



King County

Office of Emergency Management

KING COUNTY REGIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE

Volume 2: Planning Partner Annexes

Part 2b—Federal Way, Hunts Point, Issaquah, Kent,
Kirkland, Maple Valley, Medina, Mercer Island, North Bend

July 2015



TETRA TECH

**King County
REGIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE
VOLUME 2: PLANNING PARTNER ANNEXES**

JULY 2015

Prepared for:
King County
Office of Emergency Management
3511 NE 2nd Street
Renton, WA 98056

Prepared by:



TETRA TECH

complex world | **CLEAR SOLUTIONS™**

19803 North Creek Parkway, Bothell, WA 98011
Tel 425.877.2800 Fax 425.877.2899 www.tetrattech.com

Project #103S2548

King County
**Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update;
Volume 2—Planning Partner Annexes**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note: To reduce document and electronic file size, the Planning Partner annexes presented in Volume 2 of the King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan have been separated into five parts. Parts 2a through 2d include the Volume 2 table of contents, the introduction and a limited number of annexes. Municipal annexes are presented alphabetically in the first three parts, followed by special purpose district annexes in the fourth part. See the list below to identify which part contains each annex. Part 2e includes the Volume 2 appendices.

Part 2a

Introduction

Chapter 1. Update Annex for King County Regional Service Providers and Unincorporated Areas

Chapter 2. City of Algona Annex

Chapter 3. City of Auburn Update Annex

Chapter 4. Town of Beaux Arts Village Annex

Chapter 5. City of Bothell Update Annex

Chapter 6. City of Burien Annex

Chapter 7. City of Carnation Annex

Chapter 8. City of Clyde Hill Annex

Chapter 9. City of Duvall Annex

Part 2b

Introduction

Chapter 10. City of Federal Way Update Annex

Chapter 11. Town of Hunts Point Annex

Chapter 12. City of Issaquah Update Annex

Chapter 13. City of Kent Update Annex

Chapter 14. City of Kirkland Annex

Chapter 15. City of Maple Valley Annex

Chapter 16. City of Medina Annex

Chapter 17. City of Mercer Island Update Annex

Chapter 18. City of North Bend Annex

Part 2c

Introduction

Chapter 19. City of Pacific Update Annex

Chapter 20. City of Redmond Update Annex

Chapter 21. City of Renton Update Annex

Chapter 22. City of Seatac Annex

Chapter 23. City of Shoreline Update Annex

Chapter 24. Town of Skykomish Annex

Chapter 25. City of Snoqualmie Update Annex

Chapter 26. City of Tukwila Update Annex

Chapter 27. City of Woodinville Update Annex

Part 2d

Introduction

Chapter 28. Coal Creek Utility District Annex

Chapter 29. Covington Water District Update Annex

Chapter 30. Highline Water District Update Annex

Chapter 31. Kent Fire Department Regional Fire Authority Update Annex

Chapter 32. Kent School District #415 Annex

Chapter 33. King County Fire District No. 2 Annex

Chapter 34. King County Fire District No. 45 Annex

Chapter 35. King County Public Hospital District No. 1 (Valley Medical Center) Annex

Chapter 36. King County Public Hospital District No. 2 Annex

Chapter 37. King County Water District No. 19 Update Annex

Chapter 38. King County Water District No. 20 Annex

Chapter 39. King County Water District No. 90 Annex

Chapter 40. King County Water District No. 111 Update Annex

Chapter 41. King County Water District No. 125 Annex

Chapter 42. Midway Sewer District Annex

Chapter 43. North City Water District Update Annex

Chapter 44. Riverview School District Annex

Chapter 45. Ronald Wastewater District Annex

Chapter 46. Sammamish Plateau Water & Sewer Update Annex

Chapter 47. Shoreline Fire Department Update Annex

Chapter 48. Skyway Water and Sewer District Annex

Chapter 49. Soos Creek Water & Sewer District Update Annex

Chapter 50. Southwest Suburban Sewer District Update Annex

Chapter 51. Valley Regional Fire Authority Annex

Chapter 52. Valley View Sewer District Annex

Chapter 53. Vashon Island Fire & Rescue (King County Fire Protection District 13) Annex

Chapter 54. Woodinville Water District Annex

Part 2e

Appendix A. Planning Partner Expectations

Appendix B. Procedures for Linking to the Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

Appendix C. Annex Instructions and Templates

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) encourages multi-jurisdictional planning for hazard mitigation. All participating jurisdictions must meet the requirements of Chapter 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR):

“Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g. watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process and has officially adopted the plan.”
(Section 201.6.a(4))

For the King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update, a Planning Partnership was formed to leverage resources and to meet requirements of the federal Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA) for as many eligible local governments in King County as possible. The DMA defines a local government as follows:

“Any county, municipality, city, town, township, public authority, school district, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (regardless of whether the council of governments is incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under State law), regional or interstate government entity, or agency or instrumentality of a local government; any Indian tribe or authorized tribal organization, or Alaska Native village or organization; and any rural community, unincorporated town or village, or other public entity.”

There are two types of Planning Partners that participated in this process, with distinct needs and capabilities:

- Incorporated municipalities (cities and the County)
- Special purpose districts.

Each participating planning partner has prepared a jurisdiction-specific annex to this plan. These annexes, as well as information on the process by which they were created, are contained in this volume. This volume also includes brief profiles of the two Native American tribes that have land within King County. The tribes are independent, sovereign nations and were not official Planning Partners in this effort. However, they are important stakeholders in the region, and the King County Planning Partnership recognizes that tribal-level plans can support or enhance hazard mitigation in the planning area.

THE PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

Initial Solicitation and Letters of Intent

The planning team solicited the participation of the County and all County-recognized special purpose districts at the outset of this project. A kickoff meeting was held on January 24, 2013 at King County Office of Emergency Management in Renton to identify potential stakeholders and planning partners for this process. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the planning process to jurisdictions in the County that could have a stake in the outcome of the planning effort. All eligible local governments within the planning area were invited to attend. Various agency and citizen stakeholders were also invited to this meeting. The goals of the meeting were as follows:

- Provide an overview of the Disaster Mitigation Act.
- Provide an update on the planning grant.

