



FILED

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

FOR TILLAMOOK COUNTY, OREGON

AUG 24 2017
TASSI O'NEIL
COUNTY CLERK

Handwritten initials and number
9:19A

In the Matter of Adopting the updated)
Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional) RESOLUTION
Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan) #R-17-010

This matter came before the Board of Commissioners for Tillamook County, Oregon, on the 23rd day of August, 2017. The Board finds as follows:

1. Natural hazards threaten life, businesses, property, and environmental systems throughout Tillamook County.
2. An understanding of the nature, extent, and potential impacts of natural hazards is the foundation for developing strategies to reduce or eliminate those impacts.
3. Natural hazards mitigation planning is the process through which such understanding and strategies are developed and a process for implementation is established throughout Tillamook County.
4. It is in the interest of Tillamook County and the cities and special districts located therein to undertake natural hazards mitigation planning and implementation together as coordinated planning strengthens communities and better serves all.
5. Tillamook County and the Cities of Bay City, Garibaldi, Manzanita, Nehalem, Rockaway Beach, Tillamook, and Wheeler previously prepared, implemented, and updated multi-jurisdictional natural hazards mitigation plans in accordance with the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. These plans were each approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for a period of five years.
6. The 2012 Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan is the most recent and expired on April 9, 2017.
7. Having a natural hazards mitigation plan developed in accordance with the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and approved by FEMA is a prerequisite for local government eligibility for certain federal pre- and post-disaster mitigation funds.
8. Tillamook County, the Cities of Bay City, Garibaldi, Manzanita, Nehalem, Rockaway Beach, Tillamook, and Wheeler each participated in updating the 2012 Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan in accordance with the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000.
9. The Ports of Garibaldi and Tillamook Bay each participated updating the 2012 Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan in accordance with the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, thereby developing their first natural hazards mitigation plans.

10. As a result of coordinated planning, the 2017 Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan is an integrated plan, without an individual addendum for each participating jurisdiction but with the necessary information for each.
11. Adoption of the updated 2017 Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan is required for FEMA approval of the 2017 Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan and restored eligibility for certain federal pre- and post-disaster mitigation funds.
12. Adoption of the updated 2017 Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan demonstrates Tillamook County's commitment to reducing or eliminating the potential impacts of natural hazards and to achieving the Plan's goals.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that:

13. The Tillamook County Board of Commissioners adopts the findings set forth above in support of this resolution.
14. Tillamook County Board of Commissioners adopts the 2017 Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan.

DATED this 23rd day of August, 2017.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR TILLAMOOK COUNTY, OREGON

	Aye	Nay	Abstain/Absent
<u>Bill Baertlein</u> Bill Baertlein, Chair	✓		/
<u>Tim Josi</u> Tim Josi, Vice-Chair	✓		/
<u>David Yamamoto</u> David Yamamoto, Commissioner	B		/

ATTEST: Tassi O'Neil, County Clerk

By: [Signature]
Special Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

[Signature]
William K. Sargent, County Counsel



U.S. Department of Homeland Security
FEMA Region 10
130 - 228th Street, SW
Bothell, Washington 98021



FEMA

August 15, 2017

Ms. Angie Lane
State Hazard Mitigation Officer
Oregon Military Department
Office of Emergency Management
P.O. Box 14370
Salem, Oregon 97309

Dear Ms. Lane:


As requested, on August 15, 2017, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Region 10, completed a pre-adoption review of the ***Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan***. This letter serves as Region 10's commitment to approve the plan upon receiving documentation of its adoption by the communities. The plan successfully contains the required criteria, excluding the adoption, for hazard mitigation plans, as outlined in Code of Federal Regulation Title 44 Part 201.

Once FEMA approves the plan, the communities are eligible for mitigation project grants.

Please contact our Regional Mitigation Planning Program Manager, Brett Holt, at (425) 487-4553 with any questions.

Sincerely,

8/15/2017

X 

Signed by: TAMRA D BIASCO

Tamra Biasco
Chief, Risk Analysis Branch
Mitigation Division

AS

FEMA REGION 10 LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

The *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool* demonstrates how the Local Mitigation Plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR §201.6 and offers States and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to participating jurisdictions.

