

1 The Planning Process

The *2018 Alabama State Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) Update* (Plan Update) is the result of many different agencies and groups working together to coordinate between state and local planning efforts in a manner that is consistent with federal regulations. This section comprehensively introduces the planning process used to develop this Plan Update and demonstrates compliance with the federal regulations pertinent to this process.

1.1 Requirements for the Planning Process

The Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) *State Mitigation Plan Review Guide* (2015) synthesizes the requirements outlined in the Final Rule for 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 201.4 to provide guidance for states conducting updates to their hazard mitigation plans. Accordingly, this Plan Update is required to describe the planning process used to build this document, including an explanation of how the state coordinated with "other State agencies, appropriate Federal agencies, and interested groups."¹ Further, the planning process should be "integrated to the extent possible with other ongoing State planning efforts as well as other FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives."² The CFR also requires that the description of the planning process include "how it was prepared, who was involved in the planning process, and how other agencies participated."³

The remainder of this section follows the guidance of the *State Mitigation Plan Review Guide* by first describing in detail the planning process used by Alabama Emergency Management Agency (AEMA) to build this document, and then describing coordinating efforts with local planning at the county level (this Plan Update also gives specific attention to integration with other state and federal planning initiatives in Section 5, the Mitigation Strategy). This section concludes with an analysis of differences between this Plan Update and its predecessor, the *2013 Alabama State Hazard Mitigation Plan Update*.

¹ 44 CFR 201.4 (b). Retrieved at: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/44/201.4>

² Ibid.

³ 44 CFR 201.4 (c) (1). Retrieved at: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/44/201.4>

1.2 Description of the Planning Process

1.2.1 How the Plan was Prepared and Updated

1.2.1.1 General Requirements

The 2018 Alabama State Hazard Mitigation Plan is the fifth version of this plan. The initial plan (2004) was prepared in general accordance with the processes established in the How-To Guides produced by FEMA, and the requirements of the February 26, 2002 Interim Final Rule for 44 CFR 201.4 (which later become the Final Rule as cited in Section 1.1).

The initial planning process established many of the vital functions that continue through the update process. Early in the development of the initial plan, Governor Riley signed Executive Order 19 (EO 19) on February 24, 2004, which outlined the infrastructure around which the initial planning process, as well as the planning process for subsequent updates, should occur.⁴ To do this, EO 19 accomplished the following:

- Established the State Hazard Mitigation Council (also known as the State Hazard Mitigation Team, or SHMT), which is described further in Section 1.2.2.3;
- Encouraged representatives from all State agencies to attend SHMT meetings;
- Directed all State agencies to participate in the development of the plan by providing services as directed by the SHMT;
- Encouraged agencies and other interested parties to participate in the planning process by providing comments and information via meetings, surveys, questionnaires and other means;
- Directed the SHMT to assist in prioritizing and selecting of hazard and pre-disaster mitigation grant program project applications;
- Directed the SHMT to meet when called by the Chair and remain in place until the five-year update to the plan has been approved by FEMA; and
- Directed the SHMT to prepare the State Hazard Mitigation plan.

Each version of this plan was approved by the SHMT, adopted by the AEMA Director on behalf of the Governor, and approved by FEMA. Specific information on the initial plan and the subsequent update planning processes can be found in each version of the plan.

Previous versions of this plan called for the SHMT to reassemble before the next update on an annual basis to review and evaluate the plan in the following areas:

- Changes in risk;
- Changes in laws, policies, or regulations at the state or local level;

⁴ Executive Order Number 19 by Governor Bob Riley. Alabama Department of Archives & History. Retrieved at: <http://digital.archives.alabama.gov/cdm/singleitem/collection/executive/id/540/rec/20>

- Changes in State agencies or their procedures that may affect mitigation programs or administration of funds;
- Changes in funding sources or capabilities;
- Changes in composition of the SHMT;
- Progress on mitigation actions and new mitigation actions being considered; and
- Major changes to local hazard mitigation plans.

The results of this review impacted the implementation of mitigation actions in between plan updates and influenced the content and planning process of the 2018 Alabama State HMP Update.

FEMA requires that State Hazard Mitigation Plans be updated every five years. AEMA began working on the 2018 plan update in October 2017 and hired a consultant team from Hagerty Consulting (Hagerty) to facilitate the plan update process. FEMA requirements state that plan updates must have provisions for updates to be made to all sections of the plan. As a result, the consultant reviewed and analyzed each section of the plan and determined that each section would be updated to some degree to meet the FEMA requirements. The planning process exercised to update the plan is described below.

1.2.1.2 Project Management

AEMA and Hagerty held regular bi-weekly project management conference calls throughout the project, including the Project Planning Conference Call to initiate the project. The Project Planning Conference Call was held on October 19, 2017 to introduce the planners from AEMA and Hagerty, determine an initial strategy for updating the plan, and review the project schedule. Through the bi-weekly calls, Alabama monitored the update process and provided direction on the review of the 2013 State Hazard Mitigation Plan and creation of the 2018 State Hazard Mitigation Plan.

1.2.1.3 SHMT Planning Process Meetings

AEMA hosted five planning meetings with the SHMT during the planning process. The second of these, the Risk Assessment Methodology and Outreach Strategy Meeting, was held virtually, with the remaining four meetings all held at AEMA Headquarters in Clanton, Alabama (with an option for virtual attendance). These meetings were:

- Kickoff Meeting on November 6, 2017;
- Risk Assessment Methodology and Outreach Strategy Meeting on December 1, 2017;
- Risk Assessment Meeting on March 13, 2018;
- Mitigation Strategy Meeting on May 17, 2018; and
- Plan Review Meeting on June 12, 2018.

These meetings are summarized in the sections below. Agendas, slide decks, notes, and lists of attendees for each of these meetings are provided in Appendix E.

1.1.1.1.1 Kickoff Meeting

The purpose of the Kickoff Meeting, held on November 6, 2017, was to meet with all SHMT members to present the following information at the outset of the project:

- Project goals and objectives;
- Purpose and benefits of hazard mitigation planning;
- Review the project schedule and tasks, including updating the Risk Assessment, Capability Assessment, and Mitigation Strategy;
- Review the roles of Hagerty, AEMA, and the SHMT throughout the planning process; and
- Introduce the Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment methodology.

Throughout the meeting, AEMA and the facilitators emphasized the importance of stakeholder participation at the planning meetings. Participants were asked to identify any additional stakeholders that should be incorporated into the planning process as well.

All federal and state representatives were invited were invited to the Kickoff Meeting. Representatives from one federal agency, eight state agencies or groups, and one dual-mission department, the Alabama National Guard (ALNG), were present.

