                            |                            | ✓                         |                     | ✓                           | ✓                             | ✓               | ✓                      |                           | ✓                         |                            |                                   | ✓                | ✓                     |                               |  | ✓             |           |                                  |
| Nottoway County        | ✓                      | ✓                           |                            |                            | UD                         | ✓                         |                     |                             |                               |                 |                        | ✓                         |                           |                            |                                   | ✓                | ✓                     |                               |  | ✓             | ✓         | ✓                                |
| Town of Blackstone     | ✓                      | ✓                           |                            |                            |                            | ✓                         | ✓                   | ✓                           | ✓                             | ✓               | ✓                      | ✓                         | ✓                         | ✓                          |                                   | ✓                | ✓                     | ✓                             |  | ✓             | ✓         | ✓                                |
| Town of Burkeville     | ✓                      |                             |                            |                            |                            | ✓                         |                     |                             |                               |                 |                        |                           |                           |                            |                                   | ✓                |                       |                               |  | ✓             |           | ✓                                |
| Town of Crewe          | ✓                      | ✓                           |                            |                            |                            | ✓                         |                     |                             |                               |                 |                        | ✓                         |                           |                            |                                   | ✓                | ✓                     |                               |  | ✓             |           | ✓                                |
| Prince Edward County   | ✓                      | ✓                           |                            |                            |                            | ✓                         | ✓                   | ✓                           |                               |                 | UD                     |                           |                           |                            | ✓                                 | ✓                | ✓                     |                               |  | ✓             |           | ✓                                |
| Town of Farmville      | ✓                      | ✓                           | ✓                          | ✓                          | ✓                          | ✓                         | ✓                   | ✓                           | ✓                             | ✓               | ✓                      | ✓                         |                           |                            | ✓                                 | ✓                | ✓                     |                               | ✓  | ✓             | ✓         | ✓                                |

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

## 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.



*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 nor any of the localities located in Planning District 14 had previously prepared a hazard mitigation plan. This Plan will be maintained and implemented by the Commonwealth Regional Council 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

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

(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 seven (7) jurisdictions in Planning District 14, three (3) counties and four (4) 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.

- Five (5) of the counties and four local municipalities 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).

- Six 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.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

*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.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

- 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.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

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.



# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

**Table 7.2**  
**NFIP Participation in Planning District 14**

| Jurisdiction                  | NFIP Entry Date | Current Effective Map (revised/digitized)* |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| <b>Amelia County</b>          | 09/01/1987      | 04/16/2009                                 |
| <b>Buckingham County</b>      | 07/17/1978      | 06/17/2008                                 |
| Town of Dillwyn               | 06/17/2008      | 06/17/2008                                 |
| <b>Charlotte County</b>       | 11/01/1997      | 07/20/2009                                 |
| Town of Charlotte Court House | 07/20/2009      | 07/20/2009                                 |
| Town of Drakes Branch         | 06/11/1982      | 07/20/2009                                 |
| Town of Keysville             | N/A             | N/A  |
| Town of Phenix                | 02/25/1983      | 07/20/2009                                 |
| <b>Cumberland County</b>      | 02/15/1979      | 06/16/2009                                 |
| <b>Lunenburg County</b>       | 02/25/1983      | 07/20/2009                                 |
| Town of Kenbridge             | N/A             | N/A  |
| Town of Victoria              | N/A             | N/A  |
| <b>Nottoway County</b>        | 09/01/1987      | 06/02/2009                                 |
| Town of Blackstone            | 11/03/2008      | 06/02/2009                                 |
| Town of Burkeville            | 02/13/2009      | 06/02/2009                                 |
| Town of Crewe                 | 06/02/2009      | 06/02/2009                                 |
| <b>Prince Edward County</b>   | 09/01/1978      | 10/02/2009                                 |
| <b>Town of Farmville</b>      | 09/01/1978      | 10/02/2009                                 |

Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency/Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation  
\*FEMA recently revised its flood maps and underwent a process to digitize them. The dates for the current effective maps in the above table reflect those changes.

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.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

**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 Planning District 14.

*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.