1. The Multi-Jurisdiction Summary Sheet is used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements in the Plan.
2. The Regulation Checklist provides a summary of FEMA's evaluation of whether the Plan has addressed all requirements.
3. The Plan Assessment identifies the plan's strengths as well as documents areas for future improvement.

The FEMA Mitigation Planner must reference the *Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide* when completing this *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool*.

Jurisdiction: Tillamook County; Cities of Bay City, Garibaldi, Manzanita, Nehalem, Rockaway Beach, Tillamook and Wheeler; Ports of Tillamook Bay and Garibaldi	Title of Plan: Tillamook County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan	Date of Plan: June 29, 2017
Local Point of Contact: Sarah Absher	Address: 1510 B Third Street Tillamook, Oregon 97141	
Title: Land Use Planner III		
Agency: Tillamook County, Department of Community Development		
Phone Number: 503-842-3408	E-Mail: sabsher@co.tillamook.or.us	

State Reviewer: Joseph A. Murray	Title: Planner	Date: June 30, 2017 and August 11, 2017
--	--------------------------	--

FEMA Reviewer: Josh Vidmar	Title: CERC	Date: July 19, 2017
Amanda Siok, Amanda.Siok@fema.dhs.gov	FEMA Mitigation Planner	08/15/2017
Date Received in FEMA Region 10	06/30/2017	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption	08/15/2017	
Plan Approved		

SECTION 1: MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET (used only for multi-jurisdictional plans)

INSTRUCTIONS: The Multi-Jurisdiction Summary Spreadsheet is completed by listing each participating jurisdiction and which required Elements for each jurisdiction were 'Met' or 'Not Met,' and when the adoption resolutions were received. This Summary Sheet does not imply that a mini-plan be developed for each jurisdiction; it is used to ensure that each jurisdiction participating in the Plan has been documented and has met the requirements for those Elements (A through E).

MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET (Add additional pages if necessary)										
#	Jurisdiction Name	Jurisdiction Type (city/borough/district, etc.)	POC	Required Revisions / Comments	Requirements Met (Y/N)					
					A. Planning Process	B. Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment	C. Mitigation Strategy	D. Plan Review, Evaluation & Implementation	E. Plan Adoption	F. State Requirements
1	Tillamook County	County	Marian Lahav/ Sarah Absher	B4-a. Type of repetitive loss structures needs to be addressed.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n/a
2	City of Bay City	City	Marian Lahav/ Angie Cherry	B4-a. Type of repetitive loss structures needs to be addressed.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n/a
3	City of Garibaldi	City	Marian Lahav/ John O'Leary	B4-a. Type of repetitive loss structures needs to be addressed.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n/a
4	City of Manzanita	City	Marian Lahav/ Jerry Taylor	B4-a. Type of repetitive loss structures needs to be addressed.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n/a
5	City of Nehalem	City	Marian Lahav/ Dale Shafer	B4-a. Type of repetitive loss structures needs to be addressed.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n/a
6	City of Rockaway Beach	City	Marian Lahav/ Terri Michel	B4-a. Type of repetitive loss structures needs to be addressed.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n/a

MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET (Add additional pages if necessary)

#	Jurisdiction Name	Jurisdiction Type (city/borough/district, etc.)	POC	Required Revisions / Comments	Requirements Met (Y/N)					
					A. Planning Process	B. Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment	C. Mitigation Strategy	D. Plan Review, Evaluation & Implementation	E. Plan Adoption	F. State Requirements
7	City of Tillamook	City	Marian Lahav/ Paul Wynter-green	B4-a. Type of repetitive loss structures needs to be addressed.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n/a
8	City of Wheeler	City	Marian Lahav/ Geoff Wull-schlager	B4-a. Type of repetitive loss structures needs to be addressed.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n/a
9	Port of Tillamook Bay	Special District (Port)	Marian Lahav/ Aaron Palter	B4-a. Type of repetitive loss structures needs to be addressed.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n/a
10	Port of Garibaldi	Special District (Port)	Marian Lahav/ Michael Saindon	B4-a. Type of repetitive loss structures needs to be addressed.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n/a

SECTION 2: REGULATION CHECKLIST

INSTRUCTIONS: The Regulation Checklist is completed by FEMA. The purpose of the Checklist is to identify the location of relevant or applicable content in the Plan by Element/sub-element and to determine if each requirement has been 'Met' or 'Not Met.' The 'Required Revisions' summary at the bottom of each Element is completed by FEMA to provide a clear explanation of the revisions that are required for plan approval. Required revisions are explained for each plan sub-element that is 'Not Met.' Sub-elements are referenced in each summary by using the appropriate numbers (A1, B3, etc.), where applicable.