- Outline the King County plan update work plan.
- Describe the benefits of multi-jurisdictional planning.
- Outline planning partner expectations.
- Solicit planning partners.
- Confirm a Steering Committee.

All interested local governments were provided with a list of planning partner expectations developed by the planning team and were informed of the obligations required for participation. Local governments wishing to join the planning effort were asked to provide the planning team with a “notice of intent to participate” that agreed to the planning partner expectations (see Appendix A) and designated a point of contact for their jurisdiction. In all, formal commitment was received from 59 planning partners by the planning team, and the King County Planning Partnership was formed.

Maps for each participating city are provided in the individual annex for that city in Parts 2a through 2c of this volume. Maps showing the location of participating special purpose districts by district type are provided at the beginning of Part 2d, which includes the special purpose district annexes. These maps will be updated periodically as changes to the partnership occur, either through linkage or by a partner dropping out due to a failure to participate.

Planning Partner Expectations

The planning team developed the following list of planning partner expectations, which were confirmed at the kickoff meeting held on January 24, 2013:

- Each partner will provide a “Letter of Intent to Participate.”
- Each partner will support and participate in the selection and function of the Steering Committee overseeing the development of the update. Support includes allowing this body to make decisions regarding plan development and scope on behalf of the partnership.
- Each partner will provide support for the public involvement strategy developed by the Steering Committee in the form of mailing lists, possible meeting space, and media outreach such as newsletters, newspapers or direct-mailed brochures.
- Each partner will participate in plan update development activities such as:
 - Steering Committee meetings
 - Public meetings or open houses
 - Workshops and planning partner training sessions
 - Public review and comment periods prior to adoption.

Attendance will be tracked at such activities, and attendance records will be used to track and document participation for each planning partner. No minimum level of participation will be established, but each planning partner should attempt to attend all such activities.

- Each partner will be expected to perform a “consistency review” of all technical studies, plans, and ordinances specific to hazards identified within the planning area to determine the existence of plans, studies or ordinances not consistent with the equivalent documents reviewed in preparation of the County plan. For example: if a planning partner has a floodplain management plan that makes recommendations that are not consistent with any of the County’s

basin plans, that plan will need to be reviewed for probable incorporation into the plan for the partner's area.

- Each partner will be expected to review the risk assessment and identify hazards and vulnerabilities specific to its jurisdiction. Contract resources will provide jurisdiction-specific mapping and technical consultation to aid in this task, but the determination of risk and vulnerability will be up to each partner.
- Each partner will be expected to review the mitigation recommendations chosen for the overall county and determine if they will meet the needs of its jurisdiction. Projects within each jurisdiction consistent with the overall plan recommendations will need to be identified, prioritized and reviewed to determine their benefits and costs.
- Each partner will be required to create its own action plan that identifies each project, who will oversee the task, how it will be financed and when it is estimated to occur.
- Each partner will be required to complete its normal pre-adoption process prior to submitting the plan to its governing body for adoption. For example, if it is the community's normal process to submit a planning document to a Planning Commission prior to submittal to council for adoption, then that process must be followed for the adoption of this plan.
- Each partner will be required to formally adopt the plan.

It should be noted that by adopting this plan, each planning partner also agrees to the plan implementation and maintenance protocol established in Volume 1. Failure to meet these criteria may result in a partner being dropped from the partnership by the Steering Committee, and thus losing eligibility under the scope of this plan.

Linkage Procedures

Eligible local jurisdictions that did not participate in development of this regional plan update may comply with DMA requirements by linking to this plan following the procedures outlined in Appendix B.

ANNEX-PREPARATION PROCESS

Templates

Templates were created to help the Planning Partners prepare their jurisdiction-specific annexes. Since special purpose districts operate differently from incorporated municipalities, separate templates were created for the two types of jurisdictions. The templates were created so that all criteria of Section 201.6 of 44 CFR would be met, based on the partners' capabilities and mode of operation. Templates available for the planning partners' use were specific as to whether the partner is a municipality or a special purpose district and whether the annex is an update to a previous hazard mitigation plan or a first-time hazard plan. Each partner was asked to participate in a technical assistance workshop during which key elements of the template were completed by a designated point of contact for each partner and a member of the planning team. The templates were set up to lead each partner through a series of steps that would generate the DMA-required elements that are specific for each partner. The templates and their instructions can be found in Appendix C to this volume of the Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update.

Workshop

Workshops were held for Planning Partners to learn about the templates and the overall planning process. Topics included the following:

- DMA
- King County plan background
- The templates
- Risk ranking
- Developing your action plan
- Cost/benefit review.

Separate sessions were held for special purpose districts and municipalities, in order to better address each type of partner's needs. The sessions provided technical assistance and an overview of the template completion process. Attendance at this workshop was mandatory under the planning partner expectations established by the Steering Committee. There was 92-percent attendance of the partnership at these sessions.

In the risk-ranking exercise, each planning partner was asked to rank each risk specifically for its jurisdiction, based on the impact on its population or facilities. Cities were asked to base this ranking on probability of occurrence and the potential impact on people, property and the economy. Special purpose districts were asked to base this ranking on probability of occurrence and the potential impact on their constituency, their vital facilities and the facilities' functionality after an event. The methodology followed that used for the countywide risk ranking presented in Volume 1. A principal objective of this exercise was to familiarize the partnership with how to use the risk assessment as a tool to support other planning and hazard mitigation processes. Tools utilized during these sessions included the following:

- The risk assessment results developed for this plan
- Hazard maps for all hazards of concern
- Special district boundary maps that illustrated the sphere of influence for each special purpose district partner
- Hazard mitigation catalogs
- Federal funding and technical assistance catalogs
- Copies of partners' prior annexes, if applicable.

