

5 Capability Assessment

This section discusses the capability of the Eno-Haw region to implement hazard mitigation activities. It consists of the following four subsections:

- 5.1 Overview
- 5.2 Conducting the Capability Assessment
- 5.3 Capability Assessment Findings
- 5.4 Conclusions on Local Capability

5.1 OVERVIEW

The purpose of conducting a capability assessment is to determine the ability of a local jurisdiction to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy, and to identify potential opportunities for establishing or enhancing specific mitigation policies, programs, or projects. As in any planning process, it is important to try to establish which goals, objectives, and actions are feasible, based on an understanding of the organizational capacity of those agencies or departments tasked with their implementation. A capability assessment helps to determine which mitigation actions are practical and likely to be implemented over time given a local government’s planning and regulatory framework, level of administrative and technical support, amount of fiscal resources, and current political climate.

A capability assessment has two primary components: 1) an inventory of a local jurisdiction’s relevant plans, ordinances, and programs already in place; and 2) an analysis of its capacity to carry them out. Careful examination of local capabilities will detect any existing gaps, shortfalls, or weaknesses with ongoing government activities that could hinder proposed mitigation activities and possibly exacerbate community hazard vulnerability. The capability assessment also highlights the positive mitigation measures already in place or being implemented at the local government level, which should continue to be supported and enhanced through future mitigation efforts.

The capability assessment completed for the Eno-Haw region serves as a critical planning step toward developing an effective mitigation strategy. Coupled with the risk assessment, the capability assessment helps identify and target effective goals, objectives, and mitigation actions that are realistically achievable under given local conditions.

5.2 CONDUCTING THE CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

To facilitate the inventory and analysis of local government capabilities within the planning area, a detailed Local Capability Self-Assessment worksheet was distributed to members of the HMPC after the first planning committee meeting. The survey questionnaire requested information on a variety of “capability indicators” such as existing local plans, policies, programs, or ordinances that contribute to and/or hinder the region’s ability to implement hazard mitigation actions. Other indicators included information related to the region’s fiscal, administrative, and technical capabilities, such as access to local budgetary and personnel resources for mitigation purposes, and existing education and outreach programs that can be used to promote mitigation. Communities were also asked to comment on the current political climate with respect to hazard mitigation, an important consideration for any local planning or decision-making process.

At a minimum, the survey results provide an extensive and consolidated inventory of existing local plans, ordinances, programs, and resources in place or under development. With this information, inferences can be made about the overall effect on hazard loss reduction in each community. In completing the

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

survey, local officials were also asked to rate their jurisdiction’s specific capabilities. The survey instrument thereby not only helps accurately assess the degree of local capability, but it also serves as a good source of introspection for counties and local jurisdictions that want to improve their capabilities. Identified gaps, weaknesses, or conflicts can be recast as opportunities for specific actions to be proposed as part of the mitigation strategy.

The information provided in response to the survey questionnaire was incorporated into a database for further analysis. A general scoring methodology was then applied to quantify each jurisdiction’s overall capability. According to the scoring system, each capability indicator was assigned a point value based on its relevance to hazard mitigation. Additional points were added based on the jurisdiction’s self-assessment of their own planning and regulatory capability, administrative and technical capability, fiscal capability, education and outreach capability, and political capability.

Using this scoring methodology, a total score and an overall capability rating of “High,” “Moderate,” or “Limited” could be determined according to the total number of points received. These classifications are designed to provide nothing more than a general assessment of local government capability. In combination with the narrative responses provided by local officials, the results of this capability assessment provide critical information for developing an effective and meaningful mitigation strategy.

5.3 CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

The findings of the capability assessment are summarized in this plan to provide insight into the relevant capacity of the Eno-Haw region to implement hazard mitigation activities. All information is based upon the input provided by local government officials through the Local Capability Self-Assessment.

