

Section 6: Capability Assessment

This section describes the overall capability of Monterey County and participating jurisdictions to implement hazard mitigation activities. It consists of the following three subsections:

- 6.1 Overview of the Capability Assessment
- 6.2 Conducting the Capability Assessment
- 6.3 Capability Assessment Findings and Conclusions

6.1 Overview of the Capability Assessment

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 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 types of mitigation actions are practical and likely to be implemented over time based on **a local government's** existing authorities, policies, programs, and resources available to support such implementation.

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

The capability assessment serves as a critical part of the planning process, including the development of an effective multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation strategy. Coupled with the Hazard Analysis (Section 4) and Vulnerability Analysis (Section 5), the Capability Assessment helps identify and target meaningful mitigation actions for incorporation into the Mitigation Strategy. It not only helps establish the goals for Monterey County to pursue under this Plan, but also ensures that those goals and the mitigation actions that follow are realistically achievable given current local conditions.

6.1 Conducting the Capability Assessment

In order to facilitate the inventory and analysis of local government capabilities throughout Monterey County, several survey instruments were distributed and discussed with local community staff from each participating jurisdiction during the Individual Jurisdiction Meetings. These included a Capability Assessment Survey, Safe Growth Survey, and National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Survey, each of which was completed by appropriate local government officials as determined by Local Jurisdiction Leads. Each of these three survey instruments is described below, and full copies are available through Monterey County OES upon request.

Capability Assessment Survey

The Capability Assessment Survey requested information on a variety of “capability indicators” such as existing local plans, policies, programs, or ordinances that may reduce, or in some circumstances, increase the community’s hazard vulnerability. Other indicators included information related to each jurisdiction’s fiscal, administrative, and technical capabilities such as access to local budgetary and personnel resources necessary to implement mitigation measures. Survey respondents were also asked to comment on existing activities or capabilities to conduct public education and outreach, as well as the current political climate in their jurisdiction to implement mitigation actions, an important consideration for any local planning or decision making process.

At a minimum, survey results provide an extensive inventory of existing local plans, ordinances, programs, and resources in place or under development in addition to their overall effect on hazard loss reduction as perceived by local government staff. Local officials were also required to conduct a self-assessment of their jurisdiction’s specific capabilities. The survey instrument thereby not only helps to accurately assess each jurisdiction’s degree of local capability, but also serves as a source of introspection for those jurisdictions wishing to improve their capability as identified gaps, weaknesses, or conflicts can be recast as opportunities to be addressed in the development of new mitigation actions.

Safe Growth Survey

As part of the 2013-2014 plan update process, each jurisdiction was also asked to complete a Safe Growth Survey. This unique survey instrument was drawn from a technique recommended by David Godschalk, FAICP and professor emeritus of city and regional planning at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, to help better evaluate the extent to which each local jurisdiction in Monterey County is positioned to grow safely relative to its natural hazards. The survey covered six distinct topic areas including the following:

- Land Use
- Transportation
- Environmental Management
- Public Safety, Zoning Ordinance
- Subdivision Regulations
- Capital Improvement Program and Infrastructure Policies

The Safe Growth Survey was completed by appropriate planning, zoning, and/or community development staff for each jurisdiction. While somewhat of a subjective exercise, the Safe Growth Survey was used to provide some quantitative measures of how adequately existing planning mechanisms and tools for each jurisdiction were being used to address the notion of safe growth as currently advocated by organizations such as FEMA and the American Planning Association (APA). In addition, the survey instrument was aimed at further integrating the subject of hazard risk management into the dialogue of local planners throughout Monterey County and to possibly consider and identify new mitigation actions as it relates to those local planning policies or programs already in place.

It is anticipated that the Safe Growth Survey will be used again during future plan updates to help measure progress over time and to continue identifying possible mitigation actions as it relates to future growth and community development practices, and how such actions may better be incorporated into local planning mechanisms.

National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Survey

The NFIP Survey was designed to help gather information from each jurisdiction to describe the current status of their participation in the NFIP, including existing floodplain management programs and continued compliance with federal requirements and standards. The NFIP contains specific regulatory measures that enable government officials to determine where and how growth occurs relative to identified flood hazards. In return for meeting minimum regulatory standards, communities make the purchase of flood insurance through the NFIP available to its property owners. Participation in the NFIP is voluntary, but is promoted by FEMA as a critical means to not only make flood insurance available to community residents, but also to implement and sustain an effective, long-term hazard mitigation program aimed at reducing future flood losses.