Prioritization

44 CFR requires actions identified in the action plan to be prioritized (Section 201.c.3.iii). The planning team and steering committee developed a methodology for prioritizing the action plans that meets the needs of the partnership and the requirements of 44 CFR. The actions were prioritized according to the following criteria:

- **High Priority**—Project meets multiple plan objectives, benefits exceed cost, funding is secured under existing programs, or is grant eligible, and project can be completed in 1 to 5 years (i.e., short term project) once funded.
- **Medium Priority**—Project meets at least 1 plan objective, benefits exceed costs, requires special funding authorization under existing programs, grant eligibility is questionable, and project can be completed in 1 to 5 years once funded.
- **Low Priority**—Project will mitigate the risk of a hazard, benefits exceed costs, funding has not been secured, project is not grant eligible, and time line for completion is long term (5 to 10 years).

These priority definitions are dynamic and can change from one category to another based on changes to a parameter such as availability of funding. For example, a project might be assigned a medium priority because of the uncertainty of a funding source, but be changed to high once a funding source has been identified. The prioritization schedule for this plan will be reviewed and updated as needed annually through the plan maintenance strategy.

Benefit/Cost Review

44 CFR requires the prioritization of the action plan to emphasize a benefit/cost analysis of the proposed actions. Because some actions may not be implemented for up to 10 years, benefit/cost analysis was qualitative and not of the detail required by FEMA for project grant eligibility under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) and Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) grant program. A review of the apparent benefits versus the apparent cost of each project was performed. Parameters were established for assigning subjective ratings (high, medium, and low) to costs and benefits as follows:

- Cost ratings:
 - **High**—Existing funding levels are not adequate to cover the costs of the proposed action; implementation would require an increase in revenue through an alternative source (for example, bonds, grants, and fee increases).
 - **Medium**—The action could be implemented with existing funding but would require a re-apportionment of the budget or a budget amendment, or the cost of the action would have to be spread over multiple years.
 - **Low**—The action could be funded under the existing budget. The action is part of or can be part of an existing, ongoing program.
- Benefit ratings:
 - **High**—The action will have an immediate impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property.
 - **Medium**—The action will have a long-term impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property or will provide an immediate reduction in the risk exposure to property.
 - **Low**—Long-term benefits of the action are difficult to quantify in the short term.

Using this approach, projects with positive benefit versus cost ratios (such as high over high, high over medium, medium over low, etc.) are considered cost-beneficial and are prioritized accordingly.

It should be noted that for many of the strategies identified in this action plan, funding might be sought under FEMA's HMGP or PDM programs. Both of these programs require detailed benefit/cost analysis as part of the application process. These analyses will be performed on projects at the time of application preparation. The FEMA benefit-cost model will be used to perform this review. For projects not seeking financial assistance from grant programs that require this sort of analysis, the Partners reserve the right to define "benefits" according to parameters that meet their needs and the goals and objectives of this plan.

Analysis of Mitigation Initiatives

Each planning partner reviewed its recommended initiatives to classify each initiative based on the hazard it addresses and the type of mitigation it involves. Mitigation types used for this categorization are as follows:

- **Prevention**—Government, administrative or regulatory actions that influence the way land and buildings are developed to reduce hazard losses. Includes planning and zoning, floodplain laws, capital improvement programs, open space preservation, and stormwater management regulations.
- **Property Protection**—Modification of buildings or structures to protect them from a hazard or removal of structures from a hazard area. Includes acquisition, elevation, relocation, structural retrofit, storm shutters, and shatter-resistant glass.
- **Public Education and Awareness**—Actions to inform citizens and elected officials about hazards and ways to mitigate them. Includes outreach projects, real estate disclosure, hazard information centers, and school-age and adult education.
- **Natural Resource Protection**—Actions that minimize hazard loss and preserve or restore the functions of natural systems. Includes sediment and erosion control, stream corridor restoration, watershed management, forest and vegetation management, and wetland restoration and preservation.
- **Emergency Services**—Actions that protect people and property during and immediately after a hazard event. Includes warning systems, emergency response services, and the protection of essential facilities.
- **Structural Projects**—Actions that involve the construction of structures to reduce the impact of a hazard. Includes dams, setback levees, floodwalls, retaining walls, and safe rooms.

COMPATIBILITY WITH PREVIOUS APPROVED PLANS

Of the 59 committed planning partners, 22 were covered by prior plans approved by FEMA. This does not include local governments covered under the initial 2004 Regional Plan that did not perform and update to that plan in 2009. Table 1 lists those communities, the status of those plans, and the role this regional plan will play in achieving compliance and the CRS status if applicable. These 22 plans identified over 280 initiatives. The progress made on these initiatives has been reviewed in the progress report included in Appendix B of Volume 1 of this plan update.

FINAL COVERAGE UNDER THE PLAN

Of the 59 committed planning partners, 54 fully met the participation requirements specified by the Steering Committee. The principal requirement not met by the other partners was the completion of the jurisdictional annex template following the workshops. All 54 partners that attended the workshop subsequently submitted completed templates. Only those 54 jurisdictions are included in this volume and will seek DMA compliance under this plan. The remaining jurisdictions will need to follow the linkage procedures described in Appendix B of this volume. Table 2 lists the jurisdictions that submitted letters of intent and their ultimate status in this plan.

