

S13. Effectiveness of Local Mitigation Policies, Programs, and Capabilities

General Summary of Current Local Policies, Programs, and Capabilities of Jurisdictions to Accomplish Hazard Mitigation

Generally, Kentucky's local jurisdictions identify in their multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plans the following policies, programs, and capabilities. This is not exhaustive or a fully representative list, of course:

- Floodplain Management Ordinances
- Community Rating System (CRS) Participation or Eligibility
- Zoning Regulations
- Subdivision Regulations
- Fire Prevention Codes
- Stormwater Management Plans
- National Weather Service (NWS) Storm Ready Program Participation
- Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)
- Local Hazard Mitigation Plans
- Regional Development Agency
- Local Emergency Management
- Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)
- Community Emergency Response Teams (CERTs)

Table LC-1 summarizes which communities possess the above policies programs, and capabilities. Where recorded, the table lists county and city possession of the above policies, programs, and capabilities. To save space in the table, assume the community listed is a county unless designated as a city. Cities will be designated with “, C.” The table will at minimum¹ list all counties in possession of the above policies, programs, and capabilities. Not all communities will have identified the above policies, programs, and capabilities. Please refer to footnotes for clarifications of differences in how the policy, program, or capability was interpreted and for community-specific additions. Where a community did not record one of the above as one of its policies, programs, or capabilities, an “N/A” designation will be assigned.

For the purposes of summarizing local policies, programs, and capabilities, this document highlights in the below table the policies, programs, and capabilities shared by most of the local multi-hazard mitigation plans. Footnotes are important for caveats to this list.

¹ The only current multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan that does not list cities along with its county analysis of policies, programs, and capabilities is the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD) plan.

Table LC-1. Summary of Policies, Programs, and Capabilities Identified in Multi-Jurisdictional, Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plans

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Barren River Area Development District	Allen	✓			N/A	N/A	N/A ⁵		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	Barren	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	Butler	✓			N/A	N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A
	Edmonson	✓			N/A	N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A
	Hart	✓			N/A	N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	Logan	✓			N/A	N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	Metcalfe	✓			N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A
	Monroe				N/A	N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A
	Simpson	✓			✓	N/A	N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	Warren	✓		✓ ⁶	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

² The records in this column should be taken with the proverbial grain of salt: Many communities do not list themselves as having floodplain management ordinances. However, most communities in Kentucky are participants in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) that requires the adoption of a floodplain management ordinance. These records will be corrected in future updates and amendments to the local multi-hazard mitigation plans.

³ Community Rating System Participation as recorded in “NFIP Flood Insurance Manual – April 2018.” See: https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1523648898907-09056f549d51efc72fe60bf4999e904a/20_crs_508_apr2018.pdf [Last accessed October 9, 2018].

⁴ Many plans will not specifically specify Local Emergency Management. But, it is obviously an important program/capability for mitigation. Thus, assume that all counties have local emergency management. (FEMA Emergency Management Planning Grants ensure that all Kentucky counties have Emergency Management Agencies.) Further, county-level Emergency Management Agencies generally cover incorporated cities’ emergency management needs.

⁵ The counties of the Barren River ADD did not record any Storm Management Plans. Rather, it listed Water/Sewer Fees (all counties) and Stormwater Utility Fees (Warren County) as stormwater management capabilities.

⁶ The City of Bowling Green also is in Warren County. The City of Bowling Green is a participant in the Community Rating System (CRS), as well.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Big Sandy Area Development District ⁷	Floyd	✓				STATE ⁸	⁹	✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓		
	Allen, C	✓				✓			N/A	✓	✓			
	Martin, C	✓				STATE			N/A	✓	✓			
	Prestonsburg, C	✓	✓		✓	STATE			N/A	✓	✓			
	Wayland, C			✓		STATE			N/A	✓	✓			
	Wheelwright, C	✓		✓		✓			N/A	✓	✓			
	Johnson	✓		✓	✓	STATE		✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Paintsville, C		✓	✓		STATE			N/A	✓	✓	✓		
	Magoffin			✓		STATE		✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Salyersville, C	✓		✓	✓	STATE			N/A	✓	✓			
	Martin	✓				STATE		✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓		
	Inez, C			✓		STATE			N/A	✓	✓			
	Warfield, C					STATE			N/A	✓	✓			
	Pike	✓	✓	✓		STATE		✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Coal Run, C	✓				STATE			N/A	✓	✓			
Elkhorn City, C	✓				STATE			N/A	✓	✓				
Pikeville, C	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				N/A	✓	✓			

⁷ The Big Sandy ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan lists the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities. Communities possessing these additions are in parentheses: CRS and FMA Plans (Floyd County, Allen, Martin, and Wayland; Pike County, Coal Run, Elkhorn City, and Pikeville); Land Development Plans (Wayland, Wheelwright, Johnson County, Paintsville, Magoffin County, Salyersville, Martin County, Inez, and Warfield); Comprehensive Plans (all communities save Prestonsburg); Capital Improvement Plans (Pike County); and Local Economic Development (Floyd County, Martin, Prestonsburg, and Wheelwright; Martin County, Inez, and Warfield; and Pike County and Elkhorn City).

⁸ Big Sandy ADD's multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan distinguished between local and adherence to Kentucky's fire prevention code.

⁹ Stormwater Management Plans were listed as a potential capability for all jurisdictions in the Big Sandy ADD. However, no jurisdiction is listed as having one in Big Sandy ADD's current plan.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Bluegrass Area Development District	Anderson			✓	✓				10	✓	✓	✓	11	N/A
	Lawrenceburg, C			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Bourbon			✓	✓					✓	✓	✓		N/A
	Millersburg, C			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	North Middletown, C			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Paris, C		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Boyle	✓		✓	✓					✓	✓	✓		N/A
	Danville, C	✓		✓	✓		✓			✓	✓			N/A
	Junction City, C			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Perryville, C	✓		✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Clark			✓	✓					✓	✓	✓		N/A
	Winchester, C			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Estill	✓								✓	✓	✓		N/A
	Irvine, C	✓			✓	✓				✓	✓			N/A
	Ravenna, C	✓			✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Fayette ¹²	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A
Lexington, C ¹³	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A

¹⁰ Emergency Operations Plans were listed as local capability option for the Bluegrass ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan. No jurisdiction is listed as having one.

¹¹ LEPCs are listed as a local capability option for the Bluegrass ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan. No jurisdiction is listed as having one. This, in the future, will need clarification.

¹² Fayette County and Lexington are combined into the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government (LFUCG). LFUCG has its own multi-hazard mitigation plan separate from the Bluegrass ADD's multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan.

¹³ LFUCG lists the following policies, programs, and capabilities: Comprehensive Plans; Building Codes; Subdivision Codes; a Floodplain Management Plan; Expansion Area Master Plans; Greenway Management Plans; a Rural Service Area Land Management Plan; Zoning Ordinances; a Mining and Quarrying Ordinance; Geotechnical Manuals; a Structures Manual; Infrastructure Development Manuals; a Sanitary Sewer and Pump Station Manual; a HazMat Ordinance; Underground Tank Regulations; Stormwater Manuals; a Sinkhole Ordinance; and a Kentucky Drought Mitigation and Response Plan.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Bluegrass Area Development District	Franklin	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Frankfort, C</i>		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓		N/A
	Garrard				✓					✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Lancaster, C</i>			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Harrison	✓		✓	✓					✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Berry, C</i>			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	<i>Cynthiana, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓				✓	✓			N/A
	Jessamine			✓	✓					✓	✓	✓ ¹⁴		N/A
	<i>Nicholasville, C</i>		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	<i>Wilmore, C</i>			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Lincoln			✓	✓					✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Crab Orchard, C</i>			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	<i>Hustonsville, C</i>									✓	✓			N/A
	<i>Stanford, C</i>			✓	✓		✓			✓	✓			N/A
	Madison		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Berea, C</i>		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	<i>Richmond, C</i>		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Mercer			✓	✓					✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Burgin, C</i>			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	<i>Harrodsburg, C</i>			✓	✓		✓			✓	✓			N/A
Nicholas									✓	✓	✓		N/A	
<i>Carlisle, C</i>			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A	

¹⁴ That only Jessamine County is listed as having "local emergency management" needs to be clarified for future Bluegrass ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan amendments and updates: Every county should be listed as having an Emergency Management Agency. Scott County and the City of Georgetown share an EMA. So, this needs clarification in the future.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Bluegrass Area Development District	Powell									✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Clay City, C</i>									✓	✓			N/A
	<i>Stanton, C</i>			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
	Scott			✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Georgetown, C</i>			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Sadieville, C</i>			✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓			N/A
	<i>Stamping Ground, C</i>			✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓			N/A
	Woodford			✓	✓					✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Midway, C</i>			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A
<i>Versailles, C</i>			✓	✓					✓	✓			N/A	