1.1.1.1.2 Risk Assessment Methodology and Outreach Strategy Meeting

The SHMT convened virtually on December 1, 2017 for the Risk Assessment Methodology and Outreach Strategy Meeting. SHMT members received a briefing on the outreach strategy (see Section 1.2.3.2) and reviewed the proposed list of hazards. Participants discussed FEMA's State Mitigation Plan Review Guide which requires the effects of climate change to be addressed as part of the identified hazards, and participants discussed the role that the Sea Level Rise profile would play in meeting this requirement.⁵ Participants also concurred that Sea Level Rise should be treated as the product of both global sea level rise as the result of climatological factors and local sea level rise as a result of land subsidence. Several other potential hazards were discussed at this meeting, such as Space Weather and Pandemics, but the SHMT ultimately declined to include these hazards in favor of using the list of hazards from the previous plan update in 2013, with the addition of Sea Level Rise.

All federal and state representatives were invited were invited to the Risk Assessment Methodology and Outreach Strategy Meeting. No federal agencies were represented at this meeting, but seven state agencies or groups were present.

1.1.1.1.3 Risk Assessment Meeting

The SHMT met for the Risk Assessment Meeting on March 13, 2018 to review the Hazard Profiles and Vulnerability Assessment, including the locations, extents, and past occurrences of each hazard; the future probability of each hazard; an overview of the initial hazard rankings; and the

⁵ The Hazard Profiles (Section 3.2) describe the role of climate change in relation to other hazards as well. This section only represents the discussion that took place during the Risk Assessment Methodology and Outreach Strategy Meeting.

detailed vulnerability analysis for four selected highly-ranked hazards. During the meeting, participants discussed the importance of the Risk Assessment as the foundation for identifying mitigation strategies.

The SHMT discussed the ranking methodology used in this analysis. The 2013 State Hazard Mitigation Plan used a qualitative ranking system for hazards based on probability of occurrence and ease of mitigation. The participants indicated that a quantitative methodology for ranking hazards, considering multiple metrics that inform risk, would provide a more consistent metric across hazards and to help prioritize mitigation strategies. This Risk Factor (RF) system was developed based on agreement from the SHMT during this meeting.

In previous versions of the plan, the SHMT and FEMA determined that a subset of the hazards would receive detailed vulnerability analyses based on the determination of high-level of risk. Based on this methodology, Flooding, High Winds, and Sea Level Rise received vulnerability analyses because they were high-ranked hazards, while earthquakes were selected based on the well-developed Hazus loss estimation methodology (see Section 3.3.1).

Stakeholder discussion also focused on the selection of Sea Level Rise for detailed analysis given that its geographic extent is limited to only two of the 67 counties in Alabama. Some consideration was also given to tying Sea Level Rise to storm surge. Ultimately, the SHMT decided to defer to the results of the RF analysis (see Section 3.1.2).

The subsequent RF analysis yielded three high-risk hazards for detailed vulnerability analysis, which mirrored the original selection: Flooding, High Winds, and Sea Level Rise. The SHMT also selected earthquakes for detailed vulnerability assessment despite its lower ranking because data for earthquake vulnerability assessments are readily available through the free Hazus program (see Section 3.3.1), and because a detailed vulnerability assessment for earthquakes was included in the 2013 plan. The RF analysis was sent for, and received, SHMT concurrence on March 30, 2018.

All identified federal, state, and county stakeholders were invited to the Risk Assessment Meeting. Representatives from one federal agency, nine state agencies or groups, one dual-mission department (ALNG), one regional authority, and at least eight counties were present.

1.1.1.1.4 Mitigation Strategy Meeting

The SHMT met for a fourth time to hold the Mitigation Strategy Meeting. During the meeting, participants discussed and approved minor recommended revisions to the goals and objectives from the 2013 Plan. The SHMT also reviewed the five different types of mitigation techniques available to reduce their risk to identified risks and vulnerabilities: plans and regulations, structure and infrastructure projects, natural systems protection, education and awareness programs, and preparedness and response actions.

The SHMT reviewed the 2018 Action Plan. Participants discussed recommended changes from the 2013 Plan to streamline actions for ease of implementation and discussed new actions to address the updated risk and vulnerabilities identified in the Risk Assessment.

All identified federal, state, and county stakeholders were invited to the Mitigation Strategy Meeting. Representatives from one federal agency, nine state agencies or groups, one dual-mission department (ALNG), and four counties were present.

1.1.1.1.5 Plan Review Meeting

The SHMT attended the fifth and final meeting on June 12, 2018 when the draft document was presented for review during the Plan Review Meeting. **PLACEHOLDER FOR MEETING CONTENT.** All federal, state, and county representatives were invited to the Plan Review Meeting. **PLACEHOLDER FOR ATTENDANCE SUMMARY.**

1.2.1.4 Submission to FEMA

After comments from the Plan Review Meeting were incorporated, the 2018 State Plan Update draft was submitted to FEMA in July 2018 for review.

Following completion of the plan draft, both FEMA and the SHMT had 45 days to review the draft plan. AEMA received all comments and then incorporated them into the plan, where appropriate. A summary of comments is available in Appendix D. The plan was resubmitted in **PLACEHOLDER**, 2018 for final review and approval.

1.2.2 Who was Involved in the Planning Process

The Alabama State Hazard Mitigation Council (referred to as the SHMT throughout the Plan) was the primary mechanism for developing and updating the 2018 State Hazard Mitigation Plan. The SHMT is, however, part of a larger organization and process, including the entities listed below:

- The Governor of Alabama;
- Alabama Emergency Management Agency (AEMA);
- The SHMT;
- Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs);
- AEMA Geographic Divisions;
- Other Federal and State agencies and interested groups;
- County Stakeholders;
- Citizens; and
- Consultants.

In previous versions of this plan, this list included the SHMT Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). However, the TAC did not participate in the 2010, 2013, or 2018 Updates.

The following sections provide a general description of the respective roles in the planning process of each of the entities listed above.

1.2.2.1 The Governor of Alabama

By issuing EO 19 on February 24, 2004 the Governor initiated development of the SHMT, designated its members, outlined their tasks, and directed the Director of AEMA to lead the planning effort. EO 19 is valid until the updated plan has been approved and adopted, so there was no need for a new Executive Order. The Plan Update will be approved and adopted by the Governor through the AEMA Director as was done in previous versions of the plan.

1.2.2.2 The Alabama Emergency Management Agency (AEMA)

AEMA is the lead agency for development of the plan. Although the SHMT is the group responsible for the actual development and production of the plan, AEMA serves as a coordinating entity throughout its development. The Agency facilitated interactions among various Federal, State, and local governments, and provided important oversight and quality control to ensure that the plan and associated process met Federal requirements. AEMA coordinated the update of all aspects of the plan and facilitated coordination among agencies at all levels of government. Further, AEMA helped to establish meeting times and locations. The AEMA Director is also responsible for final approval and adoption of the Plan on behalf of the Governor.

1.2.2.3 The State Hazard Mitigation Team

The SHMT is the key organization in the development of the plan. The group was designated by the Governor via EO 19 and is mostly comprised of a variety of state organizations that were originally identified to be on a similar team in a previous administration. Some federal and regional agencies or groups also participate as a part of the SHMT. Throughout the plan update, minor changes have been made as new stakeholders are identified. The complete list of participating SHMT members can be found below.