**TABLE 1.
PRIOR PLAN STATUS**

Jurisdiction	FEMA Approval Date	Will Be Replaced by King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan? (Yes/No)	CRS Community (Yes/No)	King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan Will Become CRS Plan of Record?(Yes/No)
City of Auburn	12/2/2009	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Bothell	6/17/2010	Yes	No	N/A
City of Federal Way	12/2/2009	Yes	No	N/A
City of Issaquah	1/28/2010	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Kent (including annex for Kent Fire Department/King County Fire District 37)	1/27/2005	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Mercer Island	6/16/2011	Yes	No	N/A
City of Pacific	12/2/2009	Yes	No	N/A
City of Redmond	1/8/2010	Yes	No	N/A
City of Renton	4/19/2012	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Shoreline (including annex for Shoreline Fire Department /King County Fire District 4)	12/2/2009	Yes	No	n/a
City of Snoqualmie	4/20/2010	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Tukwila	2/16/2011	Yes	No	N/A
City of Woodinville (an annex to the North King and South Snohomish Counties Regional Mitigation Plan for Natural Hazards)	11/29/2010	Yes	No	N/A
King County (Unincorporated)	1/28/2010	Yes	Yes	No ^a
Covington Water District	1/28/2010	Yes	N/A	N/A
Highline Water District	12/2/2009	Yes	N/A	N/A
King County Water District 19	12/28/2010	Yes	N/A	N/A
King County Water District 111	4/20/2010	Yes	N/A	N/A
North City Water District (known as Shoreline Water District at the time of the previous hazard mitigation plan ^c)	N/A ^b	Yes	N/A	N/A
Soos Creek Water District	3/18/2010	Yes	N/A	N/A
Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District	12/2/2009	Yes	N/A	N/A
Southwest Suburban Sewer District	1/28/2010	Yes	N/A	N/A
South King Fire and Rescue	12/2/2009	No	N/A	N/A

a. For unincorporated King County, the CRS plan of record is the *2013 King County Flood Hazard Management Plan Update and Progress Report*.

b. The 2010 Shoreline Water District Hazard Mitigation Plan was not submitted to FEMA for approval.

**TABLE 2.
PLANNING PARTNER STATUS**

Jurisdiction	Letter of Intent Date	Attended Workshop?	Completed Template?	Covered by This Plan?
Municipalities				
King County	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Algona	1/29/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Auburn	2/13/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Bellevue	2/22/2013	No ^a	No	No
City of Bothell	2/12/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Burien	2/13/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Carnation	2/11/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Covington	2/12/2013	No ^a	No	No
City of Clyde Hill	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Duvall	2/13/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Federal Way	1/31/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Issaquah	1/33/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Kent	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Kirkland	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Maple Valley	1/30/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Medina	2/11/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Mercer Island	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of North Bend	2/22/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Pacific	3/15/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Redmond	2/19/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Renton	2/22/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of SeaTac	2/7/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Shoreline	2/15/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Snoqualmie	3/14/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Tukwila	3/1/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
City of Woodinville	2/28/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Beaux Arts Village	2/14/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Hunts Point	2/23/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Town of Skykomish	3/15/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fire Districts				
Burien Fire (King County Fire District #2)	1/24/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Duvall Fire (King County Fire District #45)	2/15/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kent Fire	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Shoreline Fire	2/13/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Valley Regional Fire Authority	1/29/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
South King Co. Fire and Rescue	2/13/2013	No	No	No
Vashon Island Fire & Rescue	1/31/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes

**TABLE 2.
PLANNING PARTNER STATUS**

Jurisdiction	Letter of Intent Date	Attended Workshop?	Completed Template?	Covered by This Plan?
School and Hospital Districts				
Kent School District	2/14/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lake Washington School District	3/15/2013	No	No	No
Riverview School District	1/30/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Evergreen Health (Public Hospital District #2)	2/5/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Snoqualmie Hospital	2/25/2013	No	No	No
Valley Medical (Public Hospital District #1)	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Water, Sewer and Utility Districts				
Covington Water District	2/12/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Highline Water District	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
King County Water District 19	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
King County Water District 20	2/20/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
King County Water District 90	2/12/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
King County Water District 111	2/25/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
King County Water District 125	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
North City Water District (formerly Shoreline Water District)	2/26/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Coal Creek Utility District	1/30/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sammamish Plateau Water & Sewer District	2/26/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Skyway Water & Sewer District	3/12/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Soos Creek Water & Sewer District	2/27/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Midway Sewer District	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ronald Wastewater District	2/13/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Southwest Suburban Sewer District	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Valley View Sewer District	2/21/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
Woodinville Water District	2/20/2013	Yes	Yes	Yes
a. Cities of Bellevue and Covington decided to maintain their own plans after submitting letter of intent				

KING COUNTY TRIBAL STAKEHOLDERS

FEMA's Tribal Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance

FEMA's 2010 *Tribal Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* assists Indian tribal governments and other tribal entities in identifying and assessing their risk to natural hazards. The document offers the following types of assistance (44 CFR 201.7):

- It helps Indian tribal governments identify their risks from natural hazards and protect their members and other resources.

- It helps Indian tribal governments develop and adopt new mitigation plans, or revise or update existing mitigation plans, to meet the requirements of 44 CFR 201.7.
- It helps plan reviewers evaluate mitigation plans from different Indian Tribal governments in a fair and consistent manner.
- It helps Indian tribal governments exercise flexibility and apply for assistance as either a grantee or subgrantee under FEMA grant programs with a single plan type.
- It provides guidance and culturally relevant examples to other tribal entities that comply with similar planning requirements under 44 CFR 201.6 as a local government.

Indian tribal governments with an approved tribal mitigation plan in accordance with 44 CFR 201.7 may apply for assistance from FEMA as a grantee. If the Indian tribal government coordinates with the state for review of the tribal mitigation plan, then the Indian tribal government also has the option to apply as a subgrantee through a state or another tribe. A grantee is an entity such as a state, territory, or Indian tribal government to which a grant is awarded and that is accountable for the funds provided. A subgrantee is an entity—such as a community, local or Indian tribal government, state-recognized tribe, or private nonprofit organization—to which a subgrant is awarded and that is accountable to the grantee for use of the funds provided.

If the Indian tribal government is eligible as a grantee or subgrantee because it has an approved tribal mitigation plan and has coordinated with the state for review, it can decide which option it wants to take on a case-by-case basis with respect to each federal disaster declaration, and for each grant program under a declaration, but not on a project-by-project basis within a grant program. For example, an Indian tribal government can participate as a subgrantee for public assistance, but as a grantee for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program under the same declaration. However, the Indian tribal government would not be able to request grantee status under HMGP for one HMGP project, then request subgrantee status for another HMGP project under the same declaration.

