

Chittenden County All-Hazards Mitigation Plan Update Committee

Mitigation Strategy Meeting

12/15/2021, 10:00 am eastern time.

Microsoft Teams Meeting

Attended Chittenden County Jurisdictions Representatives			
Name	Position/Title	Jurisdiction	
Darlene Palola	Volunteer	Huntington	
Amy Grover	Town Clerk & Treasurer	Bolton	
Chief John Audy	Fire Chief	Winooski	
Ron Hoague	Chief of Police	Essex	Also representing Essex Junction
Brad Holden	Town Administrator	Underhill	
John Abbott	Town Administrator	Jericho	
Norm Baldwin	City Engineer	Burlington	
Paul Conner	Director of Planning & Zoning	South Burlington	
Kate Lalley	Zoning Administrator	Westford	
IEM Staff			
Leroy Thompson	Senior Planner/ Project Lead	IEM	
Nancy Freeman	Senior Planner	IEM	
Barbara Spaulding	Senior Planner	IEM	
Elizabeth Burnett	Jr. Planner	IEM	

Meeting Summary

Mr. Leroy Thompson welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda and where we are currently in the planning process. He added that discussion will include next steps in the planning process in addition to objectives of the current meeting.

Mr. Thompson reminded the group the ways the current plan format compared the layout of the previous plan (2017). Work in the 2017 plan is not being discarded just reformatted.

Reviewed the hazards that are being covered into the plan and which small changes that were made to the list and how those are being addressed.

He noted that natural hazards included in the plan will be discussed in a full profile hazard profile, while the technological hazards and societal hazards will be covered under shorter smaller profiles.

The team discussed the capabilities assessment for jurisdictions to complete and review. The IEM staff is available to assist those who may need help completing the assessment, which is designed for communities to identify jurisdictional capabilities they bring to addressing to hazards that affect them.

Capabilities are designed for pre-disaster or post-disaster capabilities use during the various stages of the events that affect the community. These include, for example, availability of grant resources and how they can be used to implement a mitigation action.

Mr. Thompson described the need to develop Problem Statements based on top community concerns. These could include, for example, enhancing resiliency of community buildings, critical infrastructure, schools serving as hazard shelters, or locations that flood repetitively during heavy rainfall. Other concerns may address the needs of the vulnerable populations in your community and how to help them when disaster strikes.

Ms. Spaulding discussed Covered the Mitigation Strategy and how that included in the plan will be developed using FEMA standards. Points addressed include:

- Definition of goals, objectives, and strategies – how to develop them and ensure they are jurisdiction-appropriate.
- Mitigation actions would be designed to feasible, high-priority needed by each jurisdiction.
- How to develop mitigation strategies that align with those of the State to better provide integrated plan coverage and funding.
- Presented sample new goals and objectives that would be used in the 2022 plan, should the jurisdictions agree to these being used and combined into goals and objectives that cover everything and at the same time leave windows open for additional things.
- All of the goals fall into one part or another of the FEMA requirements outlined in the agency's Review Tool.
- Five goals were presented for group consideration. These reflected concepts and verbiage included in the 2017 plan.
- A document was included for participants to provide feedback for the goals and objectives as presented, and participants noted their approval by entering a comment to this effect in the chat box.
- It was requested that slide 23 be sent as a Word document so it can be forwarded to others.
- Mitigation Themes and potential actions.
- Action worksheets communities may wish to develop for high-priority community needs.
- Sample potential new mitigation action.
- Ranking of Mitigation Actions will take place one participating communities have decided the

The IEM team shared an abbreviated list of mitigation planning resources listed in the SHMP (funding, tools, training, technical assistance) that may be useful for jurisdictions to consider as they develop their mitigation actions.

A sample table was presented to show information required in a Mitigation Action Worksheet for communities that decide to use this tool and may be similar to previously completed worksheets. These will be reviewed to ensure that ongoing current actions and those to be developed are aligned with work previously done by the Regional Planning Council and participating jurisdictions.

The goals and Objectives were approved by 5 people during the meeting using the chat box. We may reference the teams chat box for exact names of the approvers.

We then started the Mitigation Themes so that they would have an idea of what FEMA was looking for and how to make it FEMA approved while still taking care of you community.

Provided them with an example of the worksheet for the action items, so they can get an idea of how this would be done and how to fill out this worksheet with actions that would benefit their jurisdiction. This sample shows who will be in charge of it, how it will be funded, what priority it is in getting it completed, and how long it might take to complete.

Mr. Thompson presented an example of how to rank the criteria in which new hazards will be measured against. The criteria allows for a community to identify assets and capabilities they do or have that to support mitigation and disaster preparedness and response. can help them as events happen. Each criterion is ranked on a scale from 1 to 5.

He walked the group through the Mitigation Strategy Data Collection Guide and discussed how a completed guide support development of the mitigation strategy.

Meeting Minutes from the previous meeting- these were not approved or disapproved as they were inadvertently omitted from discussion.

Participants' Questions:

Paul Conner- South Burlington: The community is in the process of developing their first climate plan. The way they are looking at the mitigation portion of this is to look at the chapter of this plan. If they wanted to at the goal or vision level if they wanted to adapt and mitigate the current and anticipated climate change how do they tie that in.

Mr. Thompson: In developing this plan and others is to keep it consistent, and they pull in the goals and objectives and place them in the climate plan and vias versa. And that it is intergraded with the other plans.

Ms. Freeman: There will be several places to link back to the climate plan even though it is still in development and in the hazard sections there will be a subsection on climate change and how to tie into that threat.

Mr. Connor: As we review hazard and community data, we using the best data collected to use for comparisons, so they know what to anticipate for future weather patterns. And also, there are 2 aspects to consider related to climate change: how to mitigate more or less rainfall, for example; and the larger role for the global scale, and what strategies are they doing to mitigate the global climate change they produce.

Ms. Freeman: Looking at what the impact of hazards as a result of climate changes, we are pulling the data from multiple sources that are fact-base and as up to date as possible. State agency information is being used also. Globally there is an International Climate Panel that issues periodic reports. We would not dwell on this element in the plan other than to reference the global picture, and then how that this impacts the county. We want to look at how climate trends affect each hazard, such as whether the trend includes increased and more frequent heavy rainfall. You might see new or expanded flood zones and anticipate whether there are addition issues of concern. Communities may also want to consider industrial and other atmospheric emissions and ways to reduce them by working in concert with power companies.

Mr. Connor: Should we be thinking local rubric or the county plan or should it be for the RPC?

Ms. Freeman: It should be for each community to review but also for everyone to consider. And make revisional approaches at the same time, for them to look at and possibly adopt.