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INTRODUCTION
Introduction

This document was created in response to Texas Senate Bill 289, 86th Legislature (available at: https://legiscan.com/TX/bill/SB289/2019). The Hazard Reduction & Recovery Center at Texas A&M University and the Texas General Land Office were identified in the bill to develop a process that will coordinate the review of housing recovery plans developed by local (municipal or county) governments.

In response to this directive, the Hazard Reduction & Recovery Center drafted the Housing Recovery Plan Assessment (HRPA) Tool and this Guidebook to support the use of the HRPA Tool with feedback from the Texas General Land Office and experts with experience in housing recovery processes.

The development team recognizes that HRPA Tool users may have varying levels of capacity to complete housing recovery plans. To account for this variety, the HRPA Tool has three versions: basic, intermediate, and advanced, with each version building upon its predecessor. The basic version includes the bare-bones items that a housing recovery plan should contain, tailored for those with limited capacity. The intermediate version contains more items than the basic and the advanced version possesses the full HRPA Tool with all items. This is the INTERMEDIATE version of the HRPA Tool.

Whether someone uses the basic, intermediate, or advanced versions of this tool, any housing recovery planning is a success!
What are the Goals of this Housing Recovery Plan Assessment Tool and Guidebook?

The overarching goal of the HRPA Tool is to improve housing recovery planning throughout the state of Texas and beyond. This tool permits the assessment of local housing recovery plans that are either stand alone plans or annexes to other recovery planning or emergency planning documents. The HRPA Tool provides an assessment of whether and to what extent the submitted plan addresses topics known to increase effective, efficient, and inclusive housing recovery after a disaster caused by a natural (e.g., coastal storm, flooding, tornado, etc.) or technological (e.g., explosion, contamination, etc.) hazard.

No other similar tool currently exists to evaluate housing recovery plans. This assessment method builds on existing methods to evaluate other types of local plans. Plan assessment tools usually apply a set of normative standards to score a plan on 1) its expected contents, 2) logical consistency between sections of the plan, and 3) logical consistency between the plan and local conditions (Berke et al., 2006). Assessment tools exist for other planning documents including comprehensive plans, land use plans, and hazard mitigation plans. This tool is the first of its kind for housing recovery plans.

This Guidebook provides background information on each assessment item in the HRPA Tool. For the item, the Guidebook describes: key definitions; justification for the item’s inclusion in the HRPA Tool; and additional resources to learn more. This Guidebook can be used during plan development to ensure the plan will score well.

How Was the Housing Recovery Plan Assessment Tool Developed?

The development team included Dr. Shannon Van Zandt, Dr. Michelle Meyer, Ms. Jaimie Hicks Masterson, Ms. Erika Koeniger, and Mr. Chandler Ian Wilkins. Dr. Van Zandt and Ms. Masterson are AICP certified planners and co-authors of the Planning for Community Resilience: A Handbook for Reducing Vulnerability to Disasters. Dr. Meyer is Director of the Hazard Reduction & Recovery Center at Texas A&M University and a researcher focused on disaster recovery, social vulnerability, and coordination of recovery processes. Ms. Koeniger and Mr. Wilkins are graduate research assistants with experience in hazards and urban planning (Wilkins) or public administration (Koeninger).

Individually scored items, as well as guiding principles, were developed based on review of existing academic articles and reports related to housing recovery, policy documents from local, state, and federal agencies related to housing recovery, programming documents for reputable housing recovery programs, and existing housing recovery plans (or elements within plans) made by jurisdictions across the country. We reviewed the following documents to gather this information:

- “Policy Recommendations from the Rapid Disaster Recovery Rehousing Program (RAPIDO)” from the Community Development Corporation of Brownsville and bcWORKSHOP (2015)
• “Fixing America’s Broken Disaster Housing Recovery System Part Two: Policy Framework Reform Recommendations” from the National Low-Income Housing Coalition Convening Report. (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020)

• “Long-term Recovery Guide” from National Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (NVOAD 2012).

• “In The Eye of The Storm: A People’s Guide to Transforming Crisis and Advancing Equity in the Disaster Continuum” from the NAACP. (Steichenv, Patterson, and Taylor 2018).

• FEMA’s National Disaster Recovery Framework (2016) and Housing Guidance (2020)

• Texas General Land Office housing guidance and programs (Texas GLO n.d., 2020).

• Houston regional area housing recovery template (in progress).

• Planning for Community Resilience textbook (Masterson et al. 2014).

• “Research in Support of Floodplain Management Regulations Compliance of Substantially Damaged Properties: Findings and Recommendations” Report completed to support FEMA guidance by scholars at Texas A&M University and the University of North Carolina (Lorente, Masterson, and Berke 2019).

• Long-term recovery disability guidelines from Project REDD at Texas A&M University (REDD.TAMU.edu).


• Plan Integration for Resilience Scorecard developed by Texas A&M faculty and staff (Masterson, Berke, Malecha, Yu, Lee, and Thapa 2017).

Mr. Wilkins and Ms. Koeniger screened existing housing recovery plans with the HRPA Tool to discover its possible strengths and weaknesses. These test plans included the Hurricane Sandy Disaster Housing Strategic Plan for New Jersey and the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Action Plan.

Each item was assigned one of 8 principles to review the breadth of the HRPA Tool across topics important to recovery housing: 1) address vulnerable populations, 2) affirm resident choice, 3) promote resilience, 4) streamline return to permanent housing, 5) foster inclