

## Section 7 Capability Assessment

### Contents of this Section

- 7.1 Overview and Purpose of Capability Assessment
- 7.2 Methodology
- 7.3 Federal and State Regulations, Plans, and Funding Sources
  - 7.3.1 Summary of Regulations, Plans and Funding Sources
  - 7.3.2 Implications of TDEM Capabilities on Local Hazard Mitigation Efforts
- 7.4 Capability Assessment for the Planning Area
  - 7.4.1 Emergency Management Capabilities
  - 7.4.2 General Planning Capabilities
  - 7.4.3 Floodplain Management Capabilities
  - 7.4.4 Technical Capabilities
  - 7.4.5 Administrative and Institutional Capabilities
  - 7.4.6 Fiscal Capabilities
  - 7.4.7 Political Capabilities
- 7.5 Hazard Mitigation Programs and Projects
- 7.6 Summary and Conclusions

### 7.1 Overview and Purpose of Capability Assessment

The purpose of conducting a capability assessment is to determine the ability of counties and municipalities in the Alamo Area Council of Governments region to implement a mitigation strategy.<sup>1</sup> As in any planning process it is important to determine what actions are feasible, based on an understanding of those departments tasked with their implementation. More specifically, the capability assessment helps to determine what mitigation actions are practical and likely to be implemented over time given the fiscal, technical, administrative and political framework of the community. It also provides an opportunity to assess existing plans, policies and processes in place. A careful analysis was conducted to detect any existing gaps, shortfalls or weaknesses within existing government activities that could exacerbate community vulnerability. The assessment also highlights positive measures already in place, which should continue to be supported and through future mitigation efforts.

---

<sup>1</sup> While the Interim Final Rule for implementing the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 does not require a local capability assessment to be completed for local hazard mitigation plans, we believe that it is a critical step to develop a mitigation strategy that meets the needs of each jurisdiction while taking into account their own unique abilities. However, the Rule does state that a community's mitigation strategy should be "based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools" (44 CFR, Part 201.6(c)(3)).

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

## 7.2 Methodology

The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 requires that local governments review and incorporate, if appropriate, existing plans, studies, reports and technical information into their hazard mitigation plans. Witt Associates worked closely with AACOG officials to distribute a detailed *Local Capability Assessment Survey* to participating jurisdictions. (A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix I.) The survey asked several detailed questions about existing local plans, policies, programs and ordinances that contribute to and/or hinder that community's ability to implement hazard mitigation actions. In addition, a series of questions were asked concerning each jurisdiction's technical, fiscal, administrative and political capabilities. The survey results provided an inventory of existing local plans, policies, programs and ordinances. Just as important, local officials conducted a self-assessment of their capabilities.<sup>2</sup>

An inventory and analysis of previously implemented mitigation actions was also included as part of the capability assessment. This information provides a region-wide perspective of the efforts taken to reduce the effect of natural hazards on the planning area and provides insight into the effectiveness of those efforts. Documenting past mitigation measures can also serve to help assess the degree to which local governments are willing to adopt future mitigation actions.

## 7.3 Federal and State Regulations, Plans, and Funding Sources

### 7.3.1 Summary of Regulations, Plans and Funding Sources

This section, including Table 7.3-1, provides summary information regarding selected federal and state regulations, plans, and sources of funding that are relevant to mitigation projects and activities. For additional information regarding funding availability and eligibility, and other details about and evaluations of these regulations, plans, and funding sources, see Section 5.

**Table 7.3-1  
Summary of Selected State and Federal Regulations, Programs, and Funding Sources Relevant to  
Natural Hazard Mitigation**

Title	Program Type	Administered By	Eligible Recipient	
			County	Municipality
FEMA Public Assistance (PA)	Funding (Federal)	Texas Division of Emergency Management	X	X
FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)	Funding (Federal)	Texas Division of Emergency Management	X	X
FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM)	Funding (Federal)	Texas Division of Emergency Management	X	X
FEMA/National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Repetitive Flood Claims (RFC)	Funding (Federal)	Texas Division of Emergency Management	X	X

<sup>2</sup> Due to the length of the survey and the number of participating jurisdictions in the Plan Update, the completed surveys were not included in this document. Hard copies of the surveys can be obtained from the participants.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Title	Program Type	Administered By	Eligible Recipient	
			County	Municipality
FEMA/NFIP Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL)	Funding (Federal)	Texas Water Development Board	X	X
FEMA/NFIP Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA)	Funding (Federal)	Texas Water Development Board	X	X
Housing and Urban Development Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	Funding (Federal)	Texas Department of Rural Affairs	X	X

For many federal grants, the non-federal share can be borne by the state as *grantee*, the recipient community as *sub-grantee* or in some cases, the property owner who benefits from the project. In the case of property acquisitions intended to remove properties that experience repetitive flood losses, the non-federal share is typically covered by the property owner, who accepts the federal share of 75% and documents the lost equity as the non-federal share. This can serve as a disincentive to participation.

## 7.3.2 Implications of TDEM Capabilities on Local Hazard Mitigation Efforts

State capabilities for hazard mitigation have an impact on the efficacy of local planning and implementation. In accordance with the State of Texas Hazard Mitigation Plan (SHMP), the focus of TDEM, with floodplain management responsibilities located under the authority of the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB).

The TDEM Mitigation Section provides plan development assistance to local jurisdictions upon request. Providing planning assistance is a daily affair as much of it is done via telephone calls and emails. TDEM Mitigation Section developed the DEM 21-Mitigation Handbook. DEM 21 provides information and guidance on the hazard mitigation process and mitigation program activities in Texas to include participation in state and federally funded mitigation opportunities. The handbook also serves as a guide for developing hazard analysis, how to develop local mitigation action plans, how to establish and maintain a viable, and effective mitigation program to reduce vulnerabilities, risks, and human suffering caused by hazards. The DEM 21 discusses the following topics: (1) why mitigation is important; (2) building partnerships to include establishing a hazard mitigation team; (3) the hazard analysis process; (4) developing mitigation goals and strategies; and (5) developing a comprehensive MAP. It is an excellent one of a kind mitigation handbook design for Texans. The DEM 21 is available for download from the TDEM website:

<http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/dem/pages/index.htm>

Historically, TDEM has had limited staffing to address the hazard mitigation needs of the state. Additional staff is needed to expand the ability of the state to support local and county mitigation planning needs. This additional staffing should have the necessary expertise for the timely development of hazard mitigation plans and to facilitate the implementation of risk reduction projects statewide.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

## 7.4 Capability Assessment for the Planning Area

The findings of the capability assessment are described below. Table 7.4-1 provides a jurisdictional overview of the plans and programs in place, followed by summary statistics of the *Local Capability Assessment Surveys*. Each county and municipality was asked to self-assess their capabilities, which are described next. As required by Annex P under the Texas Division of Emergency Management, completed Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) projects are identified and described. Finally, conclusions are presented, including a discussion of the approach used to develop meaningful mitigation strategies based on the capability and risk assessment findings.