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)	
Buffalo Trace Area Development District ¹⁵	Bracken	✓						16	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	<i>Augusta, C</i>	✓							N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	<i>Brooksville, C</i>								N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	<i>Germantown, C</i>								N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Fleming	✓							N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	<i>Ewing, C</i>								N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	<i>Flemingsburg, C</i>	✓		✓	✓				N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Lewis	✓			✓				N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	<i>Concord, C</i>	✓							N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	<i>Vanceburg, C</i>	✓			✓	✓		✓		N/A	✓		N/A	✓	
	Mason	✓			✓	✓				N/A	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	<i>Dover, C</i>	✓								N/A	✓		N/A	✓	
	<i>Maysville, C</i>	✓		17	✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	<i>Sardis, C</i>									N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Robertson	✓								N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
<i>Mt. Olivet, C</i>									N/A	✓	✓		N/A		

¹⁵ Of note, the communities under the Buffalo Trace ADD multi-hazard mitigation plan list the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities (with communities having them in parentheses): Land Development Plans (Flemingsburg, Vanceburg, and Maysville); Comprehensive Plans (all communities save Dover, Robertson County, and Mt. Olivet); Capital Improvement Plans (no community listed); and Local Economic Development (Fleming County, Flemingsburg, Mason County, and Maysville).

¹⁶ National Weather Service (NWS) StormReady program is listed as a policy, program, or capability. No community is listed as participating.

¹⁷ City of Maysville is listed as having a "CRS/FMA Plan."

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Cumberland Valley Area Development District	Bell ¹⁸	N/A	✓		N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	Middlesboro, C	N/A		✓	N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Pineville, C	N/A		✓	N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Clay ¹⁹	N/A			N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	Fogertown, C	N/A			N/A	✓ ²⁰	N/A	N/A		✓	✓			N/A
	Manchester, C	N/A		✓	N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Harlan ²¹	N/A			N/A	✓	N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	Benham, C	N/A			N/A	✓	N/A	N/A		✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Cumberland, C	N/A			N/A	✓	N/A	N/A		✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Evarts, C	N/A			N/A	✓	N/A	N/A		✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Harlan, C	N/A			N/A	✓	N/A	N/A		✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Loyall, C	N/A			N/A	✓	N/A	N/A		✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Lynch, C	N/A			N/A	✓	N/A	N/A		✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Jackson ²²	N/A			N/A			N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	
McKee, C	N/A			N/A			N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓			N/A

¹⁸ Bell County, Middlesboro, and Pineville also list the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies, Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments, Region 13 Healthcare Coalitions, and Six-Year Kentucky Highway Plans.

¹⁹ Clay County and Manchester also list the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies, Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments (THIRAs), Region 13 Healthcare Coalitions, and Six-Year Kentucky Highway Plans.

²⁰ "Fire Prevention Codes" here is interpreted for the Cumberland Valley ADD's multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan as the "Firewise" program.

²¹ Harlan County and its cities also are listed as having the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies, Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments (THIRAs), Region 13 Healthcare Coalitions, and Six-Year Kentucky Highway Plans

²² Jackson County and McKee also list the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies, Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments (THIRAs), Region 13 Healthcare Coalitions, Six-Year Kentucky Highway Plans, and Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Plans (CSEPPs).

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Cumberland Valley Area Development District	Knox ²³	N/A			N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	<i>Barbourville, C</i>	N/A		✓	N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A
	<i>Corbin, C</i>	N/A	✓	✓	N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Laurel ²⁴	N/A			N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	<i>London, C</i>	N/A		✓	N/A		N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	Rockcastle ²⁵	N/A			N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
	<i>Brodhead, C</i>	N/A			N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A
	<i>Livingston, C</i>	N/A			N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A
	<i>Mt. Vernon, C</i>	N/A			N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A
	Whitley ²⁶	N/A			N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A
	<i>Williamsburg, C</i>	N/A			✓	N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓		N/A
<i>Corbin, C</i> ²⁷	N/A	✓	✓	N/A		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓			N/A	

²³ Knox County, Barbourville, and Corbin also list the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies, Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments (THIRAs), Region 13 Healthcare Coalitions, and Six-Year Kentucky Highway Plans.

²⁴ Laurel County and London also list the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies, Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments (THIRAs), Region 13 Healthcare Coalitions, Six-Year Kentucky Highway Plans, and Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Plans (CSEPPs).

²⁵ Rockcastle County, Brodhead, Livingston, and Mt. Vernon also list the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies, Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments (THIRAs), Region 13 Healthcare Coalitions, Six-Year Kentucky Highway Plans, and Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Plans (CSEPPs).

²⁶ Whitley County, Williamsburg, and Corbin also list the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies, Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments (THIRAs), Region 13 Healthcare Coalitions, and Six-Year Kentucky Highway Plans

²⁷ The City of Corbin is shared by both Knox and Whitley Counties.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
FIVCO (Five Counties) ²⁸	Boyd	✓						✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Ashland, C	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Catlettsburg, C	✓		✓			✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Carter	✓			✓		✓		N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Grayson, C	✓	✓	✓					N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Olive Hill, C	✓		✓				✓		N/A	✓		N/A	
	Elliott	✓							N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Sandy Hook, C							✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Greenup	✓			✓		✓		N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Bellefonte, C			✓	✓		✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Flatwoods, C	✓		✓	✓		✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Greenup, C	✓		✓			✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Raceland, C	✓		✓			✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Russell, C	✓		✓	✓		✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	South Shore, C	✓							N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Worthington, C	✓			✓			✓		N/A	✓		N/A	
	Wurtland, C	✓						✓		N/A	✓		N/A	
	Lawrence	✓			✓				✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A
Louisa, C	✓							✓	N/A	✓		N/A	✓	

²⁸ FIVCO's multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan lists also the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities. Communities participating are in parentheses: CRS and FMA Plans (Ashland, Grayson, and Lawrence County); Land Development Plans (Ashland and Catlettsburg; Grayson and Olive Hill; and Greenup County, Bellefonte, Flatwoods, Greenup, Raceland, Russell, South Shore, Worthington, and Wurtland); Comprehensive Plans (Ashland and Catlettsburg; Grayson; and Greenup County, Bellefonte, Flatwoods, Greenup, Raceland, Russell, South Shore, Worthington, and Wurtland); Capital Improvement Plans (Ashland); and Local Economic Development (Boyd County and Ashland, Carter County and Olive Hill, Elliott County, Greenup County, and Lawrence County).

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)	
Gateway Area Development District ²⁹	Bath	✓	✓		✓			✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	30	
	Owingsville, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Salt Lick, C	✓	✓		✓				N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Sharpsburg, C	✓		✓	✓				N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Menifee	✓							N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A		
	Frenchburg, C	✓							N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Montgomery				✓				N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A		
	Camargo, C	✓							N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Jeffersonville, C	✓							N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Mount Sterling, C	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓	N/A		
	Morgan	✓								N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	West Liberty, C	✓			✓	✓				N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Rowan	✓	✓			✓				N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Lakeview Heights, C				✓					N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
Morehead, C	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A		

²⁹ The Gateway ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan lists the following two additional policies, programs, and capabilities: Land Development Plans and Local Economic Development Councils. Owingsville, Mount Sterling, Lakeview Heights, and Morehead are listed as having Land Development Plans. All communities save Morgan County and West Liberty are listed as having Local Economic Development Councils.

³⁰ CERTs were listed as a potential policy, program, or capability. No jurisdiction is listed as having this capability.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Green River Area Development District ³¹	Daviess	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Owensboro, C	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Whitesville, C			✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Hancock	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Hawesville, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Lewisport, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Henderson	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Corydon, C			✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Henderson, C	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Robards, C				N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	McLean	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Calhoun, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	
	Island, C				N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	
	Livermore, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	
	Sacramento, C				N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	

³¹ Green River ADD's multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan also listed the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities that most of its communities possess or participate in: Building Codes, AmeriCorps Homeland Security, Economic Development, GIS Coordinator, Reverse 911, Emergency Management Social Media. GRADD also provides for its communities Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies; Comprehensive Plans (for Owensboro; Hancock County; Henderson County; McLean County; Hartford and Beaver Dam; Union County; and for Daviess County, Owensboro, and Whitesville); the Kentucky Agricultural Emergency Plan; the Long-Term Flood Economic Recovery Strategy for the region; Emergency Response Plans targeting aging populations; Water Management Plans; the Owensboro, Daviess County, and Kentucky Transportation Cabinet Collaborative Stormwater Phase II Plan; Transportation Plans; and Economic Development Strategic Plans (for Union, McLean County, and Webster County).