5.3.1 Planning and Regulatory Capability

Planning and regulatory capability is based on the implementation of plans, ordinances, and programs that demonstrate a local jurisdiction’s commitment to guiding and managing growth, development, and redevelopment in a responsible manner, while maintaining the general welfare of the community. It includes emergency response and mitigation planning, comprehensive land use planning, and transportation planning. Regulatory capability also includes the enforcement of zoning or subdivision ordinances and building codes that regulate how land is developed and structures are built, as well as protecting environmental, historic, and cultural resources in the community. Although some conflicts can arise, these planning initiatives generally present significant opportunities to integrate hazard mitigation principles and practices into the local decision-making process.

This assessment is designed to provide a general overview of the key planning and regulatory tools or programs in place or under development for the Eno-Haw region, along with their potential effect on loss reduction. This information will help identify opportunities to address gaps, weaknesses, or conflicts with other initiatives and integrate the implementation of this plan with existing planning mechanisms where appropriate.

Table 5.1 provides a summary of the relevant local plans, ordinances, and programs already in place or under development for the Eno-Haw region. A checkmark (✓) indicates that the given item is currently in place and being implemented. An asterisk (*) indicates that the given item is currently being developed for future implementation. A plus sign (+) indicates that a jurisdiction is covered for that item under a county-implemented version. Each of these local plans, ordinances, and programs should be considered available mechanisms for incorporating the requirements of the Hazard Mitigation Plan.

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

Table 5.1 – Relevant Plans, Ordinances, and Programs

Jurisdiction	Hazard Mitigation Plan	Comprehensive Land Use Plan	Floodplain Management Plan	Open Space Management Plan	Stormwater Management Plan	Emergency Operations Plan	SARA Title III Plan	Radiological Emergency Plan	Continuity of Operations Plan	Evacuation Plan	Disaster Recovery Plan	Capital Improvements Plan	Economic Development Plan	Historic Preservation Plan	Transportation Plan	Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	Zoning Ordinance	Subdivision Ordinance	Site Plan Review Requirements	Unified Development Ordinance	Post-Disaster Redevelopment Ordinance	Building Code	Fire Code	Community Wildfire Protection Plan	National Flood Insurance Program	Community Rating System
Alamance County	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√		√	
City of Burlington	√	√	√	√	√	√	+	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	
City of Graham	√	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	
City of Mebane	+	√			√	+	+	+	+	+	+	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√		√	
Town of Elon	√	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	
Town of Green Level	√	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	
Town of Haw River	√	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	
Town of Ossipee	√	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+			
Town of Swepsonville	√	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	
Village of Alamance	√	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	
Durham County	√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√		√	√
City of Durham	√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√		√	√
Orange County	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√				√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√
Town of Carrboro	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√				√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	
Town of Chapel Hill	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√				√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	
Town of Hillsborough	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√			√	√	√	+	√	√	√	√	√		√	√		√	
Person County	√	√				√			√	√	√	√			√	√	√	√	√			√	√		√	
City of Roxboro	√	*	√		√	√			√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√		√	

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

Based upon the responses summarized in the above table, jurisdictions in the Eno-Haw Region could improve regulatory capability by developing post-disaster redevelopment ordinances. Additionally, the Region could work cooperatively to develop a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP); however, the basics CWPP are now included in this plan update.

A more detailed discussion on the region’s planning and regulatory capability follows, along with the incorporation of additional information based on the narrative comments provided by local officials in response to the survey questionnaire.

5.3.1.1 Emergency Management

Hazard mitigation is widely recognized as one of the four primary phases of emergency management, as is shown in Figure 5.1. In reality, mitigation is interconnected with all other phases and is an essential component of effective preparedness, response, and recovery. Opportunities to reduce potential losses through mitigation practices are most often implemented before a disaster event, such as through the elevation of flood-prone structures or by regular enforcement of policies that regulate development. However, mitigation opportunities can also be identified during immediate preparedness or response activities, such as installing storm shutters in advance of a hurricane. Furthermore, incorporating mitigation during the long-term recovery and redevelopment process following a disaster event is what enables a community to become more resilient.