6.1 Capability Assessment Findings and Conclusions

The findings of the 2010 capability assessment are summarized below in order to provide insight into the abilities of participating jurisdictions to implement a feasible hazard mitigation strategy. All information is based upon the input provided by local government officials through the survey questionnaires in addition to the Individual Jurisdiction Meetings.

Capability Assessment Survey Results

All of the information provided by participating jurisdictions in response to the Capability Assessment Survey was incorporated into a database by AECOM for further analysis. A general scoring methodology was then applied to quantify and rank each jurisdiction's specific capabilities relative to one another. According to the scoring system, each capability indicator was assigned a point value based on its relevance to hazard mitigation. A general capability rating of "High," "Moderate," or "Limited" was then determined for each jurisdiction according to the total number of points received.

Table 6.1 summarizes the overall capability rating for each jurisdiction, in addition to individual ratings according to the following four different types of capabilities as defined by FEMA:

- *Planning and Regulatory* – capabilities based on the jurisdiction's implementation of ordinances, policies, local laws and State statutes, and plans and programs that relate to guiding and managing growth and development.
- *Administrative and Technical* – capabilities associated with the jurisdiction's staff and their skills and tools that can be used for mitigation planning and to implement specific mitigation actions.
- *Financial* – refers to the fiscal resources that a jurisdiction has access to or is eligible to use to fund mitigation actions.
- *Education and Outreach* – refers to education and outreach programs and methods already in place that could be used to implement mitigation activities and communicate hazard-related information.

**Table 6.1
Monterey County Capability Assessment Ratings**

Jurisdiction	Planning & Regulatory	Administrative & Technical	Financial	Education & Outreach	TOTAL CAPABILITY RATING
Monterey County	High	High	Moderate	Limited	MODERATE
City of Carmel-by-the-Sea	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	HIGH
City of Del Rey Oaks	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Limited	MODERATE
City of Gonzales	Moderate	High	Limited	Limited	MODERATE
City of Greenfield	Limited	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	LIMITED
City of King City	Limited	Moderate	Limited	Limited	LIMITED
City of Marina	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	LIMITED
City of Monterey	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	MODERATE
City of Pacific Grove	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Limited	MODERATE
City of Salinas	Moderate	High	Moderate	Limited	MODERATE
City of Sand City	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Limited	LIMITED
City of Seaside	High	High	Limited	Moderate	MODERATE
City of Soledad	Moderate	Moderate	Limited	Limited	LIMITED

The capability classifications provided in Table 6.1 are designed to provide a general assessment of **each individual jurisdiction's local capability relative to one another** across the multi-jurisdictional planning area. The results suggest higher ratings for Planning and Regulatory and Administrative and Technical capabilities, and lower ratings for Financial and Education and Outreach capabilities. More information on the specific capabilities that are unique to each jurisdiction is provided in Appendices H-U.

Safe Growth Survey Results

The results of the Safe Growth Survey are summarized in **Table 6.2**. In completing the survey, each respondent was asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with 25 "**Safe Growth Statements**" as they relate to their own jurisdiction's current plans, policies, and programs for guiding future community growth and development, according to the following scale:

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Somewhat Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Somewhat Agree 5=Strongly Agree

Numerical averages were calculated for each jurisdiction to help quantify how much each respondent agreed with the indicative Safe Growth Statements. Jurisdiction total averages ranged from 2.8 to 4.5, with a total cumulative average of 3.5 for the entire planning area. These results suggest that local jurisdictions have integrated hazard mitigation principles into their local community planning and development framework to a certain degree, but there are opportunities for enhancement. Of the six specific topic areas, Land Use, Public Safety, and Environmental Management received the highest average ratings (3.9 for each) while Capital Improvement Program and Infrastructure received the lowest average rating (3.0).