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)	
Green River Area Development District	Ohio	✓			N/A	N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	Beaver Dam, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Centertown, C	✓			N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Fordsville, C				N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Hartford, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	McHenry, C	✓			N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Rockport, C				N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Union	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A		
	Morganfield, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A		
	Sturgis, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A		
	Uniontown, C	✓				N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A	
	Waverly, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A			✓	✓		N/A		
	Webster	✓				N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	Clay, C	✓				N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Dixon, C					N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Providence, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Sebree, C	✓		✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Slaughters, C	✓				N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓
Wheatcroft, C	✓				N/A	N/A	N/A	✓		✓	✓		N/A	✓	

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)	
KIPDA (Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency) ³²	Bullitt	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A		
	<i>Fox Chase, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	<i>Hillview, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	<i>Hebron Estates, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	<i>Hunters Hollow, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	<i>Lebanon Junction, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	<i>Mt. Washington, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	<i>Pioneer Village, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	<i>Shepherdsville, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Henry	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	<i>Campbellsburg, C</i>						✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	<i>Eminence, C</i>						✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	<i>New Castle, C</i>						✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	<i>Pleasureville, C</i>						✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	<i>Smithfield, C</i>						✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Jefferson ³³	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
<i>Louisville, C</i> ^{34, 35}	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A		

³² The KIPDA multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan listed two (2) additional policies, programs, or capabilities: Land Development Plans and Local Economic Development Councils. Henry County; Oldham County, Crestwood, Goshen, Lagrange, Orchard Grass Hills, Pewee Valley, and River Bluff; Shelby County, Shelbyville, and Simpsonville; and Spencer County and Taylorsville have Land Development Plans. Bullitt County, Fox Chase, Hillview, Hebron Estates, Hunters Hollow, Lebanon Junction, Mt. Washington, Pioneer Village, and Shepherdsville; Henry County; Oldham County, Crestwood, Lagrange, Pewee Valley; Shelby County, Shelbyville, and Simpsonville; Spencer County; and Trimble County, Bedford, and Milton have Local Economic Development Councils.

³³ Jefferson County is combined with its major city as the Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Government.

³⁴ Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Government has its own multi-hazard mitigation plan separate from the KIPDA multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan.

³⁵ The Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Government multi-hazard mitigation plan emphasizes for its policies, programs, and capabilities the number of federal and local programs and projects being implemented at the time and emphasizes codes. Regarding the latter, specifically Louisville/Jefferson County lists Cornerstone 2020, Land Development Codes, a Floodplain Management

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
KIPDA (Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency)	Oldham	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Crestwood, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Goshen, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Lagrange, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Orchard Grass Hills, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Pewee Valley, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	River Bluff, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Shelby	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Shelbyville, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Simpsonville, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Spencer	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			N/A	✓	✓	N/A	
	Taylorsville, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			N/A	✓		N/A	
	Trimble	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Bedford, C	✓					✓		✓	N/A	✓		N/A	
Milton, C	✓					✓		✓	N/A	✓		N/A		

Ordinance, Building Codes, Residential Codes, and Hazardous Materials Ordinances. Finally, regarding Building Codes, Louisville/Jefferson County does participate in the Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS) and is a Community Rating System (CRS) community with a rare rating of Class 3.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Kentucky River Area Development District ³⁶	Breathitt	✓			37		38	39	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	<i>Jackson, C</i>	✓				✓			✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Knott	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	<i>Hindman, C</i>	✓							✓	✓	✓		N/A	
	<i>Pippa Passes, C</i>								✓	✓	✓		N/A	
	Lee	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	<i>Beattyville, C</i>	✓				✓			✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Leslie	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	<i>Hyden, C</i>	✓							✓	✓	✓		N/A	
	Letcher	✓								✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	<i>Fleming-Neon, C</i>	✓								✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	<i>Jenkins, C</i>	✓					✓			✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	<i>Whitesburg, C</i>	✓								✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Owsley	✓								✓	✓	✓	N/A	
<i>Booneville, C</i>	✓								✓	✓	✓	N/A		

³⁶ The Kentucky River ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan lists the following additional policies, programs, and capabilities. Communities participating are in parentheses: CRS and FMA Plans (No Community); Land Development Plans (No Community); Local Economic Development (Breathitt County; Knott County; Lee County; Leslie County; Letcher County and Whitesburg; Owsley County and Booneville; Perry County and Hazard; and Wolfe County).

³⁷ Subdivision Regulations are listed as a policy, program, or capability for the Kentucky River ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan. But, no community is listed as having them.

³⁸ Stormwater Management Plans are listed as a policy, program, or capability for the Kentucky River ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan. But, no community is listed as having such plans.

³⁹ NWS Storm Ready participation is listed as a policy, program, or capability for the Kentucky River ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan. But, no community is listed as participating.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Kentucky River Area Development District	Perry	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	<i>Buckhorn, C</i>								✓	✓	✓		N/A	
	<i>Hazard, C</i>	✓		✓		✓			✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	<i>Vicco, C</i>	✓							✓	✓	✓		N/A	
	Wolfe								✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	<i>Campton, C</i>	✓							✓	✓	✓		N/A	
Lake Cumberland Area Development District ⁴⁰	Adair	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	<i>Columbia, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Casey	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	<i>Liberty, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Clinton	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	<i>Albany, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Cumberland	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	<i>Burkesville, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Green	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	<i>Greensburg, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	McCreary	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A

⁴⁰ The communities of the Lake Cumberland ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan did not list policies, programs, and capabilities beyond the general citation of existing staff departments, the power to tax and to spend, and to provide enforcement. Lake Cumberland ADD did include the following caveat: "All jurisdictions in the [Lake Cumberland ADD] region have participated in the hazard mitigation planning process; but, there is little interest in the NFIP program and building and zoning code enforcement."

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Lake Cumberland Area Development District	Pulaski	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	<i>Burnside, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	<i>Eubank, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	<i>Ferguson, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	<i>Science Hill, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	<i>Somerset, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Russell	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	<i>Jamestown, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	<i>Russell Springs, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Taylor	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	<i>Campbellsville, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Wayne	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
<i>Monticello, C</i>	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Lincoln Trail Area Development District ⁴¹	Breckinridge	42		43	44	N/A	45	46	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	<i>Cloverport, C</i>					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	<i>Hardinsburg, C</i>					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	<i>Irvington, C</i>					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Grayson					N/A			✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	<i>Caneyville, C</i>					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	<i>Clarkson, C</i>					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	<i>Leitchfield, C</i>					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A

⁴¹ The Lincoln Trail ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan lists the following additional relevant policies, programs, and capabilities. It does not specify which counties and cities possess or operate such policies, programs, or capabilities: Comprehensive Master Plans; Capital Improvement Plans; Economic Development Plans; Continuity of Operations Plans; Transportation Plans; Community Wildfire Protection Plans; Brownfield, Redevelopment, Disaster, etc. Plans; Building Codes; Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS) Participation; Fire Department ISO Rating; Site Plan Review Requirements; Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs); Acquisition of Land for Open-Space and Public Recreation Areas; Planning Commissions; Mitigation Planning Commissions; Maintenance Programs to Reduce Risk; Mutual Aid Agreements; Capital Improvement Project Funding; Authority to Levy Taxes for Specific Purposes; Fees for Water, Sewer, Gas, or Electric Services; Impact Fees for New Development; Stormwater Utility Fees; the Ability to Incur Debt through Private Activities; and the Ability to Incur Debt through General Obligation Bonds

⁴² The Lincoln Trail ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan does not specify which counties and cities have Floodplain Management Ordinances. It simply cites that 12 cities and 4 counties have Floodplain Management Ordinances.

⁴³ The Lincoln Trail ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan does not specify which counties and cities have Zoning Regulations. It simply cites that 14 cities and 4 counties have Zoning Regulations.

⁴⁴ The Lincoln Trail ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan does not specify which counties and cities have Subdivision Regulations. It simply cites that 13 cities and 4 counties have Subdivision Regulations.

⁴⁵ The Lincoln Trail ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan does not specify which counties and cities have Stormwater Management Plans. It simply cites that 9 cities and 4 counties have Stormwater Management Plans.