The SHMT, in coordination with AEMA, was responsible for developing and reviewing all substantial plan processes and content. The SHMT formally met five times during development of this plan update (see Section 1.2.1.3).

The SHMT made all final decisions regarding the plan, reviewed drafts, provided comments, and made recommendations to the AEMA Director. Individual representatives of agencies on the SHMT were also asked to provide feedback for their respective agencies, data for development of the risk assessment, and input for the Mitigation Strategy.

The SHMT was convened on November 6, 2017 for a Kickoff Meeting and as part of the plan update process. The SHMT met virtually on December 1, 2017 for a Risk Assessment Methodology and Outreach Strategy Meeting. The SHMT met again for the Risk Assessment Meeting on March 13, 2018 to review the Hazard Profiles and Vulnerability Assessment. The SHMT met for a fourth time to hold the Mitigation Strategy Meeting on May 17, 2018. A final Plan Review Meeting was held on June 12, 2018 when the draft document was presented for review. These meetings are described in further detail in Section 1.2.1 and detailed meeting materials including agendas, slide decks, notes, and attendance lists can be found in Appendix E.

EO19 directed the following individuals and agencies to serve as members of the SHMT:

- The Governor or his designee who shall serve as chair;
- The Commissioner of the Department of Agriculture and Industries;
- The Attorney General;
- The Commissioner of the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources;
- The Director of the Department of Economic and Community Affairs;
- The Director of the Emergency Management Agency;
- The Director of the Alabama Department of Environmental Management;
- The State Forester of the Alabama Forestry Commission;
- The Office of the State Geologist;
- The State Historic Preservation Officer;
- The Commissioner of the Insurance Department;
- The Director of the Governor's Legal Council Office;
- The Director of the Alabama Department of Public Health;
- The Director of the Governor's Public Information Office;
- The Director of the Alabama Department of Public Safety;
- The Commissioner of the Alabama Public Service Commission;
- The Secretary of State;
- The Director of the Department of Transportation;
- The Director of the Alabama Association of Regional Councils;
- The Director of the Alabama League of Municipalities;
- The Director of the Association of County Commissioners;
- The Director of the Indian Affairs Commission;
- The Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and
- The Director of the Choctawhatchee, Pea and Yellow Rivers Watershed Management Authority.

In addition to those individuals and agencies directly assigned to the SHMT, EO 19 requested that the following federal agencies or groups establish points of contact for the Hazard Mitigation Team:

- The American Red Cross;
- The Military Department;
- The National Weather Service, Birmingham;
- The National Weather Service, Huntsville;
- The National Weather Service, Mobile;
- The National Weather Service, Tallahassee;
- U.S. Air Force, Maxwell AFB;
- U.S. Army, Fort Rucker Army Post; and
- USDA Forest Service.

During the 2018 Update process, AEMA tracked participation by the entities listed above. **Table 1-1** summarizes participation by agency. Note that although EO 19 calls for the director or commissioner of many agencies or groups, a designee was often invited or participated on their behalf. Lists of attendees (including names of individual attendees and the agencies which they represent) for each SHMT meeting can be found in Appendix E.

Table 1-1: Summary of Agencies or Groups Represented at SHMT Meetings

Agency or Group	Requested by EO 19	Representative Identified for 2018 Update	Attended at least one 2018 SHMT Meeting
Governor's Office	X		
Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries	X	X	X
Office of the Attorney General, State of Alabama	X		
Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	X	X	X
Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs	X	X	X
Alabama Emergency Management Agency	X	X	X
Alabama Department of Environmental Management	X	X	X
Alabama Forestry Commission	X	X	X
Office of the State Geologist (Geological Survey of Alabama)	X	X	X
State Historic Preservation Office (Alabama Historical Commission)	X		
Alabama Department of Insurance	X	X	X
Governor's Legal Council Office	X		
Alabama Department of Public Health	X	X	X

Agency or Group	Requested by EO 19	Representative Identified for 2018 Update	Attended at least one 2018 SHMT Meeting
Governor's Public Information Office	X		
Department of Public Safety (Alabama Law Enforcement Agency)	X	X	X
Alabama Public Service Commission	X	X	X
Office of the Alabama Secretary of State	X	X	
Alabama Department of Transportation	X	X	X
Alabama Association of Regional Councils	X		
Alabama League of Municipalities	X		
Association of County Commissioners (Association of County Commissions of Alabama)	X		
Alabama Indian Affairs Commission	X		
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	X		
Choctawhatchee, Pea and Yellow Rivers Watershed Management Authority	X	X	X
American Red Cross	X		
Military Department (Alabama National Guard)	X	X	X
National Weather Service, Birmingham	X	X	X
National Weather Service, Huntsville	X		
National Weather Service, Mobile	X		

Agency or Group	Requested by EO 19	Representative Identified for 2018 Update	Attended at least one 2018 SHMT Meeting
National Weather Service, Tallahassee	X		
U.S. Air Force, Maxwell AFB	X		
U.S. Army, Fort Rucker Army Post	X		
USDA Forest Service	X		
Alabama Division of Risk Management		X	X
Alabama Department of Senior Services		X	
Alabama Department of Human Resources		X	X
Alabama Department of Finance		X	
Alabama State Department of Education		X	X
Troy University		X	
Poarch Band of Creek Indians		X	
Federal Emergency Management Agency		X	X

1.2.2.4 Regional Planning Councils

Regional Planning Councils (RPCs) are a group of 12 organizations that provide a variety of services to the counties in their respective regions. All the counties in Alabama are part of an RPC. Historically, RPCs provided oversight and coordination of the development and update of county-level hazard mitigation plans.

In past updates of this plan, AEMA interacted with the 12 RPCs to promulgate information about the State Plan and to gather input about the local and county plans to inform the state-level process. In the 2010 update, the RPCs were the primary entity updating the local plans. However, RPC involvement in local mitigation planning declined for the 2013 State Plan Update due to limited funding. For the 2018 State Hazard Mitigation Plan Update process, AEMA elected for its own geographic divisions to facilitate this regional coordination process, rather than RPCs.

Therefore, RPCs were not directly involved in this Plan Update. Nonetheless, RPCs are described here and in Appendix C because in the case of a few counties, RPCs still maintain some responsibility for the update of local hazard mitigation plans.

1.2.2.5 AEMA Geographic Divisions

In previous versions of this Plan, AEMA and the SHMT interacted with the twelve RPCs to coordinate information between county plan development and state plan development. For the 2018 Update process, AEMA and the SHMT elected to facilitate this process through AEMA's geographic divisions.

AEMA divides the state into seven geographic regions, or divisions, within the emergency management structure. Each division, labeled A through G, represents the geographically-proximate counties as shown in **Figure 1-1**. These divisions provide a mechanism for county-level collaboration and coordination during the development and update of the State Hazard Mitigation Plan. Division meetings are held quarterly, with relevant stakeholders from each county in attendance. In accordance with the Outreach Strategy (see Section 1.2.3.2) and the project timeline, AEMA and the SHMT provided materials for distribution to stakeholders at each quarterly meeting to promulgate information about the State Plan Update and to gather input about the local and county plans to inform the state-level process. Additionally, staff from the AEMA Regional Divisions attended SHMT meetings to provide perspective from their communities and to bring information back to their counties.