**Table 7.4-1  
Capability Assessment Findings**

Jurisdiction	Hazard Mitigation Plan	Disaster Recovery Plan	Comprehensive Plan	Storm water management Plan	Emergency Operations Plan	Continuity of Operations Plan	Radio logical Emergency Plan	SARA Title III/Hazmat	Transportation Plan	Capital Improvements Plan	Regional Plan	Historic Preservation Plan	Zoning Ordinance	Subdivision Ordinance	Flood Damage/Mgt Ordinance	NFIP	Building Code
Atascosa County	X	X			X		X		X		X	X		X	X	X	
Charlotte	X	X			X		X		X		X	X		X	X	X	
Christine	X	X			X		X		X		X	X		X	X	X	
Jourdanton	X	X			X		X		X		X	X		X	X	X	
Lytle	X	X			X		X		X		X	X		X	X	X	
Pleasanton	X	X			X		X		X		X	X		X	X	X	
Poteet	X	X			X		X		X		X	X		X	X	X	
Bandera County <sup>1</sup>	X				X	X								X	X	X	
Bandera <sup>1</sup>	X				X	X								X	X	X	
Bexar County	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Alamo Heights	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Balcones Heights	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X
Converse	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Helotes															X	X	
Kirby															X	X	
Leon Valley	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Live Oak	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Jurisdiction	Hazard Mitigation Plan	Disaster Recovery Plan	Comprehensive Plan	Storm water management Plan	Emergency Operations Plan	Continuity of Operations Plan	Radiological Emergency Plan	SARA Title III/Hazmat	Transportation Plan	Capital Improvements Plan	Regional Plan	Historic Preservation Plan	Zoning Ordinance	Subdivision Ordinance	Flood Damage/Mgt Ordinance	NFIP	Building Code
San Antonio	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Saint Hedwig	X		X						X				X	X	X	X	
Somerset	X	X	X	X	X					X			X	X	X	X	X
Terrell Hills	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X		X	X	X
Von Ormy	X										X				X	X	X
Universal City															X	X	
Windcrest	X	X		X	X		X				X		X	X	X	X	X
Comal County	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	?	X	X		X	X	X	X
Bulverde	X	X			X	X	X		X	?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Garden Ridge															X	X	
New Braunfels	X		X		X	/			X		X		X	X	X	X	X
Frio County	X											X		X		X	
Dilley	X											X	X		X	X	
Pearsall	X											X	X	X	X	X	X
Gillespie County	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X
Fredericksburg	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Guadalupe County	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	
Cibolo															X	X	
Schertz	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sequin															X	X	
Karnes County	X	X	X	X	X		X				X		X	X	X	X	X
Karnes City	X	X	X	X	X		X				X		X	X	X	X	X
Kenedy	X	X	X	X	X		X				X		X	X	X	X	X
Runge	X	X	X	X	X		X				X		X	X	X	X	X
Falls City	X	X	X	X	X		X				X		X	X	X	X	X
Kerr County	X	X					X					X		X	X	X	
Ingram															X	X	
Kerrville	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Medina County	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Jurisdiction	Hazard Mitigation Plan	Disaster Recovery Plan	Comprehensive Plan	Storm water management Plan	Emergency Operations Plan	Continuity of Operations Plan	Radiological Emergency Plan	SARA Title III/Hazmat	Transportation Plan	Capital Improvements Plan	Regional Plan	Historic Preservation Plan	Zoning Ordinance	Subdivision Ordinance	Flood Damage/Mgt Ordinance	NFIP	Building Code
Castroville	X	X	/		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Devine	X	X	X										X	X	X	X	X
Hondo													X		X	X	
Natalia													X		X	X	
Wilson County	X	X			X		X	X			X			X	X	X	
Floresville															X	X	
La Vernia	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X			X	X	X	X
Stockdale															X	X	

<sup>1</sup>In process as of the development of this Plan Update.

## 7.4.1 Emergency Management Capabilities

Hazard mitigation is widely recognized as one of the four primary “phases” of emergency management. Other phases include preparedness, response and recovery. In reality, each phase is interconnected with hazard mitigation as Figure 7.4.1-1 suggests. Planning for each phase is a critical part of a comprehensive emergency management program and a key to the successful implementation of hazard mitigation actions. As a result, the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* asks several questions across a range of emergency management plans in order to assess the jurisdiction’s willingness to plan and their level of technical proficiency.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Figure 7.4.1-1  
Hazard Mitigation and the Phases of Emergency Management



**Hazard Mitigation Plan:** A hazard mitigation plan represents a community's blueprint for how they intend to reduce the impact of natural and human-caused hazards on people and the built environment. Elements of a hazard mitigation plan include a risk assessment, capability assessment and mitigation strategy.

- As this is a multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan update, each of the participating communities has developed a hazard mitigation plan.

**Disaster Recovery Plan:** A disaster recovery plan serves to guide the physical, social, environmental and economic recovery of a community, including the physical reconstruction process following a disaster.

- Survey results indicate that seven (7) counties have developed disaster recovery plans.
- Twenty six (26) of the responding municipalities surveyed indicated that they had a disaster recovery plan in place.

**Emergency Operations Plan:** An emergency operations plan outlines the responsibilities of those responding to an emergency or disaster and the means by which resources are deployed.

- Survey results indicate that ten (10) counties have emergency operation plans.
- Twenty seven (27) of responding municipalities reported that they have an Emergency Operations Plan.

**Continuity of Operation Plan:** A continuity of operations plan establishes a clear chain of command, line of succession, and plans for backup or alternate emergency facilities in case of an extreme emergency or disaster.

- Survey results indicate that eight (8) counties have continuity of operation plans.
- Ten (10) municipalities reported have continuity of operation plans.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

**Radiological Emergency Plan:** A radiological emergency plan delineates roles and responsibilities for assigning personnel and the means to deploy resources in the event of a radiological accident.