⁴⁶ The Lincoln Trail ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan does not specify which counties and cities have NWS StormReady Certification. It simply cites that 1 county has NWS StormReady certification.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Lincoln Trail Area Development District	Hardin					N/A			✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	Elizabethtown, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Radcliff, C		✓			N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Sonora, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Upton, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Vine Grove, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	West Point, C		✓			N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	LaRue					N/A			✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	Hodgenville, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Marion					N/A			✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	Bradfordsville, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Lebanon, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Loretto, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Raywick, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Meade					N/A			✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	Brandenburg, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Ekron, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Muldraugh, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Nelson					N/A			✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	Bardstown, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
Bloomfield, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	
Fairfield, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	
New Haven, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Lincoln Trail Area Development District	Washington					N/A			✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A
	Mackville, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Springfield, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A
	Willisburg, C					N/A			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Northern Kentucky Area Development District ⁴⁷	Boone	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Florence, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Union, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Walton, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓

⁴⁷ The Northern Kentucky ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan added the following policies, programs, and capabilities: CRS and FMA Plans, Land Development Plans, Comprehensive Plans, Capital Improvement Plans, and Local Economic Development. The following jurisdictions possess or use these added policies, programs, or capabilities:

- **CRS and FMA Plans:** Campbell County, Melbourne, Silver Grove, Southgate, and Woodlawn.
- **Land Development Plans:** Boone County, Florence, Union, and Walton; Campbell County, Alexandria, Bellevue, Cold Spring, Crestview, Dayton, Fort Thomas, Highland Heights, Melbourne, Newport, Silver Grove, Southgate, Wilder, and Woodlawn; Carrollton; Gallatin County; Grant County, Corinth, Crittenden, Dry Ridge, and Williamstown; Kenton County, Bromley, Covington, Crescent Springs, Crestview Hills, Edgewood, Elsmere, Erlanger, Fairview, Ft. Mitchell, Ft. Wright, Independence, Kenton Vale, Lakeside Park, Ludlow, Park Hills, Ryland Heights, Taylor Mill, and Villa Hills; and Pendleton County, Butler, and Falmouth.
- **Comprehensive Plans:** Boone County, Florence, Union, and Walton; Campbell County, Alexandria, Bellevue, Cold Spring, Crestview, Fort Thomas, Highland Heights, Melbourne, Newport, Silver Grove, Southgate, Wilder, and Woodlawn; Carrollton; Gallatin County; Grant County, Corinth, Crittenden, Dry Ridge, and Williamstown; Kenton County, Bromley, Covington, Crescent Springs, Crestview Hills, Edgewood, Elsmere, Erlanger, Ft. Mitchell, Ft. Wright, Independence, Lakeside Park, Ludlow, Park Hills, Ryland Heights, Taylor Mill, and Villa Hills; Owen County and Owenton; and Pendleton County, Butler, and Falmouth.
- **Capital Improvement Plans:** Boone County and Florence; Campbell County, Alexandria, Bellevue, Cold Spring, Crestview, Dayton, Fort Thomas, Highland Heights, Melbourne, Newport, Silver Grove, Southgate, and Wilder; Carroll County and Carrollton; Gallatin County; Grant County; Kenton County; and Pendleton County
- **Local Economic Development:** Boone County, Florence, Union, and Walton; Campbell County; Carroll County and Carrollton; Gallatin County; Grant County, Corinth, Crittenden, Dry Ridge, and Williamstown; Kenton County; Owen County and Owenton; and Pendleton County, Butler, and Falmouth.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)	
Northern Kentucky Area Development District	Campbell	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A		
	Alexandria, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Bellevue, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	California, C	✓		✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Cold Spring, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Crestview, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Dayton, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Fort Thomas, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Highland Heights, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Melbourne, C	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Mentor, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Newport, C	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Silver Grove, C	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Southgate, C	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Wilder, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Woodlawn, C	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Carroll	✓					✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Carrollton, C	✓			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Ghent, C								N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Prestonville, C	✓							N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
Sanders, C	✓							N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
Worthville, C								N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A		

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Northern Kentucky Area Development District	Gallatin	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Glencoe, C	✓		✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Sparta, C	✓		✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Warsaw, C	✓		✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Grant	✓		✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	
	Corinth, C			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Crittenden, C			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Dry Ridge, C			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Williamstown, C			✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Northern Kentucky Area Development District (NKADD)	Kenton	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Bromley, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Covington, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Crescent Springs, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Crestview Hills, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Edgewood, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Elsmere, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Erlanger, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Fairview, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Ft. Mitchell, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Ft. Wright, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Independence, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Kenton Vale, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Lakeside Park, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Ludlow, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Park Hills, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Ryland Heights, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Taylor Mill, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Villa Hills, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Owen	✓					✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A
Gratz, C						✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
Monterey, C	✓					✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
Owenton, C				✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
NKADD	Pendleton	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Butler, C	✓	✓		✓	✓		N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Falmouth, C	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
Pennyrite Area Development District ⁴⁸	Caldwell	✓				✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Fredonia, C					✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Princeton, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Christian	✓				✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Crofton, C					✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Hopkinsville, C	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Lafayette, C					✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Oak Grove, C	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Pembroke, C					✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Crittenden	✓				✓			N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Marion, C				✓		✓			N/A	✓	✓	N/A	✓

⁴⁸ The Pennyrite ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan also lists the following additional policies, programs, or capabilities: FMA Plans, Land Development Plans, Comprehensive Plans, Capital Improvement Plans, and Local Economic Development. Below lists the jurisdictions possessing or using these additional policies, programs, or capabilities.

- **FMA Plans:** All counties and cities are listed as having an “FMA Plan.” This will need to be clarified in future updates and amendments.
- **Land Development Plans:** Caldwell County and Princeton; Christian County, Hopkinsville, and Oak Grove; Marion; Hopkins County, Dawson Springs, Earlington, Hanson, Madisonville, Mortons Gap, Nebo, Nortonville, St. Charles, and White Plains; Livingston County and Smithland; Lyon County, Eddyville, and Kuttawa; Muhlenberg County, Central City, and Greenville; Elkton, Guthrie, and Trenton; and Cadiz.
- **Comprehensive Plans:** Princeton; Christian County and Hopkinsville; Marion; Hopkins County, Madisonville, and Mortons Gap; Lyon County, Eddyville, and Kuttawa; Muhlenberg County, Central City, and Greenville; Elkton; and Cadiz
- **Capital Improvement Plans:** No jurisdiction is listed as having Capital Improvement Plans.
- **Local Economic Development:** Caldwell County and Princeton; Christian County, Hopkinsville, Oak Grove, and Pembroke; Hopkins County and Madisonville; Grand Rivers and Salem; and Trigg County and Cadiz.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)	
Pennyrite Area Development District	Hopkins	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	Dawson Springs, C	✓		✓		✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Earlington, C	✓				✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Hanson, C	✓				✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Madisonville, C	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Mortons Gap, C	✓				✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Nebo, C					✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Nortonville, C	✓				✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	St. Charles, C	✓				✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	White Plains, C	✓				✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Livingston	✓				✓			N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	Carrsville, C					✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Grand Rivers, C			✓		✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Salem, C					✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Smithland, C	✓			✓		✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	
	Lyon					✓	✓			N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	Eddyville, C				✓	✓	✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
Kuttawa, C				✓	✓	✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓	

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Pennyriple Area Development District	Muhlenberg	✓			✓	✓			N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	<i>Bremen, C</i>					✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	<i>Central City, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	<i>Drakesboro, C</i>					✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	<i>Greenville, C</i>	✓		✓	✓	✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	<i>Powderly, C</i>			✓		✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	<i>South Carrollton, C</i>					✓			N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Todd	✓					✓		N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	<i>Elkton, C</i>	✓			✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	<i>Guthrie, C</i>	✓			✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	<i>Trenton, C</i>	✓			✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓
	Trigg	✓					✓		N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	<i>Cadiz, C</i>	✓			✓	✓	✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	✓

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)	
Purchase Area Development District ⁴⁹	Ballard	✓							N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	<i>Barlow, C</i>								N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	<i>Kevil, C</i>								N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	<i>La Center, C</i>								N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	<i>Wickliffe, C</i>	✓							N/A	✓	✓		N/A		
	Calloway	✓			✓	✓			✓	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	<i>Murray, C</i>	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓	N/A	✓		N/A		
	<i>Hazel, C</i>									N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Carlisle	✓							✓	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	<i>Bardwell, C</i>	✓								N/A	✓		N/A		
	<i>Arlington, C</i>	✓								N/A	✓		N/A		
	Fulton	✓								N/A	✓	✓	N/A	✓	
	<i>Fulton, C</i>	✓			✓	✓				N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	<i>Hickman, C</i>	✓			✓					N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Graves	✓								N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	<i>Mayfield, C</i>	✓			✓	✓		✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
<i>Wingo, C</i>									N/A	✓	✓		N/A		

⁴⁹ The Purchase ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan also lists the following additional policies, programs, or capabilities: CRS and FMA Plans, Land Development Plans, Comprehensive Plans, Capital Improvement Plans, and Local Economic Development. Below lists the jurisdictions possessing or using these additional policies, programs, or capabilities.