By acknowledging the tribes as stakeholders, the King County regional planning partnership recognizes tribal level plans as existing and potential mechanisms that could support or enhance hazard mitigation in King County. This is a requirement of 44 CFR 201.6.b.3. While the King County regional planning effort and those of the tribal governments are separate and autonomous efforts, tribal plans offer an opportunity to partner and share information that may lead help to leverage resources in the planning area.

The Muckleshoot Indian Tribe

Brief Profile

This section is excerpted from the City of Auburn's 2013 Annex to the King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan (<http://www.auburnwa.gov/Assets/EM/AuburnWA/Docs/hazmit2013.pdf>) and the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe website (<http://www.muckleshoot.nsn.us/about-us/overview.aspx>)

The Muckleshoot Indian Tribe is a federally recognized Indian tribe whose membership is composed of descendants of the Duwamish and Upper Puyallup people who inhabited Central Puget Sound for thousands of years before non-Indian settlement. The Tribe's name is derived from the native name for the prairie on which the Muckleshoot Reservation was established. Following the Reservation's establishment in 1857, the Tribe and its members came to be known as Muckleshoot, rather than by the historical tribal names of their Duwamish and Upper Puyallup ancestors. Today, the United States recognizes the Muckleshoot Tribe as a tribal successor to the Duwamish and Upper Puyallup bands from which the Tribe's membership descends.

The Muckleshoot Reservation consists of six sections situated diagonally, has 20 miles of boundaries, and encompasses 6 square-miles. Three sections (3 square miles) are within the municipal limits of the City of Auburn. The Muckleshoot Tribe is one of Washington's largest tribes, with a membership of about 3,300. Through the Indian Reorganization Act, the Tribe adopted its constitution in 1936. It provides a nine-member council with advice and input of the General Council, consisting of all community members, and it provides a full range of governance services to tribal members and tribal properties in the reservation.

Status of Approved Plan

The Muckleshoot Tribe does not currently have a FEMA-approved, state-level, multi-hazard mitigation plan; however, the Tribe is currently pursuing plan development.

The Snoqualmie Indian Tribe

Brief Profile

The following information is excerpted from the 2011 Snoqualmie Tribe Hazard Mitigation Plan (http://www.snoqualmietribe.us/sites/default/files/linkedfiles/snoqualmie_tribe_hmp_final_11.1.11.pdf).

The people known today as the Snoqualmie Tribe have lived in the Puget Sound region of Washington State since time immemorial, long before the early explorers came to the Northwest. They hunted deer, elk, and other game animals, fished for salmon and gathered berries and wild plants for food and medicinal purposes.

The Snoqualmie Tribe currently has approximately 650 members. Historically, tribal members lived in an area of East King and Snohomish Counties that now contains the communities of Monroe, Carnation, Fall City, Snoqualmie, North Bend, Mercer Island and Issaquah. Tribal members continue to live in each of these communities.

In 1855, Snoqualmie signed the Point Elliott Treaty creating a government-to-government relationship between the United States and the Snoqualmie Tribe. The Tribe ceded to the U.S. government all of its land between Snoqualmie Pass and Marysville. The Tribe lost federal recognition in 1953 when federal policies limited recognition to tribes having reservations.

In October 1999, After 46 years of petitioning, the Bureau of Indian Affairs notified the Tribe's Fall City headquarters that the U.S. government had re-recognized the Snoqualmie Tribe and granted Snoqualmie Nation tribal status based on evidence that the Tribe had maintained a continuous community from historical times to the present. Recognition gave the Tribe the right to acquire its initial reservation land and to develop a casino to help fund tribal governance, administration and services to its members.

In the decade since re-recognition, the Tribe has worked to develop programs and provide services to meet the needs of its members. The Tribe has developed a government, created medical clinics, and promoted economic development, social and health services, and housing programs.

On March 2, 2006 the Snoqualmie Reservation site was officially put into trust status. The Snoqualmie Casino (which opened in 2009) was built on the reservation and is used to pursue economic development and increase the financial resources of the Tribe for government operations.

Status of Approved Plan

The Snoqualmie Tribe has a FEMA-approved, state-level, multi-hazard mitigation plan effective October 2011 through October 11, 2016.

Hazards of Concern

The 2011 plan addressed the following hazards of concern:

- Earthquake
- Flood
- Landslide/mass movement
- Epidemic/pandemic
- Hazardous materials.
- Severe weather
- Wildfire
- Dam failure
- Abandoned mines

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

The following terms are used in the planning partner annexes:

- ATC—Applied Technology Council
- CED—Community and Economic Development (city department)
- CEMP—Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan
- CERT—Citizens Emergency Response Training
- CFR—Code of Federal Regulations
- cfs—cubic feet per second
- CIP—Capital Improvement Plan
- CRS—Community Rating System
- DCD—Department of Community Development
- DI—Ductile iron
- DMA—Disaster Mitigation Act
- DNRP—Department of Natural Resources and Parks (King County)
- DOT—Department of Transportation (King County)
- DPER—Department of Permitting and Environmental Review (King County)
- EOC—Emergency Operations Center
- EPA—U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- FEMA—Federal Emergency Management Agency
- GIS—Geographic Information System
- GMA—Growth Management Act (Washington State)
- gpm—gallons per minute
- Hazus-MH—Hazards, United States-Multi Hazard
- HDPE—High-density polyethylene
- HMGP—Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
- IBC—International Building Code
- IRC—International Residential Code
- KCFD—King County Fire District
- KCSO—King County Sheriff's Office
- KCWD—King County Water District
- mgd—million gallons per day
- NFIP—National Flood Insurance Program
- NOAA—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- NPDES—National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

