



FEMA

June 21, 2011

Mr. Carl Stephani, Executive Director
Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency (CCRPA)
225 North Main Street, Suite 304
Bristol, CT 06010

Dear Mr. Stephani:

Thank you for the opportunity to review additional Annexes of the CCRPA Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Region I has evaluated the plan for compliance with 44 CFR Part 201. The plan satisfactorily meets all of the mandatory requirements set forth by the regulations. Congratulations on this achievement!

This plan approval now includes the following jurisdictions, and amends previous FEMA approval letters. The plan approval now extends to the following participating jurisdictions that provided copies of their resolutions adopting the plan:

- Town of Berlin
- City of Bristol
- Town of Burlington
- City of New Britain
- Town of Plainville
- Town of Plymouth
- Town of Southington

With this plan approval, the communities listed above are eligible to apply for Mitigation Grants administered by FEMA. Please note that requests for mitigation funding will be evaluated individually according to the specific eligibility and requirements of each of these programs. Furthermore, it is important to understand that a specific mitigation activity or project identified in your region's plan may not meet the eligibility requirements for FEMA funding, and even eligible mitigation activities are not automatically approved for FEMA funding under the programs referenced above.

The CCRPA's multi-hazard mitigation plan must be reviewed, revised as appropriate, and resubmitted to FEMA for approval within **five years of the plan approval date of June 15, 2011** in order to maintain eligibility as an applicant for mitigation grants.

June 17, 2011

Page 2

Over the next five years, we encourage CCRPA to continue updating the plan's assessment of vulnerability, adhere to its maintenance schedule, and begin implementing, when possible, the mitigation actions proposed in the plan.

Once again, thank you for your continued dedication to public service demonstrated by preparing and adopting a strategy for reducing future disaster losses. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Marilyn Hilliard at (617) 956-7536.

Sincerely,



Don R. Boyce
Regional Administrator

DRB:mh

cc: Denise Ruzicka, Connecticut State Hazard Mitigation Officer
Ethan Abeles, Transportation Officer, CCRPA
Denise McNair, Berlin Interim Town Manager
Mayor Art Ward, Bristol
Catherine Bergstrom, First Selectman, Burlington
Mayor Timothy Stewart, New Britain
Paul Sweet, First Selectman, Plainville
Mayor Vincent Festa, Jr., Plymouth
John Weichsel, Town Manager, Southington

Enclosure

MULTI-JURISDICTION MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

NAME: **Bristol, CT** - NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN FOR THE CENTRAL CONNECTICUT REGION

DATE OF REVIEW AND VERSION: September 2010 & April 12, 2011

Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)	Location in Plan	Met	Not Met
Planning Process and Maintenance			
1. Does the plan document the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process?	Regional Plan, p 74-84 & Appendix B	Yes	
2. Does the plan describe an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process?	Regional Plan, p 81-83	Yes	
3. Did the plan describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	Regional Plan, pgs.77-80 & 85-86	Yes	
4. Does the plan address each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP?	Regional Plan, pgs 15 Annex 39-71	Yes	
5. Does the plan describe how the public was given an opportunity to comment on the plan during the planning process and prior to plan approval?	Regional Plan, p 82-83	Yes	
6. Does the plan describe how each jurisdiction participated in the planning process?	Regional Plan, p 2, 74, 75 & Appendix B	Yes	
7. Is there discussion of how the local government(s) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process?	Regional Plan, p 84	Yes	
8. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current, i.e., monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle?	Regional Plan, p 85	Yes	
Risk Assessment			
9. Does the plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction(s)?	Regional Plan, p 15-38	Yes	
10. Does the plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events?	Regional Plan, p 15-38	Yes	
11. Is there a description of each jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards identified, including an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community?	Regional Plan, p 15-38	Yes	
12. Does the plan address NFIP insured structures within the planning area that have been repetitively damaged by floods?	Regional Plan, p 18-20	Yes	
Mitigation Strategy			
13. Is there a description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards?	Regional Plan, p 71-73; Annexes p 39-70	Yes	
14. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard?	Regional Plan, p 71-73; Annexes p 39-70	Yes	
15. Does the plan address continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate, for each jurisdiction?	Regional Plan, p 71-73; Annexes p 39-70	Yes	
16. Does the plan describe a process by which local governments will incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate?	Regional Plan, pgs 85-86 & 77-80	Yes	
17. Is there an action plan describing how the actions identified will be prioritized (including emphasis on cost benefit review) implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction?	Regional Plan, p 71-73; Annexes p 39-70	Yes	
Additional Requirements for Plan Updates			
18. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development?		N/A	
19. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts?		N/A	
20. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities?		N/A	

FEMA REVIEWER: **Brigitte Ndikum-Nyada** APPROVABLE? YES: NO: Bristol, CT. - CCRPA 2011 New Plan.