- **CRS and FMA Plans:** No jurisdiction is listed as possessing this policy, program, or capability.
- **Land Development Plans:** La Center; Murray; the City of Fulton and the City of Hickman; Mayfield; Marshall County and Calvert City; and McCracken County and Paducah
- **Comprehensive Plans:** La Center; Murray; the City of Fulton and the City of Hickman; Mayfield; Benton and Calvert City; and McCracken County and Paducah
- **Capital Improvement Plans:** Ballard County, Barlow, Kevil, La Center, and Wickliffe; the City of Fulton; Calvert City; and Paducah
- **Local Economic Development:** All jurisdictions are listed as having Local Economic Development, save one: The City of Columbus in Hickman County.

Area Development District (ADD)	Jurisdiction	Floodplain Management Ordinance ²	Community Rating System (CRS) Participation ³	Zoning Regulations	Subdivision Regulations	Fire Prevention Codes	Stormwater Management Plans	NWS Storm Ready Program Participation	Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)	Local Hazard Mitigation Plans	Regional Development Agency	Local Emergency Management ⁴	Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC)	Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
Purchase Area Development District	Hickman								N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	<i>Clinton, C</i>	✓							N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	<i>Columbus, C</i>								N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	Marshall	✓				✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	<i>Benton, C</i>	✓		✓					N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	<i>Calvert City, C</i>	✓		✓	✓		✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	<i>Hardin, C</i>	✓							N/A	✓	✓		N/A	
	McCracken	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
<i>Paducah, C</i>	✓		✓	✓		✓		N/A	✓	✓		N/A		

Effectiveness of Local Policies, Programs, and Capabilities

Challenges to Implementing Local Policies, Programs, and Capabilities

Challenges to implementing the local policies, programs, and capabilities summarized above frequently are addressed in the Commonwealth of Kentucky's local hazard mitigation plans using the following generalization and insight⁵⁰:

Expansion of existing policies, programs, and capabilities to reduce potential losses from natural hazards through mitigation depends upon local jurisdictions' staff and financial resources.

County governments supply the majority of services and professional departments that are responsible for implementing, maintaining, and enforcing mitigation activities. Most cities in Kentucky are relatively sparsely populated and generally rural in commerce and development.

The cities of X, Y, Z, et al. are the largest cities in the region. However, these cities frequently or typically require assistance through partnerships with the county and/or with regional bodies and using regional resources.

The smaller cities of A, B, C, et al. have limited resources and few paid staff departments currently in place to implement and enforce existing and future policies. These cities have a limited ability to implement strategies that will enhance their capabilities in future mitigation activities.

Finally, the smallest, least populous, most rural cities of R, S, T, et al. have very limited local funding and a very limited supply of policies, programs, and capabilities available to implement mitigation activities. Such cities will be especially reliant on county governments to assist in the funding, implementation, and enforcement of policies, programs, and capabilities.

To summarize, the primary challenges to implementing local policies, programs, and capabilities are the quantity of small, relatively less populous, generally rural local jurisdictions and the lack of local government resources (i.e., staffing and tax base) that such size and ruralness implies.

⁵⁰ The below paragraphs are adapted from the Lake Cumberland Area Development District (LCADD) multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan update for 2018. See page 45. The paragraph construction and diction are clear in expressing the general challenges to all Kentucky jurisdictions in producing, maintaining, and implementing policies, programs, and capabilities that produce mitigation.

Opportunities for Implementing Mitigation Actions Through Local Capabilities

Two particular local capabilities listed above provide opportunities for implementing mitigation actions:

One, that every county has a consistently funded Emergency Management Agency (EMA) is instrumental in providing opportunities for implementing mitigation actions. Counties provide administrative, technical, cash-flow, and grant match capacities to Kentucky's generally sporadically populated and rural cities. County Emergency Managers (EMs) have facilitated many of the Commonwealth's mitigation champions: Frequently, Kentucky's most systematic and/or complicated mitigation actions have been facilitated and administered by county Emergency Managers.

That county EMAs serve as a local capability that provides opportunities for implementing mitigation actions has been facilitated through FEMA's Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) program: Kentucky uses EMPG to fund all but one county EMA. EMPG, then, provides stability in funding that allows for expertise to form that provides opportunities for mitigation action.

Two, the above summary of local policies, programs, and capabilities shows that each county and city is a member of a "Regional Development Agency." This "Regional Development Agency" is translated as Area Development District (ADD). Kentucky's ADDs are discussed throughout this document. For the purpose of this discussion, ADDs act as central sources of information and capability that provides opportunities for implementation of mitigation actions. It is uncontroversial to assert that both cities and counties' participation in federal and state programs either directly or indirectly influencing mitigation would be significantly lessened or lackluster without the capability that Kentucky's ADDs provide. ADDs conduct much of the planning that is necessary for taking full advantage of federal and state mitigation initiatives. ADDs many times apply directly for grants either to be administered by the ADDs or on behalf of a local jurisdiction that affect mitigation activity. ADDs are a primary source of information dissemination. Kentucky Emergency Management (KYEM), for example, frequently uses ADDs to disseminate new information in processes or mitigation opportunities and to facilitate training and stakeholder participation. ADDs serve as liaisons between the Commonwealth and local governments toward mitigation needs, especially when dealing with legal or political issues. Again, it is relevant to reassert that ADDs increase the capacity for local governments to take advantage of varying, increasing, and ever-changing mitigation opportunities.

Effectiveness of Local Policies, Programs, and Capabilities Toward Reducing Repetitive-Loss (RL) and Severe Repetitive-Loss Properties

The same logic that distinguishes Kentucky county-level Emergency Management Agencies (EMAs) and “Regional Development Agencies” (i.e., Area Development Districts, or ADDs) as providing opportunities for implementing mitigation actions through local capabilities applies to the effectiveness of local capabilities in reducing the number of Repetitive-Loss (RL) and Severe Repetitive-Loss (SRL) properties throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

Consistent, experienced, professional, and ambitious administrative and technical support from county-level Emergency Managers allows for the implementation of commonwealth-wide initiatives to seek and produce projects that reduce the stock of RL and SRL properties. This commonwealth-wide initiative is addressed elsewhere in this plan document. However, to summarize, the Commonwealth of Kentucky maintains the University of Kentucky Hazard Mitigation Grants Program Office (UK-HMPG). Its staff specialize in FEMA’s “non-disaster” Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) programs, i.e., the Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) and Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) grants. That the FMA program offers financial incentive to reduce RL and SRL stock (i.e., FMA offers potentially to reimburse 90% or 100% of eligible projects that reduce RL and SRL stock, respectively) has acted as effective advertisement to produce mitigation projects that reduce RL and SRL property stock. UK-HMGP has produced an abundance of mitigation projects in its decade-plus experience that have targeted the reduction of RL and SRL property stock. UK-HMGP is a specialist in application and administration of such projects. This abundance of RL- and SRL-reducing mitigation projects could not have been pursued, however, without the local capability that results from aforementioned consistent, experienced, professional, and ambitious county-level Emergency Managers.

Similarly, mitigation projects produced to reduce the RL and SRL stock have equally been facilitated by local jurisdictions’ participation in “Regional Development Agencies,” i.e., Kentucky’s Area Development Districts (ADDs). ADDs are responsible for producing most of the Commonwealth’s local, multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plans. ADDs ensure that strategies and actions to reduce the stock of RL and SRL properties are developed and prominent within respective local mitigation plans. ADDs also aid county-level Emergency Managers and local governments generally in further increasing their capabilities to take full advantage of mitigation projects that would reduce the stock of RL and SRL properties. ADDs will help with applications, with finding grant match or securing cash-flow to finance the reimbursement-based project, and with managing or administering projects targeting RL and SRL properties.

S14.: Supporting the Development of Approvable Local Hazard Mitigation Plans

The Commonwealth of Kentucky through Kentucky Emergency Management (KYEM) certainly has provided formal hazard mitigation plan training for local governments. This formal training has been concentrated in the provision of FEMA's G-318 Local Mitigation Planning Workshop. From 2013 to the time of this plan's writing (September 2018), the FEMA G-318 Local Mitigation Planning Workshop has been at least once per year. Additionally, from September 26-27, 2016, Nick Grinstead from the University of Kentucky's Hazard Mitigation Grants Program (UK-HMGP) with Geni Jo Brawner, State Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO) and Amanda LeMaster from Kentucky Emergency Management (KYEM) provided a complete G-318 course targeted specifically to Harlan County, Kentucky. Harlan County expressed demand for the G-318 course upon renewed interest in FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) grant programs as a result of new local government administration and subsequent new local staff responsible for various mitigation activities.

The coordination at the state level of local hazard mitigation plans primarily is the responsibility of the Hazard Mitigation Grants Program Office (UK-HMGP) housed within the University of Kentucky's Martin School of Public Policy and Administration. UK-HMGP provides considerable informal training and technical assistance in the development of local jurisdictions' hazard mitigation plans.