- OEM—Office of Emergency Management (King County)
- OFM—Office of Financial Management (Washington State)
- PDM—Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program
- PRV—Pressure-reducing valve
- RCW—Revised Code of Washington
- SCADA—Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
- SPU—Seattle Public Utilities
- USGS—U.S. Geological Survey
- WSDOT—Washington State Department of Transportation
- WTD—Wastewater Treatment Division (a division of King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks)

APPENDIX A.
PLANNING PARTNER EXPECTATIONS

APPENDIX A. PLANNING PARTNER EXPECTATIONS

One of the goals of the multi-jurisdictional approach to hazard mitigation planning is to achieve compliance with the Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA) for all participating members in the planning effort. There are several different groups who will be involved in this process at different levels. In order to provide clarity, the following is a general breakdown of those groups: the planning team, which is customarily the Tetra Tech Team and those actually responsible for the plan's written development; the Steering Committee, which represent members from the planning partnership that serve as the oversight body, assuming responsibility for many of the planning milestones prescribed for this process to help reduce the burden of time required by each planning partner; the planning partners are those jurisdictions or special purpose districts that are actually developing an annex to the regional plan; and the planning stakeholders, which are the individuals, groups, businesses, academia, etc., from which the planning team gains information to support the various elements of the plan.

DMA compliance requires that participation be defined in order to maintain eligibility with respect to meeting the requirements which allow a jurisdiction or special purpose district to develop an annex to the base plan. To achieve compliance for all partners, the plan must clearly document how each planning partner that is seeking linkage to the plan participated in the plan's development. The best way to do this is to clearly define "participation." For this planning process, "participation" is defined by the following criteria:

- **Estimated Level of Effort.** It is estimated that the total time commitment to meet these "participation" requirements for a planning partner not participating on the Steering Committee would be approximately 40 hours over the 12 to 14 month period. This time is reduced somewhat for special purpose districts.
- **Participate in the Process.** As indicated, it must be documented in the plan that each planning partner "participated" in the process to the best of your capabilities. There is flexibility in defining "participation," which can vary based on the type of planning partner (i.e.: City or County, vs. a Special Purpose District) involved. However, the level of participation must be defined at the on-set of the planning process, and we must demonstrate the extent to which this level of participation has been met for each partner. This planning process will utilize a Steering Committee that will assume responsibility for many of the planning milestones prescribed for this process to help reduce the burden of time required by each planning partner. This committee will be representative of the whole body and you as a planning partner will have input on its makeup. This committee will meet periodically (frequency to be determined by the committee) throughout the process and provide direction and guidance to the planning team. Steering Committee meetings are not mandatory meetings for all planning partners. If you are not on the committee, your attendance is not required; however, it is our hope that all planning partners will attempt to remain engaged with this process. Each committed planning partner will be notified of the date and time for all scheduled steering committee meetings. The planning team will also request support from the partnership during the public involvement phase of the planning process. Support could be in the form of providing venues for public meetings, attending these meetings as meeting participants, providing technical support, etc.
- **Duration of Planning Process.** This process is anticipated to take 12 to 14 months to complete. It will be easy to become disconnected with the process objectives if you do not participate in some of these meetings to some degree. The planning team will keep all planning partners

apprised of plan development milestones via informational bulletins that will be periodically distributed to the entire partnership.

- **Critical Facility Update.** All planning partners will be requested to update their critical facilities/infrastructure lists for use during the risk assessment. The CDMS extension to Hazaus will be used for this process, and guidance will be provided by the planning team. If the list is not updated, Hazus default data will be used. Updating this list provides a much more detailed analysis.
- **Capability Assessment.** All planning partners will be asked to identify their capabilities during this process. This assessment will look at the regulatory, technical, financial and floodplain management capabilities of each municipal partner. Special purpose districts will perform a different type of capability assessment. These capability assessments will require a review of existing plans, studies, ordinances and programs pertinent to each jurisdiction to identify policies or recommendations that can complement the hazard mitigation initiatives selected (e.g., comprehensive plans, basin plans or hazard-specific plans). This step is important because increasing a jurisdiction's capability is a viable mitigation action.
- **Action/Strategy Review.** All previous planning partners will be required to perform a review of the strategies from their respective prior action plan to: determine those that have been accomplished and how they were accomplished; and why those that have not been accomplished were not completed. The planning team will be available to assist with this task.
- **Action Plan Development.** Each planning partner must identify and prioritize an action plan that they will strive to implement to reduce the risks from hazards they have ranked that impact their jurisdiction.
- **Plan Adoption.** The plan must be adopted by each jurisdiction.

One of the benefits to multi-jurisdictional planning is the ability to pool resources. This means more than monetary resources. Resources such as staff time, meeting locations, media resources, technical expertise will all need to be utilized to generate a successful plan. In addition, these resources can be pooled such that decisions can be made by a peer group applying to the whole and thus reducing the individual level of effort of each planning partner. This will be accomplished by the formation of a steering committee made up of planning partners and other "stakeholders" within the planning area. The size and makeup of this steering committee will be determined by the planning partnership during our kick-off meeting. This body will assume the decision-making responsibilities on behalf of the entire partnership. This will streamline the planning process by reducing the number of meetings that will need to be attended by each planning partner. The assembled Steering Committee for this effort will meet monthly (unless decided otherwise) on an as-needed basis as determined by the planning team, and will provide guidance and decision making during all phases of the plan's development.

With the above participation requirements in mind, each planning partner will be asked to aid this process by being prepared to develop its section of the plan. To be an eligible planning partner in this effort, each Planning Partner will be asked to provide the following:

- A "Letter of Intent to participate" or Resolution to participate to the Planning Team (see exhibit A).
- Designate a lead point of contact for this effort. This designee will be listed as the hazard mitigation point of contact for your jurisdiction in the plan.
- Identify an un-burdened billing rate for this point of contact which will be used to calculate the in-kind match for the grant that is funding this project.
- Approve the Steering Committee.