Figure 5.1 – The Four Phases of Emergency Management



Planning for each phase is a critical part of a comprehensive emergency management program and a key to the successful implementation of hazard mitigation actions. As such, the Local Capability Self-Assessment asked several questions across a range of emergency management plans to assess the region’s willingness to plan and their level of technical planning proficiency.

Hazard Mitigation Plan

A hazard mitigation plan is a community’s blueprint for how it intends to reduce the impact of natural, and in some cases human-caused, hazards on people and the built environment. The essential elements of a hazard mitigation plan include a risk assessment, capability assessment, and mitigation strategy.

- ▶ Alamance, Durham, and Orange Counties and their participating jurisdictions were previously covered by the Eno-Haw Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan. Person County and the City of Roxboro were previously covered by the Person-Roxboro Hazard Mitigation Plan.

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

Disaster Recovery Plan

A disaster recovery plan serves to guide the physical, social, environmental, and economic recovery and reconstruction process following a disaster event. In many instances, hazard mitigation principles and practices are incorporated into local disaster recovery plans with the intent of capitalizing on opportunities to break the cycle of repetitive disaster losses. Disaster recovery plans can also lead to the preparation of disaster redevelopment policies and ordinances to be enacted following a hazard event.

- ▶ 14 of the 18 participating jurisdictions have a disaster recovery plan either in place or under development. (6 jurisdictions have one in place; 8 covered under a county plan)

Emergency Operations Plan

An emergency operations plan outlines responsibilities and how resources will be deployed during and following an emergency or disaster.

- ▶ All participating jurisdictions have an emergency operations plan either in place or are covered under a county plan.

Continuity of Operations Plan

A continuity of operations plan establishes a chain of command, line of succession, and plans for backup or alternate emergency facilities in case of an extreme emergency or disaster event.

- ▶ 15 of the 18 participating jurisdictions have a continuity of operations plan either in place or are covered under a county plan.

5.3.1.2 General Planning

The implementation of hazard mitigation activities often involves agencies and individuals beyond the emergency management profession. Stakeholders may include local planners, public works officials, economic development specialists, and others. In many instances, concurrent local planning efforts will help to achieve or complement hazard mitigation goals, even though they may not be designed as such. The Local Capability Self-Assessment asked questions regarding general planning capabilities and the degree to which hazard mitigation is integrated into other ongoing planning efforts in the region.

Comprehensive/General Plan

A comprehensive land use plan, or general plan, establishes the overall vision for what a community wants to be and serves as a guide for future governmental decision making. Typically, a comprehensive plan contains sections on demographic conditions, land use, transportation elements, and community facilities. Given the broad nature of the plan and its regulatory standing in many communities, the integration of hazard mitigation measures into the comprehensive plan can enhance the likelihood of achieving risk reduction goals, objectives, and actions.

- ▶ All participating jurisdictions have a comprehensive land use plan in place or are covered by county planning efforts. Some communities are currently in the process of updating their comprehensive plans.

Capital Improvements Plan

A capital improvements plan guides the scheduling of spending on public improvements. A capital improvements plan can serve as an important mechanism for guiding future development away from identified hazard areas. Limiting public spending in hazardous areas is one of the most effective long-term mitigation actions available to local governments.

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

- ▶ All participating jurisdictions have a capital improvements plan in place or are covered by county capital improvements planning.

Historic Preservation Plan

A historic preservation plan is intended to preserve historic structures or districts within a community. An often-overlooked aspect of the historic preservation plan is the assessment of buildings and sites located in areas subject to natural hazards, and the identification of ways to reduce future damages. This may involve retrofitting or relocation techniques that account for the need to protect buildings that do not meet current building standards or are within a historic district that cannot easily be relocated out of harm's way.

- ▶ All but one of the participating jurisdictions have a historic preservation plan in place or are covered by a county plan.