- Survey results indicate that nine (9) counties have a radiological emergency plan.
- Twenty-two (22) of responding municipalities have Radiological Emergency Plans.

## 7.4.2 General Planning Capabilities

The implementation of hazard mitigation activities often involves individuals beyond the emergency management profession. Stakeholders may include local planners, public works officials, economic development specialists and others. Similarly, hazard mitigation planning cuts across multiple disciplines. As a result, the questions asked in the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* regarding general planning capabilities were designed to measure the degree to which mitigation is integrated into other planning efforts.

**Regional Planning:** Regional planning refers to any type of planning effort that involves a community working in conjunction with neighboring jurisdictions. For example, the development of this Hazard Mitigation Plan is a regional planning effort, in the original plan; over half of respondents did not consider their participation in the AACOG Regional Hazard Mitigation plan as such. In the plan update, the majority of all responding communities noted AACOG planning participation in response to this question.

- Survey indicates eight (8) counties have participated in regional plans.
- Twenty-six (26) of responding municipalities participated in regional planning efforts.

**Comprehensive Plan:** A comprehensive plan establishes the overall vision for a community and helps to guide municipal decision-making.

- Survey results indicate that five (5) counties have comprehensive plans.
- Sixteen (16) responding municipalities have a comprehensive plan, two (2) municipalities have a plan in progress.

**Transportation Plan:** A transportation plan identifies the means to gauge transportation demands and the options to meet those needs, while considering the social, economic and environmental characteristics of the area. The development of transportation networks can significantly impact the amount, type and location of future growth. As a result, transportation planning can have a dramatic impact on future hazard vulnerability.

- Survey results indicate that six (6) counties have transportation plans.
- Nineteen (19) responding municipalities have a transportation plan.

**Capital Improvements Plan:** A capital improvements plan guides the scheduling of spending on public improvements. A capital improvements plan can serve as an important mechanism to guide future development away from identified hazard areas. Limiting public spending in hazardous areas is one of the most effective long-term mitigation actions available to local governments.

- Survey results indicate that five (5) counties have a capital improvement plan.
- Nine (9) responding municipalities indicated they have a capital improvement plan.



# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

## ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

**Historic Preservation Plan:** A historic preservation plan is intended to preserve historic structures or districts within a community. An often overlooked aspect of the historic preservation plan is the assessment of buildings and sites located in areas subject to natural hazards to include the identification of the most effective way to reduce future damages.<sup>3</sup> This may involve retrofitting or relocation techniques that account for the need to protect buildings that do not meet current building standards or are within a historic district that cannot easily be relocated out of harms way.

- Five (5) of the counties surveyed have a historic presentation plan.
- Twelve (12) of the responding municipalities surveyed have a historic preservation plan.

**Zoning Ordinances:** Zoning represents the means by which land use is controlled by local governments. As part of a community's police power, zoning is used to protect the public health, safety and welfare. A zoning ordinance is the mechanism through which zoning is typically implemented. Since zoning regulations enable municipal governments to limit the type and density of development, it can serve as a powerful tool when applied in identified hazard areas.

- No counties have a zoning ordinance.<sup>4</sup>
- Twenty-five (25) of the responding municipalities have zoning ordinances.

**Subdivision Ordinances:** A subdivision ordinance is intended to regulate the development of housing, commercial, industrial or other uses, including associated public infrastructure, as land is subdivided into buildable lots for sale or future development. Subdivision design that accounts for natural hazards can dramatically reduce the exposure of future development.<sup>5</sup>

- Survey results indicate that ten (10) counties have a subdivision ordinance.
- Twenty-eight (28) of municipalities have subdivision ordinances.

**Building Codes, Permitting and Inspections:** Building codes regulate construction standards. Decisions regarding the adoption of building codes, the type of permitting process required both before and after a disaster, and the enforcement of inspection protocols all affect the level of hazard risk faced by a community.

- No counties reported the enforcement of building codes.<sup>6</sup>
- 12 of the responding municipalities have building codes.

---

<sup>3</sup> See *Protecting the Past from Natural Disasters*. 1989. Nelson, Carl. National Trust for Historic Preservation: Washington, D.C.

<sup>4</sup> Counties do not have the statutory right to implement zoning (Chapter 232 of the Texas Local Government Code).

<sup>5</sup> For additional information regarding the use of subdivision regulations in reducing flood hazard risk, see *Subdivision Design in Flood Hazard Areas*. 1997. Morris, Marya. Planning Advisory Service Report Number 473. American Planning Association: Washington, D.C.

<sup>6</sup> Counties do not have the authority to adopt building codes. Some counties have circumvented this restriction by adopting Uniform Fire and Building Codes for commercial buildings and certain public facilities, stating that they are needed for fire safety.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

## 7.4.3 Floodplain Management Capability

Flooding represents the greatest natural hazard facing the Nation and the planning area. At the same time, the tools available to reduce the impacts associated with flooding are among the most developed when compared to other hazard-specific mitigation techniques. Information contained in this section has been gathered through surveys and the NFIP Status Book.

**Storm Water Management Plan:** A storm water management plan is designed to address flooding associated with storm water runoff. The storm water management plan is typically focused on design and construction measures that are intended to reduce the impact of more frequently occurring minor urban flooding.

- Survey results indicate that four (4) counties have a storm water management plan.
- Fifteen (15) of responding municipalities have a storm water management plan.

**Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance/NFIP participation:** A local Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance is a tool used by counties and municipalities to regulate the type of construction that occurs in the floodplain. If a community is an NFIP participant, a Flood Ordinance or Court Order is in place.

- All responding counties have a Flood Damage Prevention/Management Ordinance/participate in the NFIP.

Across the board increases in planning and code adoption were seen in several areas in both counties and municipalities, primarily with NFIP participation and Flood Damage Protection Court Orders. Additionally increases were seen in regional planning participation, disaster recovery planning, and comprehensive planning at both the County and Municipal level. In some cases surveys indicated conflicting information at the municipal level, for instance whether or not Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance was in place. Some of this could be attributable to the wording of the questionnaire; however there may also be an opportunity to further improve awareness of the NFIP and floodplain management practices. Overall it appears was an improvement at all levels of the importance of mitigation planning and its integration at all levels of emergency management.