- If requested, provide support in the form of mailing list, possible meeting space, and public information materials, such as newsletters, newspapers or direct mailed brochures, required to implement the public involvement strategy developed by the Steering Committee.
- Participate in the process. There will be many opportunities as this plan evolves to participate. Opportunities such as:
 - Steering Committee meetings
 - Public meetings or open houses
 - Workshops/ Planning Partner specific training sessions
 - Public review and comment periods prior to adoption

At each and every one of these opportunities, attendance will be recorded. Attendance records will be used to document participation for each planning partner. No thresholds will be established as minimum levels of participation. However, each planning partner should attempt to attend all possible meetings and events.

- There will be one mandatory workshop that all planning partners will be required to attend. This workshop will cover the proper completion of the jurisdictional annex template, which is the basis for each partner's jurisdictional chapter in the plan. Failure to have a representative at this workshop will disqualify the planning partner from participation in this effort. The schedule for this workshop will be such that all committed planning partners will be able to attend.
- After participation in the mandatory annex workshop, each partner will be required to complete their annex and provide it to the planning team in the time frame established by the Steering Committee. Technical assistance in the completion of these annexes will be available from the planning team. Failure to complete your annex in the required time frame may lead to disqualification from the partnership.
- Each partner will be asked to review the Risk Assessment and identify hazards and vulnerabilities specific to its jurisdiction. Contract resources will provide the jurisdiction specific mapping and technical consultation to aid in this task, but the determination of risk and vulnerability will be up to each partner (through a facilitated process during the mandatory workshop).
- Each partner will be required to create its own action plan that identifies each project, who will oversee the task, how it will be financed and when it is estimated to occur.
- Each partner will be required to formally adopt the plan.

Planning tools and instructions to aid in the compilation of this information will be provided to all committed planning partners. Each partner will be asked to complete their annexes in a timely manner and according to the timeline specified by the Steering Committee.

**** Note**:** Once this plan is completed, and FEMA approval has been determined for each partner, maintaining that eligibility will be dependent upon each partner implementing the plan implementation-maintenance protocol identified in the plan.

Exhibit A
Example Letter of Intent to Participate

King County Hazard Mitigation Planning Partnership

C/O Tetra Tech, Inc.

19803 N. Creek Parkway

Bothell, WA 98011

Via email at: rob.flaner@tetratech.com

Dear King County Planning Partnership,

Please be advised that the _____ (*insert City or district name*) is committed to participating in the update to the King County Regional Multi- Hazard Mitigation Plan. As the _____ (title, e.g., Chief Administrative Official) for this jurisdiction, I certify that I will commit all necessary resources in order to meet Partnership expectations as outlined in the “Planning Partners expectations” document provided by the planning team, in order to obtain Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA) compliance for our jurisdiction.

Mr./Ms. _____ will be our jurisdiction’s point of contact for this process and they can be reached at (*insert: address, phone number and e-mail address*). We understand that this designated point of contact’s time will be applied to the “in-kind” local match for the grant that is funding this project. To aid in the determination of this local match, we have determined that the fully burdened bill rate for our designated point of contact is \$ _____. The funding source for our point of contact’s position within our jurisdiction is _____ / is not _____ through federal funds. If it is through federal funds, what percentage of their salary is federally funded? _____%

Sincerely,

**Exhibit B
(Current) Planning Team Contact information**

Name	Representing	Address	Phone	e-mail
Janice Rahman	King County OEM	3511 NE 2nd Street Renton, WA 98056	(206) 205-4061	<u>Janice.Rahman@Kingcounty.gov</u>
Sam Ripley	King County OEM	3511 NE 2nd Street Renton, WA 98056	(206) 205-4072	<u>Sam.Ripley@kingcounty.gov</u>
Rob Flaner	Tetra Tech, Inc.	90 S. Blackwood Ave Eagle, ID 83616	(208) 939-4391	<u>Rob.flaner@tetrattech.com</u>

**APPENDIX B.
PROCEDURES FOR LINKING TO
THE REGIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE**

APPENDIX B. PROCEDURES FOR LINKING TO THE REGIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE

Not all eligible local governments in King County are included in the King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update. Some or all of these non-participating local governments may choose to “link” to the Plan at some point to gain eligibility for programs under the federal Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA). In addition, some current partners may not continue to meet eligibility requirements due to a lack of participation prescribed by the plan. The following “linkage” procedures define the requirements established by the Planning Team for dealing with an increase or decrease in the number of planning partners linked to this plan. No currently non-participating jurisdiction within the defined planning area is obligated to link to this plan. These jurisdictions can choose to do their own “complete” plan that addresses all required elements of Section 201.6 of Chapter 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR).

INCREASING THE PARTNERSHIP THROUGH LINKAGE

Eligible jurisdictions located in the planning area may link to this plan at any point during the plan’s performance period. It is expected that linking jurisdictions will complete the requirements outlined below and submit their completed template to the lead agency (King County Office of Emergency Management) for review within three months of beginning the linkage process:

- The eligible jurisdiction requests a “Linkage Package” by contacting the Point of Contact (POC) for the plan:
 - Janice Rahman, Project Manager
King County Office of Emergency Management
3511 NE 2nd Street
Renton, WA 98056
(206) 205-4061

Janice.Rahman@kingcounty.gov
- The POC will provide a linkage procedure package that includes linkage information and a linkage tool-kit:
 - Linkage Information
 - Procedures for linking to the regional hazard mitigation plan update
 - Planning partner’s expectations for linking jurisdictions
 - A sample “letter of intent” to link to the Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan
 - A copy of Section 201.6 of 44 CFR, which defines the federal requirements for a local hazard mitigation plan.
 - Linkage Tool-Kit
 - Copy of Volume 1 and 2 of the plan
 - A special purpose district or city template and instructions
 - A catalog of hazard mitigation alternatives
 - An annex review check-list
 - A sample resolution for plan adoption

- The new jurisdiction will be required to review both volumes of the Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan, which include the following key components for the planning area:
 - Goals and objectives
 - The planning area risk assessment
 - Comprehensive review of alternatives
 - Countywide initiatives
 - Plan implementation and maintenance procedures.