Zoning Ordinance

Zoning represents the primary means by which land use is controlled by local governments. As part of a community's police power, zoning is used to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of those in a given jurisdiction that maintains zoning authority. A zoning ordinance is the mechanism through which zoning is typically implemented. Since zoning regulations enable municipal governments to limit the type and density of development, a zoning ordinance can serve as a powerful tool when applied in identified hazard areas.

- ▶ All participating jurisdictions have a zoning ordinance in place.

Subdivision Ordinance

A subdivision ordinance is intended to regulate the development of residential, commercial, industrial, or other uses, including associated public infrastructure, as land is subdivided into buildable lots for sale or future development. Subdivision design that accounts for natural hazards can dramatically reduce the exposure of future development.

- ▶ All participating jurisdictions have a subdivision ordinance in place.

Building Codes, Permitting, and Inspections

Building codes regulate construction standards. In many communities, permits and inspections are required for new construction. Decisions regarding the adoption of building codes (that account for hazard risk), the type of permitting process required both before and after a disaster, and the enforcement of inspection protocols all affect the level of hazard risk faced by a community.

- ▶ All participating jurisdictions have building codes in place.

The adoption and enforcement of building codes by local jurisdictions is routinely assessed through the Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS) program, developed by the Insurance Services Office, Inc. (ISO). In North Carolina, the North Carolina Department of Insurance assesses the building codes in effect in a particular community and how the community enforces its building codes, with special emphasis on mitigation of losses from natural hazards. The results of BCEGS assessments are routinely provided to ISO's member private insurance companies, which in turn may offer ratings credits for new buildings constructed in communities with strong BCEGS classifications. The expectation is that communities with well-enforced, up-to-date codes should experience fewer disaster-related losses, and as a result should have lower insurance rates.

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

In conducting the assessment, ISO collects information related to personnel qualification and continuing education, as well as number of inspections performed per day. This type of information combined with local building codes is used to determine a grade for that jurisdiction. The grades range from 1 to 10, with a BCEGS grade of 1 representing exemplary commitment to building code enforcement, and a grade of 10 indicating less than minimum recognized protection.

5.3.1.3 Floodplain Management

Flooding represents the greatest natural hazard facing the nation, yet the tools available to reduce the impacts associated with flooding are among the most developed when compared to other hazard-specific mitigation techniques. In addition to approaches that cut across hazards such as education, outreach, and the training of local officials, the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) contains specific regulatory measures that enable government officials to determine where and how growth occurs relative to flood hazards. Participation in the NFIP is voluntary for local governments; however, program participation is strongly encouraged by FEMA as a first step for implementing and sustaining an effective hazard mitigation program. It is therefore used as part of this capability assessment as a key indicator for measuring local capability.

In order for a county or municipality to participate in the NFIP, they must adopt a local flood damage prevention ordinance that requires jurisdictions to follow established minimum building standards in the floodplain. These standards require that all new buildings and substantial improvements to existing buildings be protected from damage by a 100-year flood event, and that new development in the floodplain not exacerbate existing flood problems or increase damage to other properties.

A key service provided by the NFIP is the mapping of identified flood hazard areas. Once completed, the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) are used to assess flood hazard risk, regulate construction practices, and set flood insurance rates. FIRMs are an important source of information to educate residents, government officials, and the private sector about the likelihood of flooding in their community.

Table 5.2 provides NFIP policy and claim information for each participating jurisdiction in the Eno-Haw region.

All but one jurisdiction in the region participate in the NFIP and will continue to comply with all required provisions of the program. Floodplain management is managed through zoning ordinances, building code restrictions, and the county and municipal building inspection programs. The jurisdictions will coordinate with NCEM and FEMA to develop maps and regulations related to Special Flood Hazard Areas within their jurisdictional boundaries and, through a consistent monitoring process, will design and improve their floodplain management program in a way that reduces the risk of flooding to people and property.