Figure 1-1: AEMA Geographic Divisions

1.2.2.6 Other Federal and State Agencies and Interest Groups

Early in the planning process the SHMT and AEMA identified a list of entities that should be involved in the plan development process including federal and state agencies and other interested groups. In the first stages of the process these groups were contacted, and points of contact identified. Throughout development of the plan, these groups and the points of contact were informed of the planning process and its outcomes. Because EO 19 formally established the SHMT, the Team itself was the only body directly authorized to make decisions about what was included in the plan. However, at many points in the process, these other organizations were invited to review materials related to the plan and comment on them. Representatives from these agencies, groups, and organizations were invited to attend the SHMT meetings and participate in the plan update process.

As noted above, the RPCs provided a conduit for information to flow both from the local communities to AEMA, and vice versa. These entities and the AARC participated throughout development of the plan by providing representatives at the SHMT meetings and maintaining contact with AEMA and its consultant as local mitigation plans were developed and updated. The RPCs also assisted in the plan update process by facilitating coordination with local governments to obtain information regarding their local capabilities.

FEMA provided technical assistance on this plan and kept AEMA abreast to the latest requirements needed in the state plan update. AEMA informed FEMA of the planning process and process benchmarks and invited FEMA to participate in all planning meetings.

1.2.2.7 County Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholders from each county were invited to participate in the Risk Assessment Meeting, Mitigation Strategies Meeting, and the Plan Review Meeting. Table 1-2 summarizes participation by county.

Table 1-2: County Participation in SHMT Meetings

County	Risk Assessment Meeting (March 13, 2018)	Mitigation Strategy Meeting (May 17, 2018)	Plan Review Meeting (June 12, 2018)
Autauga			
Baldwin			
Barbour			
Bibb	X		
Blount			
Bullock	X		
Butler			
Calhoun			
Chambers			
Cherokee			
Chilton			
Choctaw			
Clarke			
Clay			
Cleburne			
Coffee			
Colbert			
Conecuh			
Coosa			
Covington			
Crenshaw			
Cullman			
Dale			
Dallas	X		
DeKalb			
Elmore			

County	Risk Assessment Meeting (March 13, 2018)	Mitigation Strategy Meeting (May 17, 2018)	Plan Review Meeting (June 12, 2018)
Escambia			
Etowah			
Fayette			
Franklin			
Geneva			
Greene			
Hale			
Henry			
Houston		X	
Jackson			
Jefferson			
Lamar			
Lauderdale			
Lawrence			
Lee			
Limestone			
Lowndes			
Macon			
Madison			
Marengo			
Marion			
Marshall			
Mobile		X	
Monroe			
Montgomery			
Morgan			
Perry	X		
Pickens	X		
Pike		X	
Randolph			
Russell			
St. Clair	X	X	
Shelby			
Sumter	X		
Talladega			

County	Risk Assessment Meeting (March 13, 2018)	Mitigation Strategy Meeting (May 17, 2018)	Plan Review Meeting (June 12, 2018)
Tallapoosa			
Tuscaloosa			
Walker			
Washington			
Wilcox	X		
Winston			

Additionally, the Outreach Strategy identified other avenues for county stakeholder engagement (see Section 1.2.3.2). For example, county stakeholders were engaged through participation in AEMA's quarterly geographic division meetings (see Section 1.2.2.5) and through distribution of targeted mitigation informational materials, such as the monthly newsletter.

1.2.2.8 Public Involvement

For the 2018 Plan Update, the citizens of Alabama were invited to participate in this planning process according to the Outreach Strategy (see Section 1.2.3.2) by ensuring that meeting materials and plan elements were available for public review. To accomplish this, the AEMA Hazard Mitigation Web Page was updated to include a plan update description, plan update contact information (including the SHMT), a link to the 2013 Plan Update, and links to the Draft Plan Update and the Final Plan Update.

1.2.2.9 Consultant Assistance in Developing the Plan

In addition to the groups discussed above, AEMA secured the services of a professional consultant to facilitate the planning process and develop some technical materials for the 2018 update. The Hagerty Consulting team assisted AEMA and the SHMT in a variety of ways:

- Provided technical assistance including planning guidance and federal compliance;
- Collected and analyzed data from the appropriate local, state, and federal sources to describe Alabama Current and Future Conditions;
- Collected and analyzed data for the Risk Assessment from the appropriate local, state, and federal sources;
- Collected and analyzed data from the appropriate state and local agencies for the Capability Assessment;
- Facilitated SHMT meetings;
- Developed materials for meetings;
- Documented the Plan Update process including meeting notes and lists of invitees and attendees;
- Developed and facilitated an Outreach Strategy (see Section 1.2.3.2) to directly and indirectly engage stakeholders and the public in the planning process;

- Worked with the SHMT to revise and update the Mitigation Strategy (including mitigation goals, objectives, and actions);
- Assembled and incorporated information into the Plan Update; and
- Prepared the Plan documents.

1.2.3 How Other Agencies Participated in the Planning Process

1.2.3.1 General Participation

A range of state agencies and groups were designated by EO 19 as participants in the planning process (see Section 1.2.2.3). Members of these State agencies and groups participated in the planning process in several ways. Their primary means of doing so was by attending the SHMT meetings and participating in discussions and decisions about various plan procedures and components. The entire planning process was carefully documented. Documentation includes invitee lists, attendees, materials provided, presentations, and meeting notes. These materials are included in Appendix E.

A range of Federal agencies and departments were also identified in EO 19 as recommended participants (see Section 1.2.2.3). Many of these agencies and departments were invited to each SHMT planning meeting and were encouraged to provide input to all aspects of the plan. AEMA was established as the main point of contact for this purpose, and telephone numbers and email addresses were provided on communications with the Federal agencies.

During the 2018 Update process, AEMA tracked participation by these state and federal agencies and groups. Refer to Section 1.2.2.3 for a summary of participation by these agencies.

1.2.3.2 Outreach Strategy

The Final Rule states that “the mitigation planning process should include...interested groups.” AEMA and its consultant developed an Outreach Strategy to meet this requirement and facilitate the participation of agencies and groups outside of AEMA. First, AEMA and Hagerty defined a successful outreach strategy as one that possesses the following characteristics:

- Informs and educates about hazards and risks;
- Invites interested parties to contribute their views and ideas for mitigation;
- Identifies conflicts and incorporates different perspectives and priorities early in the process;
- Provides data and information that improves overall quality and accuracy of the plan;
- Ensures transparency and builds trust; and
- Maximizes opportunities for implementation through greater consensus and acceptance.