Recommendation: Ongoing and continued involvement at all levels of the mitigation planning effort and increased outreach to municipalities in the future will enhance the participants' ability to successfully integrate the mitigation plan in their community's other planning efforts to reduce or eliminate losses to life and property by natural disasters. In addition to this continued involvement and outreach, the State of Texas's reduction of area wide multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plans will improve community awareness of the mitigation planning process, leading to a better understanding of local risks and the effective mitigation thereof.

## 7.4.4 Technical Capability

Technical capability can be defined as possessing the skills and tools needed to improve decision-making, including the development of sound mitigation actions. Technical capability can be measured across three primary elements: 1) geographic information systems (GIS) and database management; 2) grants management; and 3) hazard mitigation planning. Measuring the degree to which each element is found in the planning area was conducted using the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* and through discussions with county and municipal staff. Self-assessment survey questions addressing technical capability focused on the use of GIS, while questions addressing grants management and mitigation planning capability focused on grants and planning management.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

The analysis of the responses to the capability assessment survey indicated that there was an improvement, especially at the county level, of technical capability since the previous plan. According to survey results, six, (6) counties rated their technical capability as moderate, and increase of 3 over the original plan, while one (1) rated themselves as having a high level of technical capability, same as the original plan, and three (3) rated their technical capability as low. Of the responding municipalities five (5) assessed themselves as having a moderate level of technical capability, one (1) rated their technical capability as high, and twelve (12) rated their capability in this area as low. The following factors affect technical capability:

- Information on previous disasters and mitigation projects;
- Expertise in mitigation planning; and
- Training to undertake GIS-driven risk assessments, identify potential mitigation projects, and develop hazard mitigation plans.

**Recommendations:** The original results of the technical capability assessment highlighted a belief among those who filled out the survey that the existing capability of most counties and communities should have been improved. Counties made apparent strides in this area, the number of counties rating themselves as moderate doubled. Continued focus on technical capabilities should be maintained and improved upon, especially at the municipal level. Continued sharing of resources could significantly increase the level of technical capability to analyze natural hazards and continue develop meaningful actions to reduce their impact. Building on the series of regional mitigation actions in the planning area could also be used to assist in this effort.

## 7.4.5 Administrative/Institutional Capability

Administrative and institutional capability was evaluated by reviewing county and municipal staffing and the existing organizational structure found across local government to implement mitigation strategies. The analysis of the responses to the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* indicated that there is a moderate administrative capability at the county level. No counties reported a high administrative capability, seven (7) counties reported a moderate level, and three (3) counties reported a low administrative capability. Of the municipalities responding to this question, twelve (12) rated their administrative capability as moderate, and four (4) rated their community as low in their ability to administer mitigation activities. One (1) responding municipality reported they were unsure of their ability in this area. The following are a summary of key issues affecting administrative capability:

- Varied integration of mitigation into county/local governments functions; and
- The level of interdepartmental coordination.

**Recommendations:** The result of the administrative capability assessment demonstrates that administrative capability varies geographically and by population concentration, and further attention and time should be spent working with municipalities directly to better understand their capability in this area. As with the previous Mitigation Plan, of those counties that possess high or moderate administrative capability are in more urban areas, accordingly most responding municipalities within these counties rated themselves as maintaining a moderate level of administrative capability. Conversely, those counties with low capability tended to contain municipalities, which responded with low capability. In most cases this can be explained as a function of urban versus rural counties. The enhancement of administrative capability may be achieved through continued county-municipal training, outreach and mentoring of smaller rural jurisdictions as well as the sharing of resources, when appropriate.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

## 7.4.6 Fiscal Capability

The ability to take action is often closely associated with the amount of money available to implement policies and projects.<sup>7</sup> This may take the form of grants received or state and locally based revenue. The costs associated with policy and project implementation vary widely. In some cases, policies are tied primarily to staff costs associated with the creation and monitoring of a given program. In other cases, money is linked to an actual project, like the acquisition of flood-prone homes, which can require a substantial commitment from local, state and federal funding sources.

The analysis of the responses to the capability assessment survey indicated that there is a moderate to low fiscal capability at the county and municipal levels respectively. Since the original plan, there was an increase in counties reporting low fiscal capability. This is likely an effect of the economic downturn in the intervening years since the original plan. Of the counties responding to this question, four (4) reported a moderate fiscal capability, and six (6) counties assessed their fiscal capability as low. Of responding municipalities, six (6) rated their fiscal capability as moderate, with eleven (12) rating their fiscal capability as moderate or unknown.

**Recommendations:** The factors used in the self-assessment of local capability should be used as a general guide to help craft mitigation actions that are achievable. When considering the effect of fiscal capability on the implementation of policies and projects, jurisdictions should ask several questions:

- Does the action require a monetary commitment or staff resources?;
- Can jurisdictions combine resources with other counties or municipalities to address identified problems?; and
- Is the jurisdiction willing to commit local revenue on a sustained or one time basis?

## 7.4.7 Political Capability

One of the most difficult and sensitive capabilities to evaluate involves the political will of a jurisdiction to enact meaningful policies and projects designed to reduce the impact of future events. Despite this, the ability of a jurisdiction to enact policies to mitigate against hazards is essential in reducing risks from those hazards, however often the climate is not conducive, the fiscal capability is absent, and the expertise to create the policy is not present, or a combination of those factors and others prevent enactment.

Due to the low response rate to this question in the previous Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, the question posed to the participants focused on providing examples of policies that have been enacted. Three counties reported multiple enacted policies and ordinances, two counties listed NFIP ordinances, and the remaining five did not address the question. Of the responding municipalities, four (4) communities noted any sort of ordinance, although one noted that using ordinances and codes to mitigate was a priority.

**Recommendations:** The response to this question displayed that larger municipalities and more urban areas/counties wield more political capital than municipalities and rural areas/counties as a whole. Continued

---

<sup>7</sup> Gaining access to federal, state or other sources of funding is often an overriding factor driving the development of hazard mitigation plans. However, an important objective of local governments seeking a more sustainable future is the concept of self-reliance. Over time, counties and municipalities should seek the means to become less dependent on federal assistance, developing a more diversified approach that assesses the availability of federal, state and locally generated funding to implement mitigation actions. Additional assistance may be available from the business and corporate sector as well as certain non-profit groups. This should be coupled with an attempt to identify mitigation measures that cost little or no money, yet may compliment the larger array of actions identified in the Plan.