Community Rating System

An additional indicator of floodplain management capability is active participation in the Community Rating System (CRS). The CRS is an incentive-based program that encourages communities to undertake defined flood mitigation activities that go beyond the minimum requirements of the NFIP. Each of the CRS mitigation activities is assigned a point value. As a community earns points and reaches identified thresholds, they can apply for an improved CRS class. Class ratings, which range from 10 to 1 and increase on 500-point increments, are tied to flood insurance premium reductions. Every class improvement earns an additional 5 percent discount for NFIP policyholders, with a starting discount of 5 percent for Class 9 communities and a maximum possible discount of 45 percent for Class 1 communities.

Community participation in the CRS is voluntary. Any community that is in full compliance with the rules and regulations of the NFIP may apply to FEMA for a CRS classification better than class 10. The CRS application process has been greatly simplified over the past several years, based on community

Eno-Haw

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

comments intended to make the CRS more user friendly, and extensive technical assistance available for communities who request it.

- ▶ Durham County, the City of Durham, and Orange County participate in the Community Rating System. Each community's CRS Class is shown in Table 5.2.

Floodplain Management Plan

A floodplain management plan (or a flood mitigation plan) provides a framework for action regarding corrective and preventative measures to reduce flood-related impacts.

- ▶ 16 of the 18 participating jurisdictions have a floodplain management plan in place or are covered by a county plan.

Open Space Management Plan

An open space management plan is designed to preserve, protect, and restore largely undeveloped lands in their natural state, and to expand or connect areas in the public domain such as parks, greenways, and other outdoor recreation areas. In many instances open space management practices are consistent with the goals of reducing hazard losses, such as the preservation of wetlands or other flood-prone areas in their natural state in perpetuity.

- ▶ 15 of the 18 participating jurisdictions have an open space management plan in place or are covered by a county plan.

Stormwater Management Plan

A stormwater management plan is designed to address flooding associated with stormwater runoff. The stormwater management plan is typically focused on design and construction measures that are intended to reduce the impact of more frequently occurring minor urban flooding.

- ▶ 17 of the 18 participating jurisdictions have a stormwater management plan in place or are covered by a county plan.

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

Table 5.2 – NFIP Policy and Claim Information

Jurisdiction	Date of Initial FIRM or FHBM	CRS Class	Current Effective Map Date	NFIP Policies in Force	Insurance in Force	Written Premium in Force	Closed Losses	Total Payments
Alamance County	01/03/75	-	09/06/06	49	\$15,023,600	\$104,809	29	\$824,801
City of Burlington	06/21/74	-	09/06/06	149	\$31,186,800	\$150,597	31	\$378,054
City of Graham	07/11/75	-	09/06/06	43	\$8,991,900	\$27,646	8	\$63,752
City of Mebane	11/05/80	-	09/06/06	40	\$9,747,000	\$19,948	2	\$4,622
Town of Elon	06/05/89	-	09/06/06	22	\$5,373,800	\$11,328	2	\$12,790
Town of Green Level	12/22/98	-	09/06/06	0	0	0	0	0
Town of Haw River	07/18/75	-	09/06/06	6	\$899,200	\$3,008	1	\$60,000
Town of Ossipee	09/06/06	-	09/06/06	0	0	0	0	0
Town of Swepsonville	01/03/75	-	09/06/06	3	\$557,900	\$1,600	0	0
Village of Alamance	01/03/75	-	09/06/06	0	0	0	0	0
Durham County	01/25/74	8	05/02/06	208	\$54,359,900	\$129,208	44	\$583,957
City of Durham	01/25/74	7	05/02/06	1,124	\$274,660,200	\$980,475	153	\$2,555,190
Orange County	06/16/78	6	02/02/07	86	\$25,734,300	\$41,096	9	\$185,944
Town of Carrboro	02/22/74	-	09/26/17	90	\$24,270,700	\$50,509	8	\$94,288
Town of Chapel Hill	06/21/74	-	02/02/07	672	\$130,511,700	\$596,394	191	\$10,242,770
Town of Hillsborough	05/19/78	-	02/02/07	15	\$4,796,500	\$14,615	3	\$9,032
Person County	02/10/78	-	06/04/07	17	\$3,874,400	\$7,199	0	\$0
City of Roxboro	01/13/78	-	06/04/07	10	\$3,412,700	\$14,974	2	\$24,521
TOTAL PLAN	-	-	-	2,534	\$593,400,600	\$2,153,406	483	\$15,039,721