The Outreach Strategy defines four goals to ensure it encompasses these characteristics:

- **Organization identification:** The Plan update process should identify organizations and stakeholders that AEMA and the SHMT should engage to participate in the Update;
- **Direct engagement:** To ensure comprehensive outreach, stakeholder meetings should be held in-person in various regions statewide;
- **Indirect engagement:** Technological solutions should be leveraged to allow for more comprehensive awareness and involvement in the planning process; and
- **Outreach documentation:** All planning outreach efforts should be documented and captured within the Plan, including any related meeting materials and notes.

These four goals were supported by six specific tactics:

- **Outreach to critical partners:** AEMA coordinated with the SHMT to identify potential partners in the types of organizations that FEMA encourages engagement with during the planning process: emergency management, economic development, land use and development, health and social services, infrastructure, and natural and cultural resources. AEMA and SHMT determined that they did not have appropriate state-level contacts into the housing organizations that FEMA recommends, but will continue to explore partnerships with these types of organizations. concentrated on building out organizational involvement by engaging these identified organizations, re-engaging partners involved in the 2013 Plan Update, and conducting targeted outreach to organizations in each of the FEMA-recommended categories above.
- **Leverage existing cohorts and/or stakeholder/public engagement activities:** AEMA prepared Plan Update information for distribution to stakeholders at the quarterly meetings of each AEMA geographic division (see Section 1.2.2.5) in accordance with the project timeline.
- **Develop a distinctive and cohesive 2018 HMP Update brand:** Hagerty, in coordination with AEMA, developed style guides and templates distinctive to the HMP update planning process for all materials, as well as a 2018 HMP Update logo.
- **Ensure meeting materials and plan elements are available for stakeholder and public review:** To satisfy the requirement that the Plan be a publicly available resource and to satisfy the need for a comprehensive approach to outreach process, the AEMA Hazard Mitigation Web Page was updated to include a plan update description, plan update contact information (including the SHMT), a link to the 2013 Plan Update, and links to the Draft Plan Update and the Final Plan Update. The SHMT also conducted in-person meetings to gather information and validate findings for each of the elements being updated during the planning process, including hazard analysis and risk assessment, mitigation strategy development, and draft plan review (see Section 1.2.1.3).
- **Generate awareness and engagement through email distribution, and newsletters:** AEMA delivered monthly mitigation newsletters to the SHMT and other state and federal partners. These newsletters provided an update on the process, profiled notable mitigation strategies from around the state and country, and outlined upcoming planning expectations. AEMA made these newsletters electronically available to all counties through AEMA's intranet, which is commonly used to post information for distribution to county stakeholders. SHMT and other planning partners also received emails with

information about upcoming meetings, as well as requests to review components of the Plan.

- **Document outreach activities:** All meeting materials and planning activities were captured in this Plan Update document. All agendas, slide decks, notes, and lists of attendees for each meeting are provided in Appendix E. An ongoing outreach strategy was also developed for the Plan Maintenance portion of this document (see Section 6).

1.2.4 Agency Coordination During Development of 2018 State Hazard Mitigation Plan

Most agency coordination was achieved by assembling the SHMT. Beyond the activities of the SHMT, the following summarizes efforts to involve other agencies in the planning process.

1.2.4.1 Coordination to Incorporate Local Hazard Mitigation Plans

The Final Rule requires that state hazard mitigation plans contain a review of FEMA approved local hazard mitigation planning efforts including risk assessments and mitigation goals and actions. Much progress has been made with local level planning. When the initial State Hazard Mitigation Plan was developed in 2004, no local hazard mitigation plans had been approved. The number of approved plans (and approved updated plans) has increased with each plan update process. By the 2010 State Hazard Mitigation Plan Update, all counties had an approved plan in place. By the 2013 State Plan Update, most counties had an approved update. With the 2018 State Plan Update, all counties now have approved updates in place (one, Morgan County, is designated as “approvable pending adoption” as of this writing). Coordination between AEMA, local Emergency Management Agencies (EMAs) and the 12 Regional Planning Councils helped to make this possible.

Because all 67 counties have approved hazard mitigation plan updates in place at the time of the 2018 State Plan Update, these plans could be reviewed directly, and appropriate information could be extracted and incorporated into the state plan update. Information from the local risk assessment and mitigation strategy sections was extracted and incorporated into this plan. This process helped to ensure that the statewide planning effort was both a “top-down” and “bottom-up” approach as it pertains to the relationship between the local and state plans. The integration of local plans is described further in Section 1.3 and referenced throughout this plan.

1.2.4.2 Coordination to Complete the Risk Assessment

AEMA also consulted with several state and federal agencies represented on the SHMT to obtain information and guidance while updating the Risk Assessment section. For example, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) was contacted to obtain SLOSH data and sea level rise trend data for coastal area analysis. FEMA Region IV was contacted to obtain NFIP claim data. Many of the agencies consulted by AEMA lead and incorporate statewide mitigation programs, as discussed in Section 4.6. Table 1-3 summarizes the different agencies and organizations from which data was obtained for the 2018 Risk Assessment.

Table 1-3: Data Sources per Hazard⁶

Agency/Organization	DF	DR	EQ	ET	FL	HA	HW	LS	LT	SL	SU	TS	WF	WS
ADECA-OWR	X	X												
AFC													X	
ASCE	X													
ASCE/SEI							X							
ASDSO	X													
Climate Central													X	
Climate Impact Lab				X										
FEMA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X	
GSA			X					X			X			
ICC							X							
NCEI						X			X					
NDMC		X												
NHC					X									
NLDN									X					
NOAA		X		X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X
NWS		X		X	X	X	X		X					
SERCC				X										
SGSF													X	
UCS										X				
US Climate Data				X										
US Dept. of Commerce										X				
US Dept. of Interior													X	
US Drought Monitor		X												
USACE	X													
USDA-RMA		X												
USFS													X	
USGS			X		X			X		X	X	X	X	
Vaisala, Inc.									X					

⁶ Hazards are abbreviated as follows: Dam Failure (DF), Drought (DR), Earthquakes (EQ), Extreme Temperatures (ET), Flooding (FL), Hail (HA), High Winds (HW), Landslides (LS), Lightning (LT), Sea Level Rise (SL), Sinkholes and Land Subsidence (SU), Tsunamis (TS), Wildfire (WF), Winter Storms (WS).

AEMA continues to coordinate with State agencies to identify state owned and/or operated critical facility information for incorporation into the plan. The Final Rule states that “State owned critical or operated facilities...shall be addressed.” The SHMT determined that these facilities should include state-insured facilities and state-identified Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources (CIKR). The Alabama Division of Risk Management (DORM) provided an inventory of state-insured facilities, and the Alabama Law Enforcement Agency (ALEA) provided an inventory of CIKR. These two databases were merged to facilitate GIS spatial overlay analysis of critical facilities with various hazards. This process is described further in Section 3.3 (Vulnerability Assessment & Loss Estimation).

The Risk Assessment was finalized following comments and verification provided at the Risk Assessment Meeting on March 13, 2018, to which all state, federal, and county stakeholders were invited.

