

A comparison of local hazard mitigation plan quality in six states, USA

Ward Lyles^{a,*}, Philip Berke^b, Gavin Smith^c

a Urban Planning Department, School of Architecture, Design and Planning, University of Kansas, United States

b Department of City and Regional Planning and Center for Sustainable Community Design, Institute for the Environment, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, United States

c Department of City and Regional Planning and Department of Homeland Security Coastal Hazards Center of Excellence, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, United States

Abstract: Local hazards mitigation plans can be valuable tools in national policy frameworks for reducing risks from natural hazards. The United States' Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 requires local governments to adopt plans to remain eligible for certain federal disaster funds. We use seven principles of plan quality to content analyze mitigation plans for 175 jurisdictions in six coastal states. We analyze variation of plan quality based on the seven principles of plan quality and the state contexts of local mitigation planning. Findings indicate that plan quality is low to moderate overall. In addition, state mandates for local comprehensive planning are associated with higher scores on just two plan quality principles, suggesting limited, specific influences of comprehensive planning mandates on hazard mitigation planning. Recommendations are offered for how national, state and local officials can target strategic adjustments to local mitigation planning efforts.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved

Citation: Lyles, Ward, Philip Berke, and Gavin Smith. 2014. A Comparison of Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Quality in Six States, USA., *Landscape and Urban Planning* 122 (February): 89-99.