Source: FEMA NFIP Policy Statistics via NCEM Risk Management Tool; revised by HMPC

5.3.2 Administrative and Technical Capability

The ability of a local government to develop and implement mitigation projects, policies, and programs is directly tied to its ability to direct staff time and resources for that purpose. Administrative capability can be evaluated by determining how mitigation-related activities are assigned to local departments and if there are adequate personnel resources to complete these activities. The degree of intergovernmental coordination among departments will also affect administrative capability for the implementation and success of proposed mitigation activities.

Technical capability can generally be evaluated by assessing the level of knowledge and technical expertise of local government employees, such as personnel skilled in using GIS to analyze and assess community hazard vulnerability. The Local Capability Self-Assessment was used to capture information on administrative and technical capability through the identification of available staff and personnel resources.

Table 5.3 provides a summary of the Local Capability Self-Assessment results for the region with regard to relevant staff and personnel resources. A checkmark indicates the presence of a staff member(s) in that jurisdiction with the specified knowledge or skill.

Note that while all but one jurisdiction are participants in the NFIP, several jurisdictions in Alamance County do not have a local floodplain manager. In these cases, due to the limited capacity of these small jurisdictions, Alamance County is the designated floodplain administrator for the jurisdiction.

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

Table 5.3 – Relevant Staff/Personnel Resources

Jurisdiction	Planners with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Engineers or professionals trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural and/or human-caused hazards	Building Official	Emergency manager	Floodplain manager	Land surveyors	Scientist familiar with the hazards of the community	Staff with education or expertise to assess the community vulnerability to hazards	Personnel skilled in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and/or HAZUS	Resource development staff or grant writers	Maintenance programs to reduce risk	Warning systems/services	Mutual Aid Agreements
Alamance County	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
City of Burlington	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
City of Graham	√	√	√	√	√	√			√	√	√	√	√	√
City of Mebane	√	√	√	√	√	√			√	√	√	√	√	√
Town of Elon	√	√	√	√	√	√			√			√		√
Town of Green Level		√		√		√								√
Town of Haw River	√	√		√								√		√
Town of Ossipee														√
Town of Swepsonville														√
Village of Alamance	√													√
Durham County	√	√	√	√	√	√			√	√	√	√	√	√
City of Durham	√	√	√	√	√	√			√	√	√	√	√	√
Orange County	√	√	√	√	√	√			√	√		√	√	√
Town of Carrboro	√	√	√	√		√			√	√	√	√	√	√
Town of Chapel Hill	√	√	√	√	√	√			√	√		√	√	√
Town of Hillsborough	√	√	√	√	√	√			√	√		√	√	√
Person County	√		√	√	√	√			√	√	√		√	√
City of Roxboro	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

5.3.3 Fiscal Capability

The ability of a local government to implement mitigation actions is often dependent on the amount of money available. This may take the form of outside grant funding awards or locally based revenue and financing. The costs associated with mitigation policy and project implementation vary widely. In some cases, policies are tied primarily to staff time or administrative costs associated with the creation and monitoring of a given program. In other cases, direct expenses are linked to an actual project such as the acquisition of flood-prone houses, which can require a substantial commitment from local, state, and federal funding sources.

The Local Capability Self-Assessment was used to capture information on the region’s fiscal capability through the identification of locally available financial resources.

Table 5.4 provides a summary of the results for the region with regard to relevant fiscal resources. A checkmark indicates that the given fiscal resource is locally available for hazard mitigation purposes (including match funds for state and federal mitigation grant funds).