This considerable informal training and technical assistance is greatly facilitated through the process by which local jurisdictions' hazard mitigation plans are developed and updated: The Commonwealth of Kentucky maintains fifteen (15) legislatively-created regional entities called Area Development Districts (ADDs). While ADDs are discussed in greater detail within both the Standard and Enhanced plans as a disproportionately important capability for the commonwealth and as a means by which planning processes are integrated, for the purpose of this section of the Standard plan it is relevant only to note that Kentucky's ADDs are responsible for most of the commonwealth's hazard mitigation plan development. This means that most of Kentucky's hazard mitigation plans are regional or "multi-jurisdictional." There are three (3) exceptions, of course: 1. Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Government with a population of approximately 1.3 million⁵¹ people (i.e., more than one-quarter of Kentucky's total population) understandably develops its own hazard mitigation plan. 2. Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government (LFUCG) population-wise is significantly smaller than Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Government. However, it is a major economic, urban, and cultural area for Kentucky and is home the University of Kentucky. Consequently, it develops its own hazard mitigation plan. 3. Finally, universities within Kentucky develop their own hazard mitigation plans: University of Kentucky, University of Louisville, Kentucky State University, and Northern Kentucky University all have developed or are currently developing hazard mitigation plans. And every community and

⁵¹ 1,293,953 in the metropolitan area as of 2017. 615,366 within the confines of the city itself.

technical college within the commonwealth has a hazard mitigation plan through the development of one by the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS).

With a manageable fifteen (15) multi-jurisdictional, two (2) single-jurisdictional, and (currently) five (5) university-level hazard mitigation plans able to cover 120 counties, 418 cities, four (4) public universities, and sixteen (16) community and technical colleges across 70 campuses, it is obvious the efficiency that the Area Development Districts (ADDs) provide for the commonwealth and, specifically, for UK-HMGP in being able to offer training and technical assistance: UK-HMGP is able to build and, thusly, has built individual relationships with each of Kentucky's Area Development Districts that allow it to offer one-on-one training and technical assistance during each ADD's hazard mitigation plan development/update process. UK-HMGP attends many local hazard mitigation plan meetings with ADD staff, presents at regional level meetings, and meets with ADD plan-writers and leadership throughout the plan process. Further, in the commonwealth's non-regulatory role as the frontline reviewer of hazard mitigation plans before they are sent to FEMA for its formal review and potential approval, UK-HMGP is able offer additional writing and editing technical assistance to completed hazard mitigation plans or plan sections. This UK-HMGP has performed consistently.

In summary, then, primarily training and technical assistance for local hazard mitigation plans is provided by UK-HMGP and is provided on demand, is individualized, and throughout respective planning processes.

UK-HMGP also is primarily responsible for coordinating the funding of local hazard mitigation plans. To this end, UK-HMGP uses fully the FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grants Program (HMGP) 7% allotment for planning and its Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) grants program. (Flood Mitigation Assistance grants were used for hazard mitigation planning in 2013 and 2014. The desire to increase Flood Mitigation Assistance funding is presented below as a barrier to overcome for the commonwealth in the development of local hazard mitigation plans.)

Regarding the prioritization of funding for local hazard mitigation plan development, generally, UK-HMGP maintains a list of plan expiration dates that it uses to prioritize ADDs', single jurisdictions', and universities' applications to FEMA for funding. Generally, the plans that expire first in the order that they expire are the ones that are prioritized.

At the time of this writing (September 2018), the order of mitigation plan expiration by which prioritization is based is as follows:

Table LC-2. Kentucky Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Expiration Dates and Status, Current to September 14, 2018

Planning Entity	Plan Expiration Date (or Current Status of Plan)
Buffalo Trace Area Development District (BTADD)	July 15, 2020
Green River Area Development District (GRADD)	January 30, 2021
Kentucky State University (KSU)	February 8, 2021
University of Kentucky (UK)	March 9, 2021
Kentuckiana (Regional) Planning and Development Agency (KIPDA)	June 22, 2021
Pennyrile Area Development District (PeADD)	July 28, 2021
Big Sandy Area Development District (BSADD)	August 18, 2021
Lincoln Trail Area Development District (LTADD)	December 6, 2021
Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Government	January 4, 2022
FIVCO (Five Counties)	January 24, 2022
Bluegrass Area Development District (BGADD)	March 6, 2022
Barren River Area Development District (BRADD)	April 27, 2022
Northern Kentucky Area Development District (NKADD)	August 16, 2022
Lake Cumberland Area Development District (LCADD)	April 9, 2023
Kentucky River Area Development District (KRADD)	August 8, 2023
Purchase Area Development District (PADD)	~ September 4, 2023 (in APA Status)
Gateway Area Development District (Gateway ADD)	Original FEMA Review Complete; Awaiting Revisions
Cumberland Valley Area Development District (CVADD)	Draft for Commonwealth to Review Submitted
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government (LFUCG)	In Development
Northern Kentucky University (NKU)	New Plan; In Development
University of Louisville (UofL)	Awaiting PDM Funding
Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS)	Awaiting PDM Funding
Kentucky Department for Public Health (KDPH)	New Plan; Awaiting PDM Funding

One elaboration on the prioritization of local multi-hazard mitigation plan funding: It is noticeable that plan approvals and, thus, plan expirations can occur in “sets” (i.e., the dates of expiration are in proximity to each other). As examples, Green River ADD’s, Kentucky State University’s, and the University of Kentucky’s hazard mitigation plans all expire at around the same time. Similarly, Lincoln Trail ADD’s, Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Government’s, and FIVCO’s plans expire at around the same time. Further, this latter set might include Bluegrass ADD’s and Barren River ADD’s plans. Regarding such “sets,” the Commonwealth will not only prioritize individual mitigation plans for funding according to their order of expiration, but also while attempting to fund complete “sets” of planning projects within a grant cycle.

When possible, Kentucky prioritizes the use of HMGP to fund the Area Development District (ADD) multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plans and to fund the Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Government and LFUCG single-jurisdictional plans. The reasoning behind the preference for HMGP to fund Kentucky’s county and city plans involves a criterion for Kentucky’s Enhanced status: Kentucky provides 12% of the 25% local contribution to a local government for an HMGP grant. Further, the 12% contribution is provided simply as an addition to the otherwise 75% federal reimbursement for HMGP. Rather than a plan or project receive reimbursement at 75% of total outlays, it receives reimbursement at 87% of total outlays. Relevantly, the 12% contribution does not apply to FEMA’s other Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) grant programs, i.e., PDM and FMA. Regional planning is a heavily labor-intensive and heavily administrative activity. Area Development Districts contribute significant time and administration that is regulatorily excluded from a planning grant’s budget and thus is sunk⁵². Lowering the percentage of local contribution required eases the burden of regional planning.

FEMA’s Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) program is targeted for new planning activity, for university/college plan update and development, and for continuity: Though there were exceptions in 2013 and 2014⁵³, FEMA’s PDM program generally has allowed for many planning application submissions and has allowed for healthier budgets than the HMGP 7% allotment for hazard mitigation plans.

Summary of Local Mitigation Plan Coverage, 2013 – 2018

Below is a table illustrating the local mitigation plan coverage from 2013 through 2018. It highlights percentage of county coverage, percentage of jurisdiction coverage (i.e., to include city adoption of mitigation plans), and percentage of population coverage. With a few exceptions, the data in the table covers each month from March 1, 2013 through September of 2018.

⁵² This refers to caps to “management costs” for subrecipients of FEMA HMA grants. FEMA’s “Management Cost” definition includes indirect costs. FEMA “Management Costs” are capped at 5% of total cost estimate approved for an HMA application. An Area Development District will expend far more in federal Economic Development Agency (EDA)-approved indirect cost than what is allowed with a 5% cap. So, the difference in the amount an ADD spends in indirect costs toward a mitigation plan project and the allowable 5% reimbursement for indirect costs are “sunk.”

⁵³ PDM-2013 and PDM-2014 both allowed for only one planning grant, period, maxed at \$250,000 federal share.