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS				
A1. Does the Plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(1))	Ack., p. 2; Planning Process, pp. 328-339; App. C, PDF pp. 602-681	X		
A2. Does the Plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as other interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement §201.6(b)(2))	Ack., p. 2; Planning Process, pp. 328-339; App. C, PDF pp. 602-681	X		
A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1))	Ack., p. 2; Planning Process, pp. 328-339; App. C, PDF pp. 602-681	X		
A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))	Citations throughout plan; References, pp. 345-351	X		
A5. Is there discussion of how the community(ies) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii))	Plan Maintenance, p. 341	X		
A6. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a 5-year cycle)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i))	Plan Maintenance, pp. 340-344	X		
ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS				

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT				
B1. Does the Plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction(s)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))	Risk Assessment, pp. 116-245; App. A, pp. 360-451	X		
B2. Does the Plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))	Risk Assessment, pp. 116-245; App. A, pp. 360-451	X		
B3. Is there a description of each identified hazard's impact on the community as well as an overall summary of the community's vulnerability for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))	Risk Assessment, pp. 116-245; App. A, pp. 360-451	X		
B4. Does the Plan address NFIP insured structures within the jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))	Risk Assessment, pp. 175-176	X		
<u>ELEMENT B: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY				
C1. Does the plan document each jurisdiction's existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3))	Mitigation Strategy, p. 317; App. C, PDF pp. 460-601	X		
C2. Does the Plan address each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))	App. B, PDF pp. 478-482; App. C, PDF pp. 556-557	X		
C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))	Mitigation Strategy, pp. 296-297	X		
C4. Does the Plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))	Mitigation Strategy, pp. 298-311	X		
C5. Does the Plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including cost benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii))	Mitigation Strategy, pp. 297-311	X		
C6. Does the Plan describe a process by which local governments will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii))	Mitigation Strategy, p. 315	X		

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION (applicable to plan updates only)				
D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Community Profile, pp. 84-114	X		
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Mitigation Strategy, pp. 312-314	X		
D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Mitigation Strategy, pp. 296-297	X		
ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS				
ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION				
E1. Does the Plan include documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	Tracking for approval letters on PDF p. 682 - 685			
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	Tracking for approval letters on PDF p. 682 - 685			
ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS				
ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)				
The State of Oregon imposes no additional requirements upon local mitigation plans.				

SECTION 3: PLAN ASSESSMENT

A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas where these could be improved beyond minimum requirements.

Element A: Planning Process

Plan Strengths

- The description of the planning process is very detailed, and includes information on when new data was obtained, resulting in a change of participation.
- Table 131, which details public comment and response, is an excellent way to show that the public's comments are being addressed.
- There was a wide array of methods utilized in soliciting public participation for this plan. Some of these include web-based outreach, notices at public locations, and notices published in local papers.

Opportunities for Improvement

- For future plan updates, consider utilizing social media outlets to reach a broader section of the public. Surveys are another useful tool for garnering participation in the planning process. Using a survey would be especially helpful given the large number of individuals who participated in the planning process.

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

Plan Strengths

- The large-scale maps and individual jurisdictional maps are a good way to show how hazards affect each community separately, juxtaposed with how they affect the County as a whole.
- The hazard profiles include detailed descriptions of sub-hazards (i.e. Riverine and Coastal flooding in the main Flood profile). This adds an extra level of detail that goes beyond requirements, and focuses more on what affects the County.
- Tables are very well-utilized in a wide variety of manners. These help to organize and summarize critical information, which greatly enhances the overall readability of the plan.
- There is a dedicated section to Areas of Mitigation Interest that describes by community projects that may help to alleviate some of the problems that could be caused by hazard events. These sections identify what, if any, particular areas of each jurisdiction are most susceptible, and how risk can be reduced.
- Overall, the risk assessment and vulnerability analysis are extremely comprehensive, and cover a great deal of detail.