Table 5.4 – Relevant Fiscal Resources

Jurisdiction	Capital Improvement Programming	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	Special Purpose Taxes	Gas/Electric Utility Fees	Water/Sewer Fees	Stormwater Utility Fees	Development Impact Fees	General Obligation Bonds	Revenue Bonds	Special Tax Bonds	Other
Alamance County	√			√	√	√	√		√		
City of Burlington	√	√	√	√	√	√					
City of Graham				√	√						
City of Mebane	√	√			√		√				
Town of Elon				√	√						
Town of Green Level				√	√						
Town of Haw River				√	√						
Town of Ossipee				√	√						
Town of Swepsonville				√	√						
Village of Alamance				√	√						
Durham County	√	√			√		√	√	√		√
City of Durham	√	√			√		√	√	√		√
Orange County	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	
Town of Carrboro	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	
Town of Chapel Hill	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	
Town of Hillsborough	√				√	√		√	√	√	√
Person County	√	√			√	√		√	√		
City of Roxboro	√	√			√	√	√	√			

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

5.3.4 Education and Outreach Capability

This type of local capability refers to education and outreach programs and methods already in place that could be used to implement mitigation activities and communicate hazard-related information. Examples include natural disaster or safety related school programs; participation in community programs such as Firewise or StormReady; and activities conducted as part of hazard awareness campaigns such as a Tornado Awareness Month.

Table 5.5 provides a summary of the results for the region with regard to relevant education and outreach resources. A checkmark indicates that the given resource is locally available for hazard mitigation purposes.

Table 5.5 – Education and Outreach Resources

Jurisdiction	Local citizen groups or non-profit organizations focused on environmental protection, emergency preparedness, access and functional needs populations, etc.	Ongoing public education or information program (e.g., responsible water use, fire safety, household preparedness, environmental education)	Natural disaster or safety related school programs	StormReady certification	Firewise Communities certification	Public-private partnership initiatives addressing disaster-related issues	Other
Alamance County		√	√	√	√	√	
City of Burlington	√	√	√	√		√	
City of Graham			√				
City of Mebane		√	√				
Town of Elon			√				
Town of Green Level			√				
Town of Haw River			√				
Town of Ossipee			√				
Town of Swepsonville			√				
Village of Alamance			√				
Durham County	√	√	√	√			
City of Durham	√	√	√	√			
Orange County	√	√	√	√		√	
Town of Carrboro	√	√	√				
Town of Chapel Hill	√	√	√			√	
Town of Hillsborough	√	√					
Person County		√		√	√		
City of Roxboro		√	√			√	

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey

5.3.5 Mitigation Capability

This type of local capability refers to the mitigation strategies and actions that are developed by the communities in this plan.

Table 5.6 provides a summary of the results for the planning area with regard to relevant mitigation resources. A checkmark (✓) indicates that the given resource is locally available for hazard mitigation purposes.

Table 5.6 – Mitigation Resources

Jurisdiction	Do you apply for mitigation grant funding?	Do you perform reconstruction projects?	Do you perform building elevations?	Do you perform acquisitions?
Alamance County	✓			
City of Burlington	✓			
City of Graham				
City of Mebane				
Town of Elon				
Town of Green Level				
Town of Haw River				
Town of Ossipee				
Town of Swepsonville				
Village of Alamance				
Durham County	✓	✓	✓	✓
City of Durham	✓	✓	✓	✓
Orange County	✓	✓	✓	✓
Town of Carrboro	✓	✓	✓	✓
Town of Chapel Hill				
Town of Hillsborough	✓			
Person County	✓	✓		
City of Roxboro				

5.3.6 Political Capability

One of the most difficult capabilities to evaluate involves the political will of a jurisdiction to enact meaningful policies and projects designed to reduce the impact of future hazard events. Hazard mitigation may not be a local priority, or it may conflict with or be seen as an impediment to other goals of the community, such as growth and economic development. Therefore, the local political climate must be considered in designing mitigation strategies, as it could be the most difficult hurdle to overcome in accomplishing their adoption and implementation.