Table LC-3. Percentage of County, All Jurisdictions, and Populations Covered by FEMA-Approved Hazard Mitigation Plans, 2013 - 2018

<u>Date of Status</u>	<u>Percent (%) County Covered</u>	<u>Percent (%) Jurisdiction Covered</u>	<u>Percent (%) Population Covered</u>
March 1, 2013	95.0%	88.5%	89.73%
June 6, 2013	100.0%	93.1%	98.32%
July 3, 2013	100.0%	93.1%	98.32%
December 5, 2013	100.0%	95.6%	99.85%
January 6, 2014	100.0%	95.6%	99.85%
April 4, 2014	100.0%	95.8%	99.85%
June 5, 2014	100.0%	96.2%	100.03%
July 3, 2014	100.0%	96.9%	100.22%
July 31, 2014	100.0%	96.9%	100.22%
September 5, 2014	100.0%	97.1%	100.24%
October 3, 2014	100.0%	97.1%	100.24%
December 4, 2014	95.8%	93.6%	98.94%
January 9, 2015	95.8%	93.6%	98.94%
February 6, 2015	95.8%	93.6%	98.94%
August 7, 2015	96.7%	93.8%	99.20%
September 4, 2015	96.7%	93.8%	99.20%
October 5, 2015	96.7%	93.8%	99.20%
November 5, 2015	100.0%	96.0%	100.22%
December 3, 2015	93.3%	88.2%	94.02%
January 8, 2016	93.3%	88.2%	94.02%
February 5, 2016	90.0%	81.4%	89.19%
March 4, 2016	90.0%	81.4%	89.19%
May 5, 2016	85.8%	80.5%	89.00%
June 2, 2016	81.7%	76.7%	85.45%
August 5, 2016	78.3%	66.1%	78.20%
September 2, 2016	79.2%	66.3%	78.24%
October 5, 2016	81.7%	67.4%	62.53%
November 3, 2016	73.3%	66.1%	60.75%
December 1, 2016	65.0%	58.5%	54.21%
February 3, 2017	63.3%	53.4%	64.81%
March 3, 2017	63.3%	60.5%	70.65%
April 6, 2017	76.7%	65.2%	74.53%
May 4, 2017	85.0%	71.6%	82.28%
June 1, 2017	85.0%	73.4%	84.44%
July 7, 2017	85.0%	75.8%	85.24%
August 2, 2017	85.0%	76.7%	85.72%
September 1, 2017	85.0%	75.8%	85.78%
October 5, 2017	85.0%	83.8%	91.69%
November 2, 2017	78.3%	78.3%	86.24%
November 30, 2017	78.3%	78.3%	86.24%
January 8, 2018	78.3%	78.3%	86.24%
February 2, 2018	71.7%	72.5%	81.73%
March 2, 2018	71.7%	73.2%	81.91%
April 6, 2018	70.8%	74.3%	75.39%
May 7, 2018	73.3%	75.2%	77.32%
June 1, 2018	75.0%	75.2%	77.32%
July 3, 2018	75.0%	75.2%	77.32%
August 2, 2018	75.0%	76.5%	78.37%
September 7, 2018	81.7%	81.2%	81.01%

First, as a point of reference, note that 2013 represents the beginning of cycles of plan updates for all of Kentucky counties, cities, and populations (with Area Development Districts developing the plans). (The only exception is Buffalo Trace Area Development District and the counties, cities, and populations it represents where its plan update began in 2012.) From the above table, it is apparent that the Commonwealth of Kentucky from 2013 to 2018 generally facilitated maximum coverage of its counties, cities, and population under a local hazard mitigation plan. This is, of course, not without its caveats: The third and fourth quarters of 2016 saw the Commonwealth dip below 80% coverage in its counties and populations for the first time since the beginning of the most recent cycle of plan updates. This dramatic decrease in county, city, and population coverage was the result of a couple of factors, both of which are addressed below while elaborating obstacles to local mitigation plan development: In 2016, there were three (3) mitigation plans that expired and required significant technical assistance during the revise-and-resubmit stage of the planning process. One of the plans' technical assistance issues during revision of its final document resulted from positive effects: The plan document and the plan's participants performed some novel planning techniques and analysis that did not quite fit obviously into the categories by which hazard mitigation plans are officially reviewed. Another plan's technical assistance issues resulted from turnover of staff during the review stage of the mitigation plan. Additionally and generally, where percent coverage decreased also was the result of truncated plan development timelines.

Still, at the time of this document's writing, FEMA has completed reviews of hazard mitigation plans that had lapsed past their expiration dates for a significant amount of time (due to truncated plan development from funding issues), the Commonwealth has received a significantly lapsed plan for its review, and the final lapsed plan is ending its development and is expected prepared for Commonwealth review during Calendar Quarter 4 2018. This means, that the Commonwealth is expected to achieve near 100% coverage in the coming months ending Calendar Quarter 4 2018 and Calendar Quarter 1 2019.

Barriers and Solutions to FEMA-Approved Local Plan Updates and Development and their Adoptions

The Commonwealth can identify two primary barriers to the timely update of existing, development of new, and subsequent adoption of a local hazard mitigation plan.

First, a significant barrier involves funding sources for hazard mitigation plans and subsequent application management both at the Commonwealth and federal level. As mentioned above, where there has been significant loss of coverage under hazard mitigation plans, a primary suspect is truncated plan update timelines. It is not atypical that sub-applicants-cum-subrecipients will apply for a hazard mitigation plan project and, by the time it is approved, have less than a year to update the entire plan and have it reviewed and adopted before the plan “expires.” The solution to this barrier is straightforward: The Commonwealth (through the University of Kentucky Hazard Mitigation Grants Program Office) will foster the development of hazard mitigation plan project applications sooner than it did during the 2013-2018 local plan update cycle. Specifically, the Commonwealth will intend to identify funding sources and that subsequent applications for mitigation plan update projects be submitted three (3) years before the local mitigation plan’s expiration date. This gives FEMA a year to review and approve a hazard mitigation plan update project (whose application was submitted to the Pre-Disaster Mitigation grant or Hazard Mitigation Grant Program) and the subsequent planning team two (2) full years to update and have reviewed its typically multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan.

Second, a less easily overcome barrier to local plan update or development and subsequent adoption involves relatively new messaging, emphasis, and subsequent implementation toward increased plan integration. Clarifying that local hazard mitigation plans be integrated with other community and regional plans has consistently (and rightfully) been an articulated goal. However, the Commonwealth interprets an increase in (particularly) federal agency development of plan requirements toward application for federal resources and/or to satisfy regulation or incentive program requirements. The issue seems tied to the mitigation plan idea’s success: The idea of requiring a plan before eligibility for certain federal grants is allowed is straightforward and intuitive. Mitigation projects primarily are capital projects. By economic law, resources always are scarce and demand for capital projects always exceeds what resources are available. Consequently, that a community deliberately advertises that the public and experts meet to identify and articulate risk from natural hazards; that a quantitative risk assessment is conducted for those identified natural hazards; and that the expression of public and expert demand justified by quantitative and qualitative risk assessment justify an action plan comprised of capital projects, capabilities in implementing capital projects and administering external funding sources, general expectations of funding source availability, and subsequent prioritization of said capital projects is an idea whose importance is obvious and uncontroversial. That an organization like ISO Verisk and its Community Rating System has a Floodplain Management Plan (510 FMP) or an agency like the Environmental Protection Agency has a Wetlands Mitigation Action Plan is a testament to the success of the mitigation plan idea. But, these mitigation plans from other agencies and

organizations resemble a face: Like FEMA's hazard mitigation plan, these agencies and organizations will claim that their plans, too, have the equivalent of eyes, of a nose, and of a mouth. Their plans, too, require a planning process, a risk assessment, and a mitigation strategy. So, it should be seamless to integrate a local hazard mitigation plan with a 510 FMP or with a Wetlands Mitigation Action Plan. Meanwhile, it seems ignored that, yes and indeed, most faces have eyes, a nose, and a mouth. But, every pair of eyes, every nose, and every mouth is different. So, too, are the agency-specific requirements for a planning process, risk assessment, and mitigation strategy.

If a local hazard mitigation plan, then, increasingly is expected to be integrated in other agencies' superficially similar mitigation plans despite their differences, then that is a barrier to local plan update and development completion.

To overcome this barrier will require significant and timely technical assistance from the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth intends to provide this technical assistance through the University of Kentucky Hazard Mitigation Grants Program (UK-HMGP).

S15.: Criteria for Prioritizing Jurisdictions to Receive Planning and Project Grants Under Available Federal and Non-Federal Programs

As required, the principal criterion for prioritizing jurisdictions to receive planning and project grants under available federal and non-federal programs is cost-effectiveness, i.e., the extent to which benefits are maximized.

Cost-effectiveness is not myopically defined as maximizing the Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR), however. If this were true, then the Commonwealth of Kentucky would do nothing but promote the construction of safe room projects toward mitigation. These projects frequently return BCRs nearing double digits.

Still, the extent to which benefits are maximized is logical toward at least one of the ends consistently promoted by the Commonwealth: The voluntary acquisition/demolition of properties or the elevation of properties designated Repetitive-Loss (RL) and Severe Repetitive-Loss (SRL) by FEMA. In 2013, FEMA completed an analysis of 11,000 acquisition/demolition and elevation projects⁵⁴. From this analysis, FEMA determined that within 100-year (1%) floodplains, acquisition/demolition projects averaged \$276,000 in benefits. Similarly, elevations within 100-year (1%) floodplains averaged \$175,000 in benefits. Subsequently, acquisition/demolition projects within the 100-year (1%) floodplain costing less than \$276,000 automatically are deemed cost-beneficial. Again, similarly, elevation projects within the 100-year (1%) floodplain costing less than \$175,000 are deemed cost-beneficial. Finally, there is correlation between RL and SRL property designation and properties within the 100-year (1%) floodplain.

