

Mitigation Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Title: Prince George’s County Mitigation Advisory Committee: Mitigation Strategy Development **Location:** Microsoft Teams (Virtual)

Date: Wednesday, December 14th, 2022 **Time:** 3:00 – 4:30 pm ET

Purpose: The 2023 update of the Prince George’s County, MD Hazard Mitigation Plan is underway. Dewberry will provide an overview of the project status, and the Committee will decide on actions to include in the Mitigation Strategy.

Attendees:

1. Finch, Kim	15. Gill, Ronald E.
2. Stephanie Robinson	16. Sherrill, Mary C.
3. Payne, Jade	17. Rush, Hanna R.
4. Kelly Flint	18. Tennekoon, Lilantha
5. Henderson, Joey L.	19. Robert Love
6. Bahador, Ehsan	20. Brandy Alexis Espinola
7. Carter, James A.	21. Galosi, Frank L.
8. Callahan, Patrick T.	22. Batten-Mickens, Meloyde R.
9. Cline, Anthony J.	23. Gary 2 Cunningham - Office of Safety and Security Services
10. Erin Meyer (UMD) (Guest)	24. Smith, Joanna M.
11. Quattrocchi, Dominic	25. Mishra, Sudhanshu
12. Choquette, Scott	26. Miles Roesner
13. Wright, David A:(BGE)	27. Hawkins-Nixon, Dawn
14. Christina Cornwell	28. De Guzman, Reynaldo S.

Meeting Summary

Scott Choquette (Project Manager, Dewberry) and Jade Payne (Deputy Project Manager, Dewberry) met with the Prince George’s County Mitigation Advisory Committee (MAC) on December 14, 2022, to discuss the actions that would be included in the updated Hazard Mitigation Plan. A PowerPoint presentation was used to review the project status, mitigation goals, and action prioritization methodology. An Airtable database was used to discuss and make decisions on the actions for the updated Mitigation Strategy. Discussions were held throughout the presentation so Dewberry could gather feedback from the MAC. Discussion and presentation topics are grouped below with input and questions from the MAC.

Meeting Notes

Introduction

No Comments

Project Status

- Scott explained that the HIRA section is in quality review now
- Now we are working on creating the mitigation strategies for the Plan
- Scott showed the results of the public outreach strategy – 7 people have designated community hazard areas, 38 responses to the Public survey
- Jade introduced Technical Assistance and its importance for the County or City
- Jade gave a brief overview of Technical Assistance, its capabilities for helping the County or City with project implementation, grant applications, etc.
- Jade gave examples of Technical Assistance, including BCAs, which was mentioned in the previous meeting
- Jade explained how Technical Assistance will be incorporated in the Mitigation Strategy sections

Mitigation Goals Review

- Jade presented the mitigation goals/objectives that were decided upon by the MAC at the previous meeting
- These goals incorporated feedback from the MAC meeting as well as feedback from individuals through email response

Action Prioritization

- Action prioritization is using the STAPLE/E Prioritization, which looks at a project through a variety of lenses including: social, technical, administrative, political, legal, economic, environmental
- Joey asked in terms of legal, do we keep into account new laws/policies that have come into effect?
- Scott responded yes, and that all projects will comply with current laws and policies

Public Survey Feedback

- Jade explained the feedback that has been received through the public survey
- Hazards that were the highest ranked as issues are: flooding, high winds, and severe storms
- Top projects from the survey were: localized flood risk reduction, technical assistance to property owners, outreach and education, and ordinance updates
- Jade showed comments from the survey. The majority of comments related to pluvial flooding and stormwater management, as well as incorporating more tree trimming to reduce damage from high winds and severe storms, expanding open space
- Joey asked if there were more comments from one area of the county?
- Jade replied there was a cluster around the Collington Branch area, but otherwise the respondents were spread throughout the County

Mitigation Strategy Update

- Jade presented the Airtable, which includes mitigation strategies and suggestions for updating the mitigation strategies
- Scott explained that FEMA is looking for more actionable, meaningful strategies as opposed to actions that the County routinely does (ex: strategies that begin with “continue...”), the actions that the County routinely does will be included in the Capability Assessment section of the plan
- Jade will consolidate any feedback and changes on the mitigation action strategies and send them to the MAC for review

- Scott explained that FEMA likes to see the updates on progress of mitigation action strategies from the previous hazard mitigation plan when creating new mitigation action strategies
- The group went through each mitigation action strategy and provided feedback on all strategies
- Dawn said on an annual basis, the County will be able to acknowledge where they have updated information from upcoming studies that may be more up to date than FEMA's information
- Dawn said since the 2017 plan, the County has added 2 new staff to the flood management group which has allowed for more capacity
- Dawn asked if the Elevation Certificates are being phased out with the new RiskRating2.0
- Scott replied they are not being totally phased out, but they will be slightly less important in setting premiums
- Frank asked if "natural hazards" could be expanded to include non-natural hazards that may occur in urban areas for Strategy 7; Ehsan agreed that we should make it more general wording, and include acquisition for all endangered structures as well as flood-prone structures as an eligible project
- Frank said he will talk with Dawn offline to see what tweaks can be made in the wording of Strategy 7
- Dawn said that we should keep Strategy 9 because the Upper Marlboro Emergency Response Plan because it hasn't been updated since 1999
- Frank said the MS4 Permit mandates water quality practices (Strategy 11), and he can provide specific verbiage if needed
- Frank said the MS4 Permit also requires watershed assessment plans (Strategy 12) so we should keep that action as well, but not use the M-NCPPC 2016 study should use
- The City of Laurel mitigation strategies will be reviewed at a later date with a representative from the City
- Dawn suggested it would be helpful to determine what Pepco is responsible for (tree trimming, etc.) and what the County is responsible for

Questions & Comments (Open Forum)

- Jade will be following up with the mitigation strategies list to allow for more feedback to finalize the actions
- Jade asked if there are any other projects that should be added to the list before it is sent out for more feedback.
- Frank suggested we have a meeting with the MNPPC group to discuss their plans and studies and incorporating those into the mitigation strategies