1.2.4.3 Coordination to Complete the Mitigation Strategy

AEMA coordinated with members of the SHMT to complete the Mitigation Strategy. AEMA requested all members of the SHMT, but especially those named as “Responsible Agency” for mitigation actions in the initial plan, to do the following:

- Review and provide an update for their mitigation actions from the 2013 plan;
- Identify any new mitigation actions that they were interested in pursuing; and
- Validate new mitigation actions developed by AEMA.

The Mitigation Strategy was finalized following comments and verification provided at the Mitigation Strategy Meeting on May 17, 2018, to which all state, federal, and county stakeholders were invited.

1.2.4.4 Coordination with FEMA During the Planning Process

AEMA and FEMA continued to coordinate for the 2018 Plan update. FEMA Region IV participated in the Plan update process by providing technical assistance and by providing general guidance on the plan update process. FEMA also provided data for the Risk Assessment (see Table 1-3).

Further, AEMA coordinated with FEMA to submit the Mitigation Strategy (see Section 5) for review prior to formal submission of the entire 2018 Plan Update. This was done to expedite the review and comment process.

1.3 Coordinating Local Planning

1.3.1 Process for Reviewing, Coordinating and Linking the State and Local Plans

This section explains the process used to link local plans to the state plan. The risk assessment and mitigation strategies of local plans were reviewed to ensure consistency with the state plan to meet the local plan integration requirement.

When the initial State Plan was being composed in 2004, no local plans were finalized. As a result, an appropriate methodology was used to incorporate the few plans that were near completion. A detailed description of that methodology can be found in the 2004 or 2007 version of this plan.

For the 2013 update, all 67 counties had reviewable plans. Consequently, the SHMT was able to cross-check the state hazard data with that of the local risk assessments. This review process continues to be used for the 2018 update and is expected to be used for subsequent updates.

The review of local plans focuses on three main areas:

- Hazard identification and profiles;
- Potential loss estimates; and
- Mitigation goals and actions.

This review ensures that the state's mitigation strategy is reflective of the local mitigation strategies. AEMA utilizes this opportunity to identify areas where local plans can be improved during the local plan updates.

During the 2013 Plan Update, only local plans with changes were reviewed. However, as of this writing, all 67 counties have implemented approved updates since the 2013 State HMP Update was approved (with one of the 67 county updates designated as “approvable pending adoption”); therefore, every county plan was reviewed for the 2018 Plan Update. In future versions of this plan, newly updated local plans will be incorporated into the state plan, focusing on the areas of hazard identification, potential loss estimates, and mitigation goals and actions. The following sections describe the methodology used to review the local plans and a summary of the results.

1.3.2 Review and Incorporation of Local Plan Information into the State Plan Update

1.3.2.1 Hazard Identification and Profiles

As part of the plan update process, the hazard profile sections of all local hazard mitigation plans were reviewed to determine which hazards were identified and profiled by local jurisdictions.

The purpose of this review is to ensure that there is consistency between the state and county documents. In 2007, AEMA refined the list of hazards identified in the state plan to reflect those hazards commonly found in local plans and those hazards which affect the state. For example, hazards that do not affect the state, such as volcanoes, were removed from the hazard identification list. This hazard list was used to review local plans for the 2013 update. As described in Section 5.2 and Section 7.3 of the 2013 update, the SHMT made slight modifications to this list. The 2018 update uses the same hazard list as the 2013 update.

Most county plans profiled the hazards identified in this plan, except for coastal counties who profiled hazards that are unique to coastal area (e.g., Sea Level Rise and Tsunamis). Some county plans combine hazards identified separately in this plan, such as Winter Storms and Extreme Temperatures. For a more complete description of this review process including a tabular summary of hazards profiled in county plans, refer to **Section 3.1.3** (Hazard Profiled in County Plans) and **Table 5.4** (Summary of County Hazard Mitigation Plans).

1.3.2.2 Potential Loss Estimates

In previous versions of this document, AEMA conducted an initial review of the loss estimates contained in each local plan to identify common elements that could be extracted and incorporated into this plan update. However, local plan developers often used a wide range of methodologies to determine these potential loss estimates and were only able to include loss estimates for hazards for which there was ample historical data. Typically, these hazards were tornadoes, flooding, high winds and windstorms, and hurricanes. In both the 2013 and 2018 Plans, tornadoes, windstorms, and hurricanes were grouped into a single hazard, High Winds.

For the 2018 Plan, the SHMT selected four hazards for a detailed Vulnerability Analysis and Loss Estimation (see Sections 5.1 and 5.3). This analysis included loss estimates at the state level for all four hazards for state-owned or state-insured facilities, as well as potential loss estimates per county for three of the four selected hazards.

Consistent with previous plans, Flooding and High Winds were selected for detailed vulnerability analysis at the county level. Earthquakes were also selected for further analysis at the county level, including loss estimates per county. To determine potential county-level loss estimates for each of these three hazards, the SHMT decided to apply FEMA's Hazus loss estimation software. Hazus (Hazard US) is an integrated GIS-based simulation system that was designed to promote more consistent and standardized assessments of vulnerability, and more transparent and effective approaches to setting local and state priorities. Each Hazus analysis calculated two kinds of economic losses: 1) immediate losses related to the damage to structures and their contents; and 2) business interruption losses related to how long businesses remain inoperable. This methodology is described in detail in Vulnerability Assessment & Loss Estimation (see Section 3.3.1).

Sea Level Rise was selected for detailed vulnerability analysis as well, but analysis for this hazard only includes loss estimates for state-owned or state-insured facilities (see Section 3.3.5). County level loss estimates for Sea Level Rise are not available for this Plan.

1.3.2.3 Mitigation Goals and Actions

The final part of the local plan review involved reviewing the local mitigation strategy including goals and actions. Each of the local plans were reviewed to determine if the actions in the local plan met the goals as defined in the State Plan and, conversely, to determine if the State hazard mitigation goals were reflective of local goals, objectives, and actions. The State hazard mitigation goals (see Section 5.1.1) are as follows:

- **Goal 1:** Enhance the comprehensive statewide hazard mitigation system;
- **Goal 2:** Reduce the State of Alabama’s vulnerability and increase resilience to hazards to protect people, property, and natural resources;
- **Goal 3:** Foster public awareness and understanding of their hazard risk and of mitigation opportunities; and
- **Goal 4:** Expand and promote coordination and communication with other government agencies, local governments, other relevant organizations.

Table 1-4 summarizes this review.