So, toward the twin justifications of primarily targeting the extent to which benefits are maximized and relieving FEMA's National Flood Insurance Fund, the Commonwealth of Kentucky prioritizes both jurisdictions and projects that either voluntarily acquire and demolish or elevate properties within the 100-year (1%) floodplain. These projects are especially prioritized if they address RL and SRL properties.

That jurisdictions proposing projects addressing RL and SRL properties are the Commonwealth's top priority is facilitated through FEMA's typically annual Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) allocation that provides financial incentive to local jurisdictions to address RL and SRL properties: FEMA potentially provides 90% reimbursement for projects addressing RL properties and potentially funds entirely projects addressing SRL properties.

Additionally, there are a significant number of federal and non-federal programs toward mitigation activity that rely on either a state or federal disaster declaration. The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) potentially offers funding for mitigation projects along state and county roads and for bridges if the Commonwealth declares a disaster. The

⁵⁴ See "Cost Effectiveness Determinations for Acquisitions and Elevations in Special Flood Hazard Areas": <https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/34664>. [Last accessed October 1, 2018].

federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) also release programs potentially providing funding for mitigation projects if the Commonwealth's governor successfully requests from the President a disaster declaration. And, of course, FEMA releases the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) upon presidential disaster declaration⁵⁵. In the case of programs released as a result of either commonwealth-wide or presidential disaster declarations, the Commonwealth of Kentucky prioritizes jurisdictions for federal and non-federal mitigation funding that were part of the respective disaster declarations.

Finally, the Commonwealth of Kentucky prioritizes jurisdictions to receive mitigation funding from federal and non-federal programs according to jurisdictions' results in frequent and periodic financial risk assessments: Any jurisdiction that receives a federal grant receives periodic financial risk assessments that must be completed. From these risk assessments, determinations are made toward the future applicability for said jurisdictions to continue receiving federal funds.

⁵⁵ Presidential disaster declarations either can be sought separately toward HUD, FHWA, and FEMA programs or can be sought in one presidential disaster declaration potentially designating separate jurisdictions for declaration.

S16.: Description of the Process and Timeframe to Review, Coordinate, and Link Local Mitigation Plans to the Commonwealth Mitigation Plan

Process and Timeframe Used by the Commonwealth to Review and Submit Approvable Local Mitigation Plans to FEMA

The University of Kentucky Hazard Mitigation Grants Program Office (UK-HMGP) and its individual responsible for reviewing, editing, providing technical assistance, and writing parts of Kentucky's primarily multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plans reviews and submits approvable local mitigation plans to FEMA.

UK-HMGP is involved in the development of local hazard mitigation plan development and updates. At a minimum, UK-HMGP is involved through its management of the plan projects that fund hazard mitigation plan updates and in providing presentations at regional meetings regarding changes then known to expectations for the local hazard mitigation plan review. As mentioned elsewhere in this hazard mitigation plan document, with exceptions for Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government (LFUCG) and Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Government, Kentucky's regional economic development and planning agencies created through legislation, the Area Development Districts (ADDs), develop the multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plans for the counties and cities over which respective ADDs. UK-HMGP, then, develops relationships with the ADDs and the individuals and teams responsible for updating ADD multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plans. With such relationships, there is frequent technical assistance, editing of documents while in development, and participation in local planning processes.

UK-HMGP, then, is involved in local planning processes and writings throughout the plans' development.

Informally and for the purposes of planning project application and to set expectations about milestones, UK-HMGP proposes to local plan writers a process and review timeframe that mirrors FEMA's process and review timeframe: Submit a final draft of the plan document for review and give UK-HMGP 45 days to review the hazard mitigation plan. This means that (primarily) ADDs are emphasized to submit their plan document within 90 days of the local mitigation plan expiration date. Submittal within 90 days of plan expiration gives UK-HMGP 45 days to review a hazard mitigation plan, require revisions, have the revisions met, and submit the plan to FEMA for its 45-day review.

However, having a final plan document submitted for UK-HMGP review within 90 days of the plan's expiration date acts only as an ideal. Circumstances often undermine this ideal: Even without their Benefit-Cost Analysis requirement or despite its waiver to be reviewed by FEMA's Environmental and Historic Preservation arm, a planning project application can take a year or more to be approved. Similarly, as occurred for Kentucky during this 2013-2018 Commonwealth planning cycle, federal sources of financing (of federally-encouraged hazard mitigation plans) can experience Congressional allocation anomalies.

This is specifically in reference to Fiscal Year 2012 where there was no nationally-competitive Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) program allocation provided by Congress. The lack of a cycle of funding meant that all of Kentucky's hazard mitigation plans had to wait an additional year to begin their updates. A plan expiring in 2015 had to wait until Fiscal Year 2013 to apply for a PDM grant. Applying in Fiscal Year 2013 means waiting until Calendar 2014 for an approval of the application. This gives the plan a year or less to complete an update. In addition, using the logical strategy of prioritizing hazard mitigation plan funding to hazard mitigation plans that expire first (i.e., a First-In, First-Out approach), plans that ideally would have been funded in 2012 had to wait until 2013, which meant a cascading that all other plans had to wait until later funding cycles to apply for their grants.

In situations such as the ones described above, UK-HMGP frequently will truncate its plan review timeframe. UK-HMGP is flexible, in other words: There have been significant instances where UK-HMGP has reviewed a local hazard mitigation plan in one day or in one week to ensure timely submittal of an approvable plan to FEMA for its review.

Process and Timeframe Used by the Commonwealth of Kentucky to Coordinate and Link Risk Assessments and Mitigation Strategy Information from Local Mitigation Plans to the Commonwealth's Mitigation Plan

Again, this plan document emphasizes that UK-HMGP stays involved with local mitigation plan updates throughout their development. In so doing, UK-HMGP is able to coordinate and link risk assessments and mitigation strategy information from local mitigation plans to the Commonwealth of Kentucky's Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The process and timeframe for coordinating and linking local risk assessments to the Commonwealth's hazard mitigation plan admittedly is not immediate: It has been UK-HMGP's experience in local mitigation plan review that expectations in risk assessment qualifications change sporadically and generally are communicated through the results of FEMA local hazard mitigation plan review. The sporadic nature of changes in expectations for how a risk assessment should present data is to be expected, at least in Kentucky's case: Kentucky does suffer significantly from hazard types (primarily the geological hazards) that are very difficult to analyze in the systematic way prescribed and preferred by FEMA's risk assessment reviews. Landslides, for example, are especially costly and deleterious hazard types suffered by Kentucky. However, there is little and has been little expectation or subsequent capacity to systematically record the contours of the landslide event and its effects. There is (perhaps rightfully) no regulation or insurance program requiring or incentivizing, respectively, individuals measuring the track length and width of a landslide event after that individual has experienced the analogous famous boulder chase scene from *Raiders of the Lost Ark*. Yes, I should not have taken that frightening Golden Fertility Idol. But, I am certainly not returning now in order to measure the length that the boulder travelled and how much the Earth was moved in order to satisfy FEMA's definition for "extent" in a risk assessment.

The point is, sporadic changes in federal desires for risk assessment content are communicated through FEMA plan reviews. FEMA expectations for content of risk assessments are communicated and coordinated to future hazard mitigation plans.

Ultimately, then, linkage of local hazard mitigation plans' risk assessments to the Commonwealth's risk assessments are not made until the timeframe within which the Commonwealth's hazard mitigation plan is in the process of update. The most recent information about content and expectations of a risk assessment provided to the most recent local hazard mitigation plans are coordinated and linked to the Commonwealth's hazard mitigation plan.

The process and timeframe for coordinating and linking local mitigation strategies is significantly more methodical. As described in this document's Mitigation Strategy section, Kentucky maintains a list of mitigation actions (one of five lists in this plan update's case) that is comprised of categorizing the mitigation actions of Kentucky's local hazard mitigation plans. The philosophy assumes that prioritizing mitigation activity is a two-way relationship. The Commonwealth has its priorities, but, the Commonwealth also is primarily responsible for facilitating and coordinating local demand for mitigation

activity. The Commonwealth will not pursue mitigation activity that strays significantly from local demand for mitigation. Consequently, as demand for mitigation activity or project changes during local governments' plan update process, Kentucky reviews its list of categorizations of local mitigation actions and revises this list, if applicable⁵⁶. Again, it is intended that Kentucky maintain a list of mitigation actions that is directly and obviously linked with local mitigation plan demand for mitigation activity and project type.

⁵⁶ Throughout the 2013-2018 Commonwealth of Kentucky hazard mitigation planning cycle, there was little change to the categorizations of mitigation project types demanded by local governments.