**Table 6.3
Monterey County Safe Growth Survey Results**

Safe Growth Statement	Carmel-by-the-Sea	Del Rey Oaks	Gonzales	Greenfield	King City	Marina	Monterey	Pacific Grove *	Salinas	Sand City	Seaside	Soledad	Monterey County
LAND USE													
The general plan includes a future land use map that clearly identifies natural hazard areas.	5	4	5	3	4	3	4	2	4	4	3	3	4
Current land use policies discourage development and/or redevelopment within natural hazard areas.	4	4	5	3	4	4	3	3	5	2	5	4	4
The general plan provides adequate space for expected future growth in areas located outside of natural hazard areas.	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	3	4	3	5	5	3
TRANSPORTATION													
The transportation element limits access to natural hazard areas.	3	3	5	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	5	4	2
Transportation policy is used to guide future growth and development to safe locations.	3	4	5	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	3
Transportation systems are designed to function under disaster conditions (e.g., evacuation, mobility for fire/rescue apparatus, etc.).	3	3	5	4	3	3	5	1	4	5	4	2	4
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT													
Environmental features that serve to protect development from hazards (e.g., wetlands, riparian buffers, etc.) are identified and mapped.	5	4.5	5	3	4	3	5	4	2	3	5	3	5
Environmental policies encourage the preservation and restoration of protective ecosystems.	5	4	5	4	3	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4
Environmental policies provide incentives to development that is located outside of protective ecosystems.	5	1	4	3	3	3	1	4	3	3	2	4	4
PUBLIC SAFETY													
The goals and policies of the general plan are related to and consistent with those in the Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.	5	3	5	3	2	4	3	4	4	5	4	3	4
Public safety is explicitly included in the <u>plan's growth and development policies</u> .	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	4	2	5
The monitoring and implementation section of the plan covers safe growth objectives.	4	3	3	3	4	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	3
ZONING ORDINANCE													
The zoning ordinance conforms to the general plan in terms of discouraging development and/or redevelopment within natural hazard areas.	5	4	5	3	2	4	5	3	5	3	4	4	5
The ordinance contains natural hazard overlay zones that set conditions for land use within such zones.	4	2.5	1	3	2	2	5	2	4	2	5	4	4

Safe Growth Statement	Carmel-by-the-Sea	Del Rey Oaks	Gonzales	Greenfield	King City	Marina	Monterey	Pacific Grove*	Salinas	Sand City	Seaside	Soledad	Monterey County
Rezoning procedures recognize natural hazard areas as limits on zoning changes that allow greater intensity or density of use.	4	4	3	3	3	2	4	1	4	5	5	4	3
The ordinance prohibits development within, or filling of, wetlands, floodways, and floodplains.	5	3	3	3	3	2	5	4	4	3	5	4	2
SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS													
The subdivision regulations restrict the subdivision of land within or adjacent to natural hazard areas.	3	2	5	3	4	3	4	3	2	4	4	4	4
The regulations provide for conservation subdivisions or cluster subdivisions in order to conserve environmental resources.	3	3.5	5	3	4	3	4	2	4	1	2	3	5
The regulations allow density transfers where hazard areas exist.	1	3	5	3	3	2	1	2	3	1	3	2	5
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES													
The capital improvement program limits expenditures on projects that would encourage development and/or redevelopment in areas vulnerable to natural hazards.	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	1
Infrastructure policies limit the extension of existing facilities and services that would encourage development in areas vulnerable to natural hazards.	4	4	5	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	3	4	3
The capital improvements program provides funding for hazard mitigation projects identified in the Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.	4	1	4	3	3	3	4	1	2	1	1	1	3
OTHER													
Small area or corridor plans recognize the need to avoid or mitigate natural hazards.	4	3	5	3	3	3	3	2	5	3	4	3	3
The building code contains provisions to strengthen or elevate new or substantially improved construction to withstand hazard forces.	3	3.5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
Economic development and/or redevelopment strategies include provisions for mitigating natural hazards or otherwise enhancing social and economic resiliency to hazards.	4	3	5	4	3	3	5	2	3	3	4	3	2
AVERAGE SURVEY RATINGS	3.9	3.2	4.5	3.3	3.3	3.2	4.0	2.8	3.7	3.2	3.8	3.4	3.6

* Pacific Grove is at maximum build-out with no new developable land for future growth.