## 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

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

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 7.4** 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 7.4**  
**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 |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------|--------------------|----------------|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Amelia Co.</b>             | ✓   | ✓   | ✓  | ✓                 |                    |                |  | ✓  |  |   |
| <b>Buckingham Co.</b>         | ✓   | ✓   | ✓  | ✓                 |                    |                | ✓  | ✓  |  |   |
| Town of Dillwyn               |   |   |  |                   |                    |                |  |  |  |   |
| <b>Charlotte Co.</b>          | ✓   | ✓   |  | ✓                 |                    |                |  |  |  |   |
| Town of Charlotte Court House |   |   |  |                   |                    |                |  |  |  |   |
| Town of Drakes Branch         |   |   |  |                   |                    |                |  |  |  |   |
| Town of Keysville             |   |   |  |                   |                    |                |  |  |  |   |
| Town of Phenix                |   |   |  |                   |                    |                |  |  |  |   |
| <b>Cumberland Co.</b>         | ✓   | ✓   |  | ✓                 |                    |                |  | ✓  |  |   |
| <b>Lunenburg Co.</b>          | ✓   | ✓   |  | ✓                 |                    |                |  |  |  | ✓   |
| Kenbridge                     |   |   |  |                   |                    |                |  |  |  |   |
| Victoria                      |   |   |  |                   |                    |                |  |  |  |   |
| <b>Nottoway Co.</b>           | ✓   | ✓   | ✓  | ✓                 |                    |                |  |  |  | ✓   |
| Blackstone                    | ✓   | ✓   | ✓  | ✓                 |                    | ✓              |  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓   |
| Burkeville                    |   |   |  |                   |                    |                |  |  |  | ✓   |
| Crewe                         |   |   |  |                   |                    |                |  |  |  |   |
| <b>Prince Edward Co.</b>      | ✓   |   | ✓  | ✓                 | ✓                  |                | ✓  |  |  |   |
| Farmville                     |   | ✓   |  | ✓                 |                    |                |  |  |  |   |

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

## 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 7.5** provides a summary of the results for each jurisdiction in Planning District 14. 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).

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

**Table 7.5  
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 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <b>Amelia County</b>          | ✓                               | ✓                                  |                       |                             | ✓                  |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| <b>Buckingham County</b>      | ✓                               | ✓                                  |                       | ✓                           | ✓                  |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| Town of Dillwyn               |                                 |                                    |                       |                             |                    |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| <b>Charlotte County</b>       | ✓                               |                                    | ✓                     | ✓                           |                    |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| Town of Charlotte Court House |                                 |                                    |                       | ✓                           | ✓                  |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| Town of Drakes Branch         |                                 |                                    |                       | ✓                           | ✓                  |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| Town of Keysville             |                                 |                                    |                       |                             |                    |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| Town of Phenix                |                                 | ✓                                  | ✓                     |                             |                    |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| <b>Cumberland County</b>      | ✓                               | ✓                                  |                       | ✓                           | ✓                  |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| <b>Lunenburg County</b>       | ✓                               |                                    |                       | ✓                           |                    |                          |                         | ✓                        |               |                   |
| Town of Kenbridge             |                                 | ✓                                  | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                  |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| Town of Victoria              |                                 | ✓                                  | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                  |                          |                         | ✓                        | ✓             |                   |
| <b>Nottoway County</b>        | ✓                               | ✓                                  |                       |                             |                    |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| Town of Blackstone            | ✓                               | ✓                                  | ✓                     | ✓                           | ✓                  |                          |                         | ✓                        |               |                   |
| Town of Burkeville            |                                 | ✓                                  |                       |                             | ✓                  |                          |                         | ✓                        |               |                   |
| Town of Crewe                 |                                 | ✓                                  |                       |                             | ✓                  |                          |                         |                          |               |                   |
| <b>Prince Edward County</b>   | ✓                               | ✓                                  |                       | ✓                           |                    |                          |                         | ✓                        |               |                   |
| <b>Town of Farmville</b>      |                                 | ✓                                  |                       | ✓                           | ✓                  | ✓                        |                         | ✓                        |               |                   |

## 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 7.6** provides a summary of the individual responses for each jurisdiction in Planning District 14 (updated by each locality during the Plan update process).