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

awareness and promotion through education efforts regarding the importance and cost effectiveness of mitigation may be beneficial in creating a political atmosphere where regulations and ordinance designed to protect life and the loss of property is more accepted.

## 7.5 Hazard Mitigation Programs and Projects

The success of future mitigation efforts in a community can be gauged by past efforts. Previously implemented mitigation measures indicate that there is, or has been in the past, some political desire to reduce the effects of natural hazards on the community. Past success of these projects can also be influential in building support for new mitigation efforts.

### Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Projects

The Federal Emergency Management Agency's Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) provides competitive funding to states and local governments for the implementation of long-term hazard mitigation measures following a presidential disaster declaration. Grants are awarded to permanently reduce or eliminate future damages and losses from natural hazards. Each jurisdiction completing the capability assessment survey was asked for information regarding their HMGP projects. The information was collected and compiled, and the results are listed in Table 7.5-1.

**Table 7.5-1  
HMGP Projects in the Planning Area**

Jurisdiction	HMGP Project Description	Status
Alamo Heights	Acquisition of two residential properties in the 100-year floodplain.	Complete
Atascosa County	Culvert mitigation project to replace culverts in county roads in numerous locations throughout the county.	Complete
Bexar County	The most recent HMGP project was the Lakewood Acres Property Acquisition (146 properties in the floodplain, \$5,795,116). This project was initiated as a result of flooding in October 1998.	Complete
Comal County	Acquisition program for flood damaged properties after the Flood of 2002 and the Flood of 1998. Properties were located along the Guadalupe River. Also allowed for the acquisition of properties in the Horseshoe Falls area below Canyon Dam.	Complete
New Braunfels	Acquisition program for flood damaged properties. Properties were damaged during the Flood of 2002.	Complete
Guadalupe County	NOAA Weather Radios, Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority (GBRA) Hazard Mitigation Plan	Complete
Kerrville	Acquisition of 21 flood damaged homes with a \$1,080,000 federal share. Very effective in reducing future damage from floods (DR-1425-002).	Complete

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Jurisdiction	HMGP Project Description	Status
La Vernia	La Vernia received FEMA funds through a 2000 “Unmet Needs” program. The funds were used to acquire four (4) flood-damaged properties located in the 100-year floodplain. The City of La Vernia also applied for drainage improvement funds through the same program. The application is still pending.	Complete
Leon Valley	Storm water management project—under development.	Complete
Leon Valley	Household Hazardous Waste project—regarded as “somewhat successful”—this project did not receive the public participation that was anticipated.	Complete
San Antonio	Major acquisition program following flooding in 1998.	Complete
Schertz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ HMGP 1179-003, \$527,500—Acquired and demolished three-building apartment complex in floodplain.</li> <li>➤ HMGP 1257-010, \$352,899—Acquired and demolished three (3) structures in floodplain.</li> <li>➤ HMGP 1257, UMN project #3.2E-02C-1, \$4,079,830—Rebuild Schertz Parkway at Dietz Creek and re-channel creek to alleviate flooding. (City committed \$1 million to start road project prior to FEMA approval of grant).</li> </ul>	Complete
Wilson County	Due to the July Flood of 2002, Wilson County received FEMA funds through the HMGP “Fast Track Acquisition” program. The program funds were utilized to purchase seven (7) substantially flood-damaged properties in the 100-year floodplain. Wilson County also applied for funding through the HMGP regular acquisition program. This application is still pending. This money will be used to purchase additional flooded properties.	Complete
Windcrest	Citywide HAZMAT collection in March 2003. The program was very well received.	Complete

The table below provides information on local building and fire codes within the region. Where available, the date and type of codes in use has been listed, including a description of the inspection and permit process. If available, the number and qualifications of inspectors have been listed, as well as the number of building starts and inspections. Any missing jurisdictions means the data was not available or was not provided by the respondent.

**Table 7.5-2  
Building and Fire Codes in the Planning Area**

Jurisdiction	Adopted Building Codes	Current Building Code (Type and Date)
Atascosa County	NA	NA
City of Charlotte		
City of Christine		
City of Jourdanton	Yes	

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Jurisdiction	Adopted Building Codes	Current Building Code (Type and Date)
City of Lytle		
City of Pleasanton	Yes	International Building Code
City of Poteet		
Bandera County	NA	NA
City of Bandera	Yes	1997 Southern Standard Building Code
Bexar County	Yes	Building Codes for commercial establishments and limited public buildings when they relate to fire safety
City of Alamo Heights	Yes	International Building Code (Code of Ordinances, City of Alamo Heights)
City of Balcones Heights	Yes	Southern Building Code
City of Converse	Yes	International Building Code (2002 Edition)—National Electric Code along with Fire Code and Life Safety Code
City of Helotes	Yes	International Building Code—2000, International Residential Code 2000
City of Kirby	Yes	
City of Leon Valley	Yes	Uniform Building Code, Uniform Plumbing and Mechanical Codes, the National Electric Code and the National Fire Code—when these codes were initially adopted, the city also included a section in the ordinance which states “and subsequent additions or alterations to these codes,” which means that they are automatically updated when a new issue is published.
City of Live Oak	Yes	Standard Building Code—1997, Standard Plumbing Code, Standard Mechanical Code, Standard Gas Code and the 1999 edition of the National Electric Code
City of Olmos Park	Yes	Uniform Building Code, Adopted September 13, 1979
City of San Antonio	Yes	1997 Uniform Building Code adopted in 1997 and updated as needed—the 2003 Uniform Building Code is now in the process of being adopted for implementation.
City of Somerset	Yes	1991 Southern Building Code
City of Terrell Hills	Yes	2006 International Building Code
City of Universal City	Yes	IBC, IRC and supplemental codes 2000, adopted May 2003 and October 2002 respectively
City of Windcrest	Yes	IRC 2000 adopted in 1996
Comal County	No	NA
City of Garden Ridge	Yes	Uniform Building Code—Effective 2000
City of Bulverde	Yes	ICC—Effective 2002
City of New Braunfels	Yes	2006 International Existing Building Code
Frio County	No	NA
City of Dilley	No	NA
City of Pearsall	No	