Table 1-4: Review of County Plan Goals Against State Plan Goals

County	State Goal 1	State Goal 2	State Goal 3	State Goal 4
Autauga	X	X	X	
Baldwin	X	X	X	X
Barbour	X	X	X	
Bibb	X	X	X	
Blount	X	X	X	X
Bullock	X	X	X	
Butler	X	X	X	
Calhoun	X	X	X	
Chambers	X	X	X	X
Cherokee	X	X	X	
Chilton	X	X	X	
Choctaw	X	X	X	
Clarke	X	X	X	
Clay	X	X		X
Cleburne	X	X	X	
Coffee	X	X	X	
Colbert	X	X	X	X
Conecuh	X	X	X	
Coosa	X	X	X	
Covington	X	X	X	
Crenshaw	X	X	X	

County	State Goal 1	State Goal 2	State Goal 3	State Goal 4
Cullman	X	X	X	
Dale	X	X	X	X
Dallas	X	X	X	
DeKalb	X	X	X	
Elmore	X	X	X	X
Escambia	X	X	X	
Etowah	X	X	X	
Fayette	X	X	X	X
Franklin	X	X	X	X
Geneva	X	X	X	
Greene	X	X		
Hale	X	X		
Henry	X	X	X	
Houston	X	X	X	
Jackson	X	X	X	
Jefferson	X	X	X	X
Lamar	X	X		
Lauderdale	X	X	X	X
Lawrence	X	X	X	X
Lee	X	X	X	X
Limestone	X	X	X	
Lowndes	X	X	X	
Macon	X	X	X	X
Madison	X	X	X	
Marengo	X	X	X	
Marion	X	X	X	X
Marshall	X	X	X	X
Mobile	X	X	X	X
Monroe	X	X	X	
Montgomery	X	X	X	
Morgan	X	X	X	
Perry	X	X	X	
Pickens	X	X		
Pike	X	X	X	
Randolph	X	X	X	
Russell	X	X	X	X
Shelby	X	X	X	X

County	State Goal 1	State Goal 2	State Goal 3	State Goal 4
St. Clair	X	X	X	
Sumter	X	X	X	
Talladega	X	X	X	
Tallapoosa	X	X	X	
Tuscaloosa	X	X	X	X
Walker	X	X	X	X
Washington	X	X	X	
Wilcox	X	X	X	
Winston	X	X	X	X

This review demonstrated the local mitigation goals, objectives, and actions are consistent with the State mitigation goals; and, conversely, that the State hazard mitigation goals are reflective of the local goal, objectives, and actions.

1.3.3 Future Local Plan Review and Incorporation

The review and incorporation of local plan information has resulted in this plan being reflective of local hazards risks, loss estimates, and goals. However, these elements evolve over time, given that the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and the Final Rule require local plans to be updated every five years.

As a result, future state plan updates, which will be performed on a five-year cycle, will continue to incorporate the latest information regarding local risk assessment and mitigation strategy. At this time, it is assumed that the review process will be used for subsequent versions of this plan unless it is deemed insufficient.

1.4 Summary of Review, Analysis, and Update of Each Section

The following provides a summary of the methodology utilized to review, analyze, and update each section of the plan. As described in Section 1.2, each section of the plan was reviewed, and it was determined that revisions would be required to each section to meet FEMA requirements. Detailed language used in previous sections of this plan has been revised, removed, or reorganized where appropriate. These changes are called out in each respective section. This was done to keep the document current and user-friendly, while highlighting mitigation planning capabilities that have improved over time. As future updates are conducted, a similar update process will be used.

For the 2018 update, the Enhanced Plan Elements section has been entirely removed. The 2018 State Hazard Mitigation Plan includes the same information that was developed in the 2013 Plan, updated as appropriate and described in each section. However, the structure of the 2018 Plan was reorganized slightly for ease of reference and use. These changes are summarized below:

Table of Contents: The table of contents was revised to reflect the new structure and contents of the 2018 plan update.

Executive Summary: The executive summary was moved to the front matter of the Plan, instead of a section within the base part of the Plan and was revised to summarize the 2018 plan update.

Plan Approval, Adoption, and Assurances: This section was moved to the front matter of the Plan, instead of a section within the base part of the Plan. Minor changes were made to this section to reflect the dates for the 2018 plan update process.

Section 1 – The Planning Process: This section was revised to reflect the 2018 plan update planning process. This sub-section, Summary of Review, Analysis and Update of Each Section (Section 1.4) was created. Additional edits and restructuring include:

- Information about integration efforts was moved to Section 4 (Capability Assessment);
- Coordinating Local Planning (Section 1.3), which was a stand-alone section in the 2013 Plan, was revised and integrated with other elements in Section 1 – The Planning Process; and
- Criteria for Prioritizing Jurisdictions to Receive Funds Under Existing Programs, a sub-section of Coordinating Local Planning in the 2013 Plan, was renamed Prioritization of Communities to Receive Planning Grants and moved to Section 5 (Mitigation Strategy) as described below.

Section 2 – Alabama Current and Future Conditions: This section is new to the 2018 plan update process and establishes a demographic, economic, and geographic profile of the state.

Section 3 – Risk Assessment: The risk assessment section was updated as appropriate with current risk and vulnerability information.

For the 2018 planning process, each of the hazard profiles was reviewed to determine if more current information was available based on recent studies, actual hazard events, or input from State agencies and local stakeholders. Several SHMT members provided up-to-date information for inclusion in the hazard profiles section.

Some adjustments were made to the content of Section 3 (Risk Assessment). Impacts of Development Trends on Vulnerability was updated per the information identified in Section 2 (Alabama Current and Future Conditions). Additionally, the methodology for prioritizing the list of identified hazards for further analysis was revised in coordination between the SHMT and Hagerty to include a risk factor (RF) analysis, which ranks hazards by the degree of risk they pose based on a set of factors deemed important by the SHMT and other stakeholders. The results of the RF approach called for detailed risk assessments for Earthquakes, High Winds (tornadoes, wind storms, and hurricanes), Flooding, and Local Sea Level Rise. These hazards (less Local Sea Level Rise) are identical to those identified for detailed assessment in the 2013 plan. The RF approach is described further in Section 3.1.2.

The methodologies used to update and maintain the vulnerability assessment and potential loss estimates were reviewed from the previous plan update and used as appropriate in this update. Potential loss estimates were updated for the selected hazards (Floods, High Winds, Earthquakes, and local Sea Level Rise) using the identified methodologies and the most current data available as described in Section 3.3. In addition, dollar values were inflated to 2017 values.

Section 4 – Capability Assessment: The content in this section was extracted from the Planning Process and the Mitigation Strategy sections in previous plans to be a stand-alone section. The content pulled from the 2013 Mitigation Strategy includes:

- Discussion and Evaluation of State Pre- and Post-Disaster Hazard Management Policies, Programs and Capabilities (Section 4.1);
- Evaluation of State Laws Regulations, Policies, and Programs Related to Hazard Mitigation and Development in Hazard Prone Areas (Section 4.2);
- State Funding Capabilities for Hazard Mitigation Projects (Section 4.3; this section includes some information about FEMA grant programs previously included in Appendix I in the 2013 Update, as described below); and
- General Description and Analysis of the Effectiveness of Local Mitigation Policies, Programs, and Capabilities (Section 4.4).

The assessments of state and local capabilities, including state funding capabilities, were reviewed to determine what information was still current and if new capabilities had been added and were revised accordingly.