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

**Table 7.6  
Political Capability**

| Jurisdiction                  | Comments  |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Amelia County</b>          | 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.  |
| <b>Buckingham County</b>      | The County will comply with the State Code as it pertains to buildings located within the flood plain.  |
| Town of Dillwyn               | No comments.  |
| <b>Cumberland County</b>      | No comments.  |
| <b>Charlotte County</b>       | The need to address hazard mitigation in development practices is identified in the County's Comprehensive Plan. These issues will be considered when the County's zoning and subdivision ordinances undergo a full review.   |
| 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.   |
| <b>Lunenburg County</b>       | 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.  |
| <b>Nottoway County</b>        | No comments.  |
| Town of Blackstone            | No comments.  |
| Town of Burkeville            | No comments.  |
| Town of Crewe                 | No comments.  |
| <b>Prince Edward County</b>   | 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.   |
| <b>Town of Farmville</b>      | 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.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

Local officials classified each of the aforementioned capabilities as either “limited,” “moderate” or “high.” **Table 7.7** 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 7.7**  
**Self-Assessment of Local Capability**

| Jurisdiction                  | Planning and Regulatory Capability | Administrative and Technical Capability | Fiscal Capability | Political Capability | Overall Capability |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Amelia County</b>          | M                                  | L                                       | L                 | L                    | L                  |
| <b>Buckingham County</b>      | L                                  | M                                       | L                 | L                    | L                  |
| Town of Dillwyn               | M                                  | L                                       | L                 | L                    | L                  |
| <b>Charlotte County</b>       | L                                  | 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                  |
| <b>Cumberland County</b>      | M                                  | L                                       | M                 | L                    | M                  |
| <b>Lunenburg County</b>       | M                                  | M                                       | M                 | M                    | M                  |
| Town of Kenbridge             | H                                  | H                                       | M                 | H                    | H                  |
| Town of Victoria              | M                                  | L                                       | L                 | L                    | M                  |
| <b>Nottoway County</b>        | 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                  |
| <b>Prince Edward County</b>   | M                                  | M                                       | L                 | M                    | L                  |
| <b>Town of Farmville</b>      | 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 7.8**.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

**Table 7.8**  
**Impact on Loss Reduction of Existing Plans, Studies, Reports and Technical Information**

| Jurisdiction             | Plans, Policies, Studies and their Current Impact on Loss Reduction  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <b>Amelia County</b>     | Hazard Mitigation Plan (High)*, Local Emergency Operations Plan (Medium)   |
| <b>Buckingham County</b> | 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)   |
| <b>Charlotte County</b>  | Hazard Mitigation Plan (High), Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Moderate), Floodplain Management Plan (High), Emergency Operation Plan (Moderate), SARA Title III/Hazardous Materials Facility Emergency Response Plan (Moderate), Economic Development Plan (Low), 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   |
| <b>Lunenburg County</b>  | 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)   |
| <b>Nottoway County</b>   | 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)  |



# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Prince Edward County</b> | 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) |
| <b>Town of Farmville</b>    | 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)  |

\*Amelia County was initially covered under its own Plan. As part of the update process, that Plan was incorporated into the Regional Plan.

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:

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>0-19 points = Limited overall capability</b><br/> <b>20-44 points = Moderate overall capability</b><br/> <b>45-77 points = High overall capability</b></p> |
|--|

## 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

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

## **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

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

*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 7.9** 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 Planning District 14 is **25.8**.

**Table 7.9  
Capability Assessment Results**

| JURISDICTION                | CAPABILITY SCORE | CAPABILITY RATING |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Amelia County</b>        | 17               | Limited           |
| <b>Buckingham County</b>    | 40               | Moderate          |
| Dillwyn                     | 10               | Limited           |
| <b>Charlotte County</b>     | 28               | Moderate          |
| Charlotte Court House       | 12               | Limited           |
| Drakes Branch               | 9                | Limited           |
| Keysville                   | 5                | Limited           |
| Phenix                      | 19               | Limited           |
| <b>Cumberland County</b>    | 47               | High              |
| <b>Lunenburg County</b>     | 39               | Moderate          |
| Kenbridge                   | 28               | Moderate          |
| Victoria                    | 29               | Moderate          |
| <b>Nottoway County</b>      | 28               | Moderate          |
| Blackstone                  | 47               | High              |
| Burkeville                  | 11               | Limited           |
| Crewe                       | 18               | Limited           |
| <b>Prince Edward County</b> | 34               | Moderate          |
| <b>Farmville</b>            | 44               | Moderate          |

The capability of local governments in Planning District 14 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 Planning District 14 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

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

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.