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Jurisdiction	Adopted Building Codes	Current Building Code (Type and Date)
Gillespie County	No	
City of Fredericksburg	Yes	Standard Building Code adopted in the 1960s and used until the International Building Code was adopted in 2001
Guadalupe County	No	NA
City of Cibolo		
City of Schertz	Yes	2000 International Building Code—adopted January 2001
City of Seguin	Yes	2000 International Building Code
Karnes County	No	NA
City of Karnes City	Yes	International Building Code, March 26, 2002
City of Kenedy	Yes	1997 Southern Standard Building Code, adopted November 11, 1999
City of Runge		No answer
City of Falls City	Yes	No answer
Kerr County	No	NA
City of Ingram	Yes	State minimum standards for occupancy. November 1, 1984
City of Kerrville	Yes	International Building Code 2002
Medina County	No	NA
City of Castroville	Yes	International Residential Building Code 2002—Standard Building Code (Commercial) amended through 1997
City of Devine	Yes	2009 edition of the IBC, IRC, IPC, IFGC, IMC, IFC, IECC, IEBC, and IPMC (adopted 10/19/2010)
City of Hondo		
City of Natalia	Yes	Southern Building Code and International Building Code
Wilson County	No	NA
City of Floresville	Yes	International Building Code July 10, 2003
City of La Vernia	Yes	2003 International Residential Building Code (adopted in 2005) (Subdivision Ordinance 041008-01)
City of Stockdale	Yes	Southern Building Code (adopted June 1986) and adopted International Building Code in July 2003

## Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule

Municipalities were evaluated using the Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS). The Insurance Services Office (ISO) has developed a method to assess the effectiveness of municipal building codes, including the degree to which they are enforced. The development and enforcement of sound building codes can help predict how structures will withstand the impacts associated with disasters such as hurricanes or tornadoes. Following the voluntary assessment, ISO staff analyzes the results and assigns a grade based on a 1 to 10 scale. A grade of 1 represents an exemplary commitment to their building code; whereas a grade of 10 means that there is no recognizable enforcement. It is up to the insurance industry to provide premium credits based on the findings. The results of those jurisdictions that agreed to submit to the evaluation are listed below. Communities did not note a change from information listed.



# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

**Table 7.5-3  
BCEGS Ratings in the Planning Area**

Jurisdiction	County	Personal Rating	Commercial Rating	Chose not to participate	No recognized program	Not Applicable	Not listed	Most Recent Date
Atascosa County	Atascosa					X		
Charlotte	Atascosa				X			1996
Jourdanton	Atascosa			X				1996
Lytle	Atascosa	7	7					1996
Pleasanton	Atascosa			X				1996
Poteet	Atascosa				X			1996
Bandera County	Bandera					X		
Bandera	Bandera	6	6					1996
Bexar County	Bexar					X		
Alamo Heights	Bexar			X				1996
Balcones Heights	Bexar	6	6					1996
Leon Valley	Bexar			X				1996
Live Oak	Bexar	5	5					1999
San Antonio	Bexar	8	8					1996
Schertz	Bexar	6	6					1999
Selma	Bexar	5	5					2002
Terrell Hills	Bexar	7	7					1999
Universal City	Bexar	7	7					1996
Windcrest	Bexar				X			1996
Comal County	Comal					X		
New Braunfels	Comal			X				1996
Frio County	Frio					X		
Dilley	Frio				X			1996
Pearsall	Frio			X				1996
Gillespie County	Gillespie						X	
Fredericksburg	Gillespie	5	5					2002
Guadalupe County	Guadalupe						X	
Seguin	Guadalupe	5	5					2001
Karnes County	Karnes						X	
Karnes City	Karnes			X				1996
Kenedy	Karnes				X			1996
Runge	Karnes				X			1996
Kerr County	Kerr					X		

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Jurisdiction	County	Personal Rating	Commercial Rating	Chose not to participate	No recognized program	Not Applicable	Not listed	Most Recent Date
Kerrville	Kerr	5	5					2002
Medina County	Medina					X		
Castroville	Medina	NR	7					1996
Hondo	Medina	8	8					1996
Wilson County	Wilson					X		
Floresville	Wilson	7	7					1999
Stockdale	Wilson	Not rated	9					1996

## Floodplain Management Programs in the AACOG Region

Sound floodplain management involves a series of programs designed to reduce flood-related damages. Programs such as the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), the Community Rating System (CRS), and the Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) program provide the framework needed to implement a successful floodplain management program. The NFIP contains specific regulatory measures that enable government officials to determine where and how growth occurs relative to flood hazards. Each county or municipality in the NFIP has adopted a Local Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, which requires jurisdictions to follow established minimum building standards in the floodplain.<sup>8</sup> Another key service provided by the NFIP is the mapping of identified flood hazard areas. Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) are used to assess flood hazard risk and set flood insurance rates. The maps also provide an important tool to educate residents, government officials and the business community about the likelihood of flooding in their community.

The City of Christine is a participant in this Plan Update, and they are not members of the NFIP, but they are included in the NFIP and FIRM data for Atascosa County. The newly-incorporated City of Staples is not a specific participant in this Plan Update, but they are included in the NFIP and FIRM data for Guadalupe County.

Note: This information was not accessible for Bexar County at the time of this Plan Update's development.

<sup>8</sup> House Bill 1018 requires Texas cities and counties to join the NFIP. The 77th Legislature of the State of Texas amended Subchapter I, Chapter 16, Water Code, by adding Section 16.3145 to read as follows: "The governing body of each city and county shall adopt ordinances or orders, as appropriate, necessary for the city or county to be eligible to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program...not later than January 1, 2001."

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Table 7.5-4

Summary of NFIP Policies and Claims by County, Municipality, and Insurance Zone in the Planning Area (As of September 30, 2010)						
Community Name	Insurance Zones A			Insurance Zones B, C, & X		
	Policies in Effect	# of CPL*	\$ of CPL*	Policies in Effect	# of CPL*	\$ of CPL*
<b>Atascosa County</b>						
Atascosa County (includes City of Christine)	23	1	\$20,065.05	68	9	\$260,051.99
Charlotte	0	0	\$0	0	0	\$0
Jourdanton	0	0	\$0	7	0	\$0
Lyle	5	0	\$0	8	0	\$0
Pleasanton	28	3	\$47,884.98	23	0	\$0
Poteet	8	2	\$42,954.00	2	0	\$0
<b>Bandera County</b>						
Bandera County	161	60	\$1,900,033.37	200	57	\$1,737,404.06
Bandera	27	12	\$581,519.27	25	16	\$436,378.50
<b>Bexar County</b>						
Alamo Heights	144	30	\$623,731.87	56	16	\$859,980.73
Balcones Heights	3	0	\$0	10	1	\$1,669.80
Bexar County	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Converse	11	3	\$61,849.44	59	5	\$23,857.39
Fair Oaks Ranch	6	0	\$0	67	6	\$85,850.50
Grey Forest	3	4	\$22,113.05	10	3	\$29,084.76
Helotes	11	3	\$10,024.39	20	4	\$34,368.06
Kirby	11	0	\$0	19	0	\$0
Leon Valley	73	28	\$508,991.29	52	8	\$54,187.73