Integration into Other Ongoing State Planning Efforts (Section 4.5) and Integration into Other FEMA Mitigation Programs and Initiatives (Section 4.6), included in the 2013 Planning Process, were also incorporated into Section 4 (Capability Assessment) for this Plan Update. Information

identified in the previous plan as a potential improvement or integration effort, was reviewed and updated by AEMA or the appropriate agency.

Section 5 – Mitigation Strategy: During the plan update process, the SHMT reviewed and made changes to the State Mitigation Strategy (Section 5.1 of this plan) and State Hazard Mitigation Goals (Section 5.1.1) at the Mitigation Strategy Meeting. In addition, each SHMT agency was asked to provide an implementation update on each mitigation action described from their agency identified in the 2013 Mitigation Strategy. Each agency was also encouraged to provide new actions that the agency was interested in pursuing. These were incorporated into the updated Mitigation Action Plan (Section 5.1.2).

Additionally, some Mitigation Strategy content was structurally altered. Some Mitigation Strategy content in the 2013 Plan was migrated into a new stand-alone Capability Assessment in the 2018 Plan, as described above, including:

- Discussion and Evaluation of State Pre- and Post-Disaster Hazard Management Policies, Programs and Capabilities;
- Evaluation of State Laws Regulations, Policies, and Programs Related to Hazard Mitigation and Development in Hazard Prone Areas;
- State Funding Capabilities for Hazard Mitigation Projects; and
- General Description and Analysis of the Effectiveness of Local Mitigation Policies, Programs, and Capabilities.

Criteria for Prioritizing Jurisdictions to Receive Funds Under Existing Programs, a sub-section of Coordinating Local Planning in the 2013 Plan, was also moved to Section 5 (Mitigation Strategy) for the 2018 Plan Update (Section 5.2.5) and renamed Prioritization of Communities to Receive Planning Grants.

Information from Jurisdictions Most Threatened and Vulnerable to Damage and Loss, a sub-section of the Risk Assessment in the 2013 plan, was renamed to Jurisdictions with Highest Risk, and moved to Section 5.2.1 for the 2018 Plan Update. Some information featured in this section, such as loss estimates, is taken directly from Section 3.3 (Vulnerability and Loss Estimation) of the Risk Assessment.

Strategy for Repetitive and Severe Repetitive Loss Properties has been included as Section 5.1.3 for the 2018 Plan Update. This information was previously included in “draft” form in Appendix O in the 2013 Plan Update, as described below.

For the 2018 Plan Update, the mitigation actions are presented in two tables. First, the 2013 Mitigation Action Plan was modified to provide updates on all 2013 actions and was renamed accordingly as the 2013 Mitigation Action Plan Review table. In addition to updating the status of

the 2013 actions, the 2013 Mitigation Action Plan Review also makes recommendations where necessary to:

- Better position certain ongoing actions from the 2013 Plan Update for implementation with the 2018 cycle; or
- Combine multiple 2013 actions into a single action to be continued for the 2018 Plan Update.

The second table is the 2018 Mitigation Action Plan. The 2018 Mitigation Action Plan contains all actions moving forward, including those described above carried over from the 2013 Mitigation Action Plan, as well as actions that are entirely new as of the 2018 Plan Update. The 2018 Mitigation Action Plan also employs a new method for prioritizing mitigation actions as described in Section 5.1.2.2 (Mitigation Action Prioritization).

Other content changes to Section 5 for the 2018 Plan Update include updating Mitigation Successes (Section 5.3) to include new mitigation project successes and new summaries of HMGP and PDM projects.

Section 6 – Plan Maintenance: The method for monitoring, evaluating, and updating was revised slightly to reflect the plan maintenance activities that were proven to be effective since the 2013 plan adoption.

Appendices: In the 2013 Plan Update, Section 7 was titled Coordination of Local Planning. Some information from Section 7 in the 2013 Plan Update is placed in Appendix C for the 2018 Update. This information includes:

- Final Rule Requirement for Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning; and
- Development and Update of Local Mitigation Plans, which has been expanded to include a description of Barriers to Updating, Adopting, and Implementing Local Hazard Mitigation Plans.

Some Appendices from the 2013 Plan Update were simply migrated to the appendices of the 2018 Plan Update, with minor adjustments to update per the 2018 Plan Update. These include:

- Approval & Implementation (Appendix F in the 2013 Plan Update; this is Appendix A for the 2018 Plan Update);
- Glossary of Acronyms and Terms (Appendix G in the 2013 Plan Update; this is Appendix B for the 2018 Plan Update);
- Table of Local Capabilities (Appendix J in the 2013 Plan Update; this is in Appendix C for the 2018 Plan Update);
- Comments Received from SHMT and FEMA (Appendix K in the 2013 Plan Update; this is Appendix D for the 2018 Plan Update);
- Record of Changes (Appendix N in the 2013 Plan Update; this is Appendix F for the 2018 Plan Update); and

- Meeting Minutes and Meeting Sign-In Sheets (Appendices L and M, respectively, in the 2013 Plan Update; for the 2018 Plan Update all meeting materials, including agendas, slide decks, one-pagers, notes, and attendee lists are included as Appendix E; Planning Process Documents).

Other Appendices from the 2013 Plan Update were migrated to other sections of the 2018 Plan Update. These include:

- Overview of FEMA Mitigation Grant Programs (Appendix I in the 2013 Plan Update; for the 2018 Plan Update this information has been retitled as FEMA Funding Opportunities, included as Section 4.3.2); and
- State of Alabama Draft Repetitive and Severe Repetitive Flood Loss Mitigation Strategy (Appendix O in the 2013 Plan Update; for the 2018 Plan Update this information has been retitled as simply Strategy for Repetitive and Severe Repetitive Loss Properties, included as Section 5.1.3).

Some Appendices from the 2013 Plan Update were not duplicated for the 2018 Plan Update because it was determined that the full-length text of the statutes featured in those Appendices would not be necessary if those statutes were accurately summarized and cited properly elsewhere in the document. Specifically, these include:

- The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (Appendix A in the 2013 Plan Update);
- The Final Rule (44 CFR Parts 201 and 206) (Appendix B in the 2013 Plan Update);
- Executive Order 19 (Appendix C in the 2013 Plan Update); and
- Composition of the State Hazard Mitigation Planning Council (Appendix D in the 2013 Plan Update).

Similarly, some Appendices from the 2013 Plan Update were not duplicated for the 2018 Plan Update because they were redundant with other sections of the 2018 Plan Update. These include:

- General Descriptions of Hazards that Affect Alabama (Appendix H in the 2013 Plan Update; this duplicates the Hazard Profiles in Section 3.2 of the 2018 Plan Update).

Some Appendices from the 2013 Plan Update were not duplicated for the 2018 Plan Update because they described groups or activities that are not part of the 2018 planning process. These include:

- Alabama State Hazard Mitigation Council Technical Advisory Committee Membership (Appendix E in the 2013 Plan Update).

Finally, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Implementation Process was added as Appendix G to the 2018 Plan Update.