Once this review is complete, the jurisdiction will complete its specific annex using the template and instructions provided by the POC.

- The development of the new jurisdiction's annex must not be completed by one individual in isolation. The jurisdiction must develop, implement and describe a public involvement strategy and a methodology to identify and vet jurisdiction-specific actions. The original partnership was covered under a uniform public involvement strategy and a process to identify actions that covered the planning area described in Volume 1 and Volume 2 of this plan. Since new partners were not addressed by these strategies, they will have to initiate new strategies and describe them in their annex. For consistency, new partners are encouraged to develop and implement strategies similar to those described in this plan.
- The public involvement strategy must ensure the public's ability to participate in the plan development process. At a minimum, the new jurisdiction must solicit public opinion on hazard mitigation at the onset of the linkage process and hold one or more public meetings to present the draft jurisdiction-specific annex for comment at least two weeks prior to adoption by the governing body. The POC will have resources available to aid in the public involvement strategy, including:
 - The questionnaire utilized in the plan development
 - Presentations from public meeting workshops and the public comment period
 - Flyers and information cards that were distributed to the public
 - Press releases used throughout the planning process
 - The plan website.
- The methodology to identify actions should include a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard and a description of the process by which chosen actions were identified. As part of this process, linking jurisdictions should coordinate the selection of actions amongst the jurisdiction's various departments.
- Once their public involvement strategy and template are completed, the new jurisdiction will submit the completed package to the POC for a pre-adoption review to ensure conformance with the Regional plan format and linkage procedure requirements.
- The POC will review for the following:
 - Documentation of public involvement and action plan development strategies
 - Conformance of template entries with guidelines outlined in instructions
 - Chosen initiatives are consistent with goals, objectives and mitigation catalog of the Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

- A designated point of contact
- Plans will be reviewed by the POC and submitted to Washington State Emergency Management Division (EMD) for review and approval.
- EMD will review plans for federal compliance. Non-compliant plans are returned to the lead agency for correction. Compliant plans are forwarded to FEMA for review with annotation as to the adoption status.
- FEMA reviews the new jurisdiction's plan in association with the approved plan to ensure DMA compliance. FEMA notifies the new jurisdiction of the results of review with copies to EMD and the approved plan lead agency.
- New jurisdiction corrects plan shortfalls (if necessary) and resubmits to EMD through the approved plan lead agency.
- For plans with no shortfalls from the FEMA review that have not been adopted, the new jurisdiction governing authority adopts the plan and forwards adoption resolution to FEMA with copies to lead agency and EMD.
- FEMA regional director notifies the new jurisdiction's governing authority of the plan's approval.

The new jurisdiction plan is then included with the regional plan, and the new jurisdiction is committed to participate in the ongoing plan implementation and maintenance strategies.

DECREASING THE PARTNERSHIP

The eligibility afforded under this process to the planning partnership can be rescinded in two ways. First, a participating planning partner can ask to be removed from the partnership. This may be done because the partner has decided to develop its own plan or has identified a different planning process for which it can gain eligibility. A partner that wishes to voluntarily leave the partnership shall inform the POC of this desire in writing. This notification can occur any time during the calendar year. A jurisdiction wishing to pursue this avenue is advised to make sure that it is eligible under the new planning effort, to avoid any period of being out of compliance with the Disaster Mitigation Act.

After receiving this notification, the POC shall immediately notify both the Washington State Emergency Management Division and FEMA in writing that the partner in question is no longer covered by the Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update, and that the eligibility afforded that partner under this plan should be rescinded based on this notification.

The second way a partner can be removed from the partnership is by failure to meet the participation requirements specified in the "Planning Partner Expectations" package provided to each partner at the beginning of the process, or the plan maintenance and implementation procedures specified under Chapter 21 in Volume 1 of the plan. Each partner agreed to these terms by adopting the plan.

Eligibility status of the planning partnership will be monitored by the POC. The determination of whether a partner is meeting its participation requirements will be based on the following parameters:

- Are progress reports being submitted annually by the specified time frames?
- Are partners notifying the POC of changes in designated points of contact?
- Are the partners supporting the Steering Committee by attending designated meetings or responding to needs identified by the body?

- Are the partners continuing to be supportive as specified in the Planning Partners expectations package provided to them at the beginning of the process?

Participation in the plan does not end with plan approval. This partnership was formed on the premise that a group of planning partners would pool resources and work together to strive to reduce risk within the planning area. Failure to support this premise lessens the effectiveness of this effort. The following procedures will be followed to remove a partner due to the lack of participation:

- The POC will advise the Steering Committee of this pending action and provide evidence or justification for the action. Justification may include: multiple failures to submit annual progress reports, failure to attend meetings determined to be mandatory by the Steering Committee, failure to act on the partner's action plan, or inability to reach designated point of contact after a minimum of five attempts.
- The Steering Committee will review information provided by POC, and determine action by a vote. The Steering Committee will invoke the voting process established in the ground rules established during the formation of this body.
- Once the Steering Committee has approved an action, the POC will notify the planning partner of the pending action in writing via certified mail. This notification will outline the grounds for the action, and ask the partner if it is their desire to remain as a partner. This notification shall also clearly identify the ramifications of removal from the partnership. The partner will be given 30 days to respond to the notification.
- Confirmation by the partner that they no longer wish to participate or failure to respond to the notification shall trigger the procedures for voluntary removal discussed above.
- Should the partner respond that they would like to continue participation in the partnership, they must clearly articulate an action plan to address the deficiencies identified by the POC. This action plan shall be reviewed by the Steering Committee to determine whether the actions are appropriate to rescind the action. Those partners that satisfy the Steering Committee's review will remain in the partnership, and no further action is required.
- Automatic removal from the partnership will be implemented for partners where these actions have to be initiated more than once in a 5-year planning cycle.

**APPENDIX C.
ANNEX INSTRUCTIONS AND TEMPLATES**