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

<b>Summary of NFIP Policies and Claims by County, Municipality, and Insurance Zone in the Planning Area (As of September 30, 2010)</b>						
<b>Community Name</b>	<b>Insurance Zones A</b>			<b>Insurance Zones B, C, &amp; X</b>		
	<b>Policies in Effect</b>	<b># of CPL*</b>	<b>\$ of CPL*</b>	<b>Policies in Effect</b>	<b># of CPL*</b>	<b>\$ of CPL*</b>
Live Oak	22	2	\$4,091.41	47	4	\$27,237.15
Olmos Park	0	0	\$0	16	2	\$13,706.50
San Antonio	1,277	328	\$8,291,531.15	2,981	281	\$5,939,826.28
Somerset	0	0	\$0	0	0	\$0
Terrell Hills	12	5	\$32,330.62	41	26	\$110,148.05
Universal City	14	0	\$0	60	1	\$8,472.01
Windcrest	11	0	\$0	44	0	\$0
<b>Comal County</b>						
Bulverde	12	0	\$0	23	1	\$2,769.54
Comal County	192	120	\$5,642,958.49	794	231	\$12,621,084.54
Garden Ridge	9	3	\$7,671.52	33	2	\$11,410.09
New Braunfels	515	261	\$19,375,370.70	927	226	\$14,562,614.37
<b>Frio County</b>						
Dilley	1	0	\$0	1	0	\$0
Frio County	0	0	\$0	0	0	\$0
Pearsall	5	0	\$0	9	1	\$449.63
<b>Gillespie County</b>						
Gillespie County	31	0	\$0	63	1	\$15,369.07
Fredericksburg	17	0	\$0	49	1	\$14,486.85
<b>Guadalupe County</b>						
Cibolo	23	10	\$494,688.50	101	8	\$238,314.48

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

<b>Summary of NFIP Policies and Claims by County, Municipality, and Insurance Zone in the Planning Area (As of September 30, 2010)</b>						
<b>Community Name</b>	<b>Insurance Zones A</b>			<b>Insurance Zones B, C, &amp; X</b>		
	<b>Policies in Effect</b>	<b># of CPL*</b>	<b>\$ of CPL*</b>	<b>Policies in Effect</b>	<b># of CPL*</b>	<b>\$ of CPL*</b>
Guadalupe County (includes City of Staples)	1,052	1,199	\$62,946,359.81	949	440	\$21,885,289.40
Schertz	272	18	\$82,149.57	365	29	\$913,144.78
Seguin	113	231	\$10,578,217.57	167	89	\$5,402,088.43
<b>Karnes County</b>						
Falls City	3	2	\$35,488.66	3	0	\$0
Karnes City	0	0	\$0	2	0	\$0
Karnes County	5	0	\$0	4	1	\$131.56
Kenedy	6	3	\$10,729.60	6	0	\$0
Runge	0	0	\$0	0	0	\$0
<b>Kerr County</b>						
Ingram	5	0	\$0	8	0	\$0
Kerr County	183	41	\$59,239,538	203	50	\$780,795.66
Kerrville	107	25	\$338,548.00	177	14	\$92,086.86
<b>Medina County</b>						
Castroville	3	1	\$90,800.00	73	4	\$183,285.56
Devine	26	1	\$9,280.52	11	0	\$0
Hondo	45	0	\$0	20	3	\$17,190.13
Medina County	136	44	\$1,738,688.02	141	17	\$65,516,512
Natalia	0	1	\$16,377.22	1	1	\$13,295.43
<b>Wilson County</b>						

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Summary of NFIP Policies and Claims by County, Municipality, and Insurance Zone in the Planning Area (As of September 30, 2010)						
Community Name	Insurance Zones A			Insurance Zones B, C, & X		
	Policies in Effect	# of CPL*	\$ of CPL*	Policies in Effect	# of CPL*	\$ of CPL*
Floresville	12	1	\$2,222.78	8	1	\$34,099.20
LaVernia	21	18	\$581,365.77	15	4	\$199,099.98
Stockdale	4	2	\$41,052.74	3	0	\$0
Wilson County	26	9	\$338,282.64	89	11	\$527,144.52

Source: FEMA Community Information Service (CIS)  
\*Closed Policies

Table 7.5-5, below, provides details of each participating jurisdiction's FIRM effective dates and date of entry into the National Flood Insurance Program. Unless listed below, all participating jurisdictions are members of the NFIP in good standing, as of the development of this Plan Update. This means that they currently meet all requirements of membership in the NFIP, including adoption and enforcement of a flood damage prevention ordinance. Communities that are not members in good standing are listed below:

- City of Christine – sanctioned since 1976

The San Antonio River Authority is not eligible for membership in the NFIP, and so does not appear in this table.

Finally, some participating jurisdictions have exceeded the basic membership requirements, and are also members of the Community Rating Service (CRS). Those communities are as follows:

- City of Live Oak – CRS Class 7
- Guadalupe County – CRS Class 8

**Table 7.5-5  
Floodplain Management Program Participation Information for the Planning Area**

Jurisdiction	Initial FHB <sup>M</sup> * Identified	Initial FIRM <sup>**</sup> Identified	Current Effective Map Date	Program Entry Date
Atascosa County	1/17/75	6/15/81	11/04/10	6/15/81
City of Charlotte	8/06/76	8/01/09	11/04/10(L)	8/01/09
City of Jourdanton	8/13/76	7/18/85	11/04/10((M))	7/18/85
City of Lytle	8/02/74	2/02/77	11/04/10	2/02/77
City of Pleasanton	6/21/74	4/01/81	11/04/10	4/01/81
City of Poteet	1/23/74	11/03/89	11/04/10	11/03/89