SECTION 5: CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

The Local Capability Self-Assessment was used to capture information on political capability of the region. Survey respondents were asked to rate political support as they perceive it and identify general examples of local political capability, such as guiding development away from identified hazard areas, restricting public investments or capital improvements within hazard areas, or enforcing local development standards that go beyond minimum state or federal requirements.

HMPC representatives from many participating jurisdictions responded that political leaders are at least potentially willing to implement mitigation measures. In Person County and Roxboro, respondents noted mixed support and that current leaders have not been faced with a hazard event requiring immediate implementation of mitigation. Therefore, leaders here may not be motivated to pursue mitigation. A few participating jurisdictions noted having local standards that exceed state requirements, which exemplifies local political will to implement mitigation. For example, the Town of Hillsborough has standards in its flood damage prevention ordinance and fire prevention ordinance that exceed state standards.

5.3.7 Local Self-Assessment Rating

In addition to the inventory and analysis of specific local capabilities, the Local Capability Self-Assessment asked counties and local jurisdictions within the Eno-Haw region to assign a rating of their perceived capability across each of the capability categories and overall as either “limited,” “moderate,” or “high.”

Table 5.7 summarizes the self-assessment ratings for each community in the Eno-Haw region.

Table 5.7 – Self-Assessment of Capability

Jurisdiction	Plans, Ordinances, Codes and Programs	Administrative and Technical Capability	Fiscal Capability	Education and Outreach Capability	Mitigation Capability	Political Capability	Overall Capability
Alamance County	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
City of Burlington	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
City of Graham	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
City of Mebane	High	High	High	Moderate	Limited	Moderate	Moderate
Town of Elon	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate
Town of Green Level	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate
Town of Haw River	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate
Town of Ossipee	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited
Town of Swepsonville	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited
Village of Alamance	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited
Durham County	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Moderate
City of Durham	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Moderate
Orange County	High	High	Moderate	High	High	Moderate	Moderate
Town of Carrboro	High	High	Moderate	High	High	Moderate	Moderate
Town of Chapel Hill	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Town of Hillsborough	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Moderate
Person County	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Moderate	Limited	Moderate
City of Roxboro	Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Moderate

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey

5.4 CONCLUSIONS ON LOCAL CAPABILITY

In order to form meaningful conclusions on the assessment of local capability, a quantitative scoring methodology was designed and applied to results of the Local Capability Assessment Survey. This methodology attempts to assess the overall level of capability of the Eno-Haw region to implement hazard mitigation actions.

Table 5.8 shows the results of the capability assessment using the designed scoring methodology. The capability score is based solely on the information provided by local officials in response to the Local Capability Self-Assessment. According to the assessment, the average local capability score for all responding jurisdictions is 86, which falls into the Moderate capability ranking.

Table 5.8 – Capability Assessment Results

Jurisdiction	Overall Capability Score	Overall Capability Rating
Alamance County	105	High
City of Burlington	109	High
City of Graham	74	Moderate
City of Mebane	91	Moderate
Town of Elon	67	Low
Town of Green Level	62	Low
Town of Haw River	63	Low
Town of Ossipee	56	Low
Town of Swepsonville	56	Low
Village of Alamance	57	Low
Durham County	107	High
City of Durham	107	High
Orange County	114	High
Town of Carrboro	105	High
Town of Chapel Hill	103	High
Town of Hillsborough	93	Moderate
Person County	79	Moderate
City of Roxboro	92	Moderate

Source: Local Capability Assessment Survey, NCEM Risk Management Tool

As previously discussed, one of the reasons for conducting a capability assessment is to examine local capabilities to detect any existing gaps or weaknesses within ongoing government activities that could hinder proposed mitigation activities and possibly exacerbate community hazard vulnerability. These gaps or weaknesses have been identified, for each jurisdiction, in the tables found throughout this section. The participating jurisdictions used the capability assessment as part of the basis for the mitigation actions that are identified in Section 7; therefore, each jurisdiction addresses their ability to expand on and improve their existing capabilities through the identification of their mitigation actions.