Opportunities for Improvement

- There are inconsistencies with the mapping. While some are marked as from outside sources, those that are made "in house" should keep a general format where possible.

- In future editions, consider adding a table showing the hazards covered in this plan, and those covered in the State's mitigation plan.

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

Plan Strengths

- The review of the county's capabilities is extraordinarily encompassing. This assessment discusses natural hazards in context of the County's Comprehensive Plan, and then offers a number of suggestions and possible policies that could be introduced in order to further improve the County's resilience to these hazards.
- Actions are very specific to each community. Not only does each community have its own actions, but there is also discussion on what are the most feasible possibilities.

Opportunities for Improvement

- According to the agendas, FEMA's STAPLEE method was used to prioritize mitigation actions. However, these scores do not show up in the body of the plan. If these exist, including the scores themselves would provide an extra level of detail in the Mitigation Strategy.
- Describe what each of the action priorities means: high, medium, and low. The plan says that they were considered qualitatively, but if particular nomenclature is to be used, these need to be more clearly defined.

Element D: Plan Update, Evaluation, and Implementation (*Plan Updates Only*)

Plan Strengths

- The plan details how the plan will be maintained during its lifecycle. This includes documenting the status of mitigation actions, "success stories" from completed projects, new funding sources, and numerous other items that will prove to be useful if implemented.
- Individual jurisdictions are stated to have a stake in the plan maintenance process, and that they will hold a meeting every January with either the same individuals from the County's initial planning meetings, or those who now occupy those same positions. This means that there is consistency from year to year, and that there is opportunity to review actions that did or did not take place.

Opportunities for Improvement

- More information could be provided on those actions that are no longer being pursued. This helps future planners and County officials to know what has been tried, and if it might be viable in the future.

B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

The **Region 10 Integrating Natural Hazard Mitigation into Comprehensive Planning** is a resource specific to Region 10 states and provides examples of how communities are integrating natural hazard mitigation strategies into comprehensive planning. You can find it in the FEMA Library at <http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/89725>.

The **Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide and Tool** resource is available through FEMA's Library and should be referred to for the next plan update. <http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?id=4859>

The **Local Mitigation Planning Handbook** is available. While the requirements under §201.6 have not changed, the Handbook provides guidance to local governments on developing or updating hazard mitigation plans to meet the requirements is available through the FEMA Library website. <http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?id=7209>

The **Mitigation Ideas: A Resource for Reducing Risk from Natural Hazards** resource presents ideas for how to mitigate the impacts of different natural hazards, from drought and sea level rise, to severe winter weather and wildfire. The document also includes ideas for actions that communities can take to reduce risk to multiple hazards, such as incorporating a hazard risk assessment into the local development review process. <http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?id=6938>

FEMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance: Currently, FEMA administers three programs that provide funding for eligible mitigation projects that reduces disaster losses and protect life and property from future disaster damages. The three programs are the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP), the Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) Program, and the Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Program.

- HMGP assists in implementing long-term hazard mitigation measures following a Presidential major disaster declaration
- PDM provides funds for hazard mitigation planning and projects on an annual basis
- FMA provides funds for projects to reduce or eliminate risk of flood damage to buildings that are insured under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) on an annual basis

The mitigation strategy may include eligible projects to be funded through FEMA's hazard mitigation grant programs (Pre-Disaster Mitigation, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, Flood Mitigation Assistance). Contact your State Hazard Mitigation Officer, Angie Lane at angie.lane@mil.state.or.us, for more information or visit: <http://www.fema.gov/hazard-mitigation-assistance>.

The FEMA Region X Risk Mapping, Analysis, and Planning program (Risk MAP) releases a monthly newsletter that includes information about upcoming events and training opportunities, as well as hazard and risk related news from around the Region. Past newsletters can be viewed at: <http://www.starrteam.com/starr/RegionalWorkspaces/RegionX/Pages/default.aspx>. If you would like to receive future newsletters, email rxnewsletter@starr-team.com