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Jurisdiction	Initial FHBM* Identified	Initial FIRM** Identified	Current Effective Map Date	Program Entry Date
<b>Bandera County</b>	6/18/76	11/01/78	2/04/11	11/01/78
City of Bandera	4/12/74	12/01/77	2/04/11	12/01/77
<b>Bexar County</b>	01/31/78	10/16/84	09/29/10	10/16/84
City of Alamo Heights	5/10/74	8/15/78	9/29/10	8/15/78
City of Balcones Heights	8/15/78	4/14/80	9/29/10	4/15/80
City of Converse	2/01/74	6/15/84	9/29/10	6/15/81
City of Helotes	--	2/16/80	9/29/10	10/28/98
City of Kirby	1/18/74	8/15/80	9/29/10	8/15/80
City of Leon Valley	10/12/73	11/15/89	9/29/10	6/01/77
City of Live Oak	5/24/74	2/16/96	9/29/10	5/16/77
City of San Antonio	4/05/74	12/15/83	9/29/10	12/15/83
Saint Hedwig	-	2/16/96	9/2/10	2/5/1997
City of Somerset	8/09/77	2/16/96	9/29/10(M)	2/16/96
City of Terrell Hills	5/17/74	1/16/81	9/29/10	1/16/81
City of Universal City	3/08/74	5/16/77	9/29/10	5/16/77
Von Ormy	-	9/29/10	9/29/10	12/4/09
City of Windcrest	5/17/74	8/15/77	9/29/10	8/15/77
<b>Comal County</b>	--	9/29/86	9/02/09	11/09/73
City of Bulverde	--	7/17/95	9/02/09	3/24/98
City of Garden Ridge	10/25/75	4/30/86	9/02/09	4/30/86
City of New Braunfels	12/02/72	12/02/72	9/02/09	12/01/72
<b>Frio County</b>	--	--	--	9/30/97(E)
City of Dilley	5/10/74	2/01/88	2/0188(L)	2/01/88
City of Pearsall	5/17/74	5/19/81	5/19/81	5/19/81
<b>Gillespie County</b>	5/10/77	5/01/87	10/19/01	5/01/87
City of Fredericksburg	4/12/74	5/19/51	10/19/01	5/19/81
<b>Guadalupe County</b>	1/24/75	3/01/79	11/02/07	3/01/79
City of Cibolo	2/01/74	5/19/81	9/29/10	5/19/81
City of Schertz	3/01/74	9/15/77	9/29/10	9/15/77
City of Seguin	--	6/18/71	11/02/07	6/18/71
<b>Karnes County</b>	6/07/77	4/01/04	10/19/10	4/01/04
City of Karnes City	5/10/74	8/01/86	10/19/10	8/01/86
City of Kenedy	--	6/18/90	10/19/10	6/25/71
City of Runge	4/25/75	12/01/89	10/19/10	12/01/89
City of Falls City	6/28/74	3/04/86	10/19/10	3/04/86
<b>Kerr County</b>	12/13/77	5/01/70	3/03/11	5/01/79
City of Ingram	--	5/01/79	3/03/11	5/01/79
City of Kerrville	6/28/74	9/27/78	3/03/11	9/29/78
<b>Medina County</b>	9/13/77	8/15/80	8/15/80	8/15/80

# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

Jurisdiction	Initial FHBM* Identified	Initial FIRM** Identified	Current Effective Map Date	Program Entry Date
City of Castroville	8/13/76	5/01/79	5/01/79	5/01/79
City of Devine	1/09/74	4/15/77	4/15/77	4/14/77
City of Hondo	9/13/74	12/01/78	12/01/78	12/01/78
City of Natalia	11/05/76	4/15/80	4/15/80	4/15/80
<b>Wilson County</b>	--	3/15/78	11/26/10	3/15/78
City of Floresville	3/08/74	11/16/77	11/26/10	11/16/77
City of La Vernia	8/06/76	5/01/78	11/26/10	5/01/78
City of Stockdale	5/31/74	3/01/78	11/26/10	3/01/78

Source: FEMA Community Status Book Report <http://www.fema.gov/cis/TX.pdf>

\*Flood Hazard Boundary Map

\*\*Flood Insurance Rate Map

(NSFHA) No Special Flood Hazard Area

(L)(M) Minimally Flood Prone

(E) Emergency Program

<sup>1</sup>From the NFIP Community Status Book: "This community was newly incorporated and the corporate limits are not reflected on the Guadalupe County FIRM dated November 2, 2007. The City of Staples has adopted panels 48187C0065F, 48187C0155F and 48187C0160F of the Guadalupe County FIRM dated"

## Community Assistance Visits

State and federal floodplain management officials occasionally perform Community Assistance Visits (CAVs). A CAV is performed to review the local floodplain management program and note any deficiencies. AACOG officials sent a letter to FEMA requesting information on CAVs conducted over the past 15 years for the participating jurisdictions. FEMA responded that they could not provide this information because of limited manpower and because community files are purged on a regular basis.

## 7.6 Summary and Conclusions

The capability of county and local governments in the planning area varies greatly, but a trend toward higher capability overall from the adoption of the original plan is evident. As in the original plan, the counties that responded to the survey tended to score higher than municipalities. The results of the *Local Capability Assessment Survey* also indicate that the municipalities within the Bexar County/San Antonio metropolitan area continue to have higher capability while some of the surrounding counties and municipalities, particularly those in the rural hill country and south of San Antonio continue to possess lesser capabilities. Several smaller jurisdictions scored high on the capability assessment survey, again keeping in line with the previous plan trends, these are suburban communities in the Bexar County and San Antonio metropolitan area. It is likely this is due to both the level of resources at their disposal and their proximity to larger urban areas, where public expectations regarding governmental services tend to be higher than in rural areas.

In the 2005 capability assessment, one of the most significant survey findings was the existence of several planning programs and tools already in use across the planning area. However, many of the processes and tools did not incorporate hazard mitigation practices. For example, planning was, and is, widely applied to response-related activities via the use of emergency operations plans, continuity of operations plans, radiological emergency plans and SARA Title III planning. Since the 2005 plan, it appears there has been some increase in the incorporation and



# CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

---

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
REGIONAL MITIGATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE

understanding of mitigation. This is evidenced by the political capabilities section revealing an increase in policies and ordinances, as well as an increase, primarily at the county level, of capability to administer mitigation activities. The continued use of the AACOG Regional Mitigation Action Plan Update will provide the vehicle to continue this process. This will require a continued educational effort to clearly articulate the benefits of participating in and sustaining the mitigation planning process. This is done when actions are clearly tied to existing hazard risk and local capabilities.