NFIP Survey Results

All jurisdictions in Monterey County actively participate in, and are in good standing with, the NFIP. Each jurisdiction has adopted and enforces a local flood damage prevention ordinance in compliance with at least the minimum federal standards for new construction located in identified Special Flood Hazard Areas. These standards require that all new buildings and substantial improvements to existing buildings will be protected from damage by the 1-percent-annual-chance

flood event, and that new floodplain development will not aggravate existing flood problems or increase damage to other properties.

Another key service provided by the NFIP is the mapping of identified flood hazard areas. Once prepared, 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. All jurisdictions in Monterey County have coordinated with FEMA in the development and update of FIRMs to identify the regulatory Special Flood Hazard Areas for their jurisdictions.

Table 6.4 summarizes NFIP participation for each of **Monterey County's local jurisdictions** along with general NFIP policy data.

Table 6.4
NFIP Participation and Policy Statistics in Monterey County

Jurisdiction	NFIP Entry Date	Current Effective Map	Policies-In-Force	Insurance-In-Force
Monterey County	1/30/1984	04/02/09	1,603	\$415,580,300
City of Carmel-by-the-Sea	12/18/1997	04/02/09	21	\$6,842,000
City of Del Rey Oaks	11/04/1981	04/02/09	20	\$4,988,100
City of Gonzales	11/18/1981	04/02/09	19	\$5,528,300
City of Greenfield	8/23/1982	04/02/09	0	\$0
City of King City	10/15/1981	04/02/09	14	\$4,039,200
City of Marina	09/26/1988	04/02/09	42	\$10,171,800
City of Monterey	07/02/1981	04/02/09	143	\$25,003,800
City of Pacific Grove	1/12/1998	04/02/09	34	\$10,533,000
City of Salinas	11/04/1981	04/02/09	272	\$70,751,500
City of Sand City	6/03/1986	04/02/09	2	\$950,000
City of Seaside	7/02/1981	04/02/09	9	\$3,338,000
City of Soledad	11/30/1978	04/02/09	2	\$378,000
Total			2,181	\$558,104,000

Source: FEMA (as of 12/31/2013)

As can be seen in the table, the largest number of policies is for properties located in unincorporated Monterey County (1,603), the City of Salinas (272), and the City of Monterey (143). Each of the remaining jurisdictions has less than 50 NFIP policies in force across their community.

Results of the NFIP Survey generally suggest that designated local floodplain managers for participating jurisdictions are often assigned the role as a secondary duty, which is quite common nationwide. No compliance issues with the NFIP were identified by local officials in response to the survey, though several impediments to running an effective floodplain management program were identified including the lack of sufficient local staff and/or funding, the lack of developable floodplain areas, the low number of properties considered at risk per current effective FIRMs, and poor coordination among various entities or authorities for flood control. Some specific actions related to continued compliance or program improvements were considered and identified as part of this process and are integrated into the Mitigation Action Plans of each jurisdiction where applicable.

Survey results also suggest that Monterey County and the City of Salinas have the most active floodplain management programs in terms of going beyond the minimum requirements of NFIP participation. For example, each has adopted higher regulatory standards through their own flood damage prevention ordinances, including a one-foot freeboard for Monterey County and two-foot freeboard for the City of Salinas. Freeboard, as defined by FEMA, is a factor of safety usually expressed in feet above a flood level for purposes of floodplain management. Freeboard is not required by NFIP standards but communities are generally encouraged by FEMA to adopt at least a one-foot freeboard to account for the one-foot rise built into the concept of designating a floodway (and the encroachment requirements where floodways have not been designated).

Another important indicator of floodplain management capability is the active participation of local jurisdictions in the Community Rating System (CRS). The CRS is an incentive-based program that encourages counties and municipalities to undertake defined flood mitigation activities that go beyond the minimum requirements of the NFIP, adding extra local measures to provide protection from flooding. Monterey County currently participates in the CRS as a Class 5 community, resulting in a 25 percent reduction in premium rates for NFIP policyholders in Special Flood Hazard Areas. The City of Salinas participates in the CRS as a Class 7 community, resulting in a 15 percent rate reduction for NFIP policyholders in its own mapped Special Flood Hazard Areas. No other jurisdictions in Monterey County currently participate in CRS, though this is mainly driven by the relatively low number of potential beneficiaries (policyholders) as described above.

More information on the current administration of the NFIP in each jurisdiction is provided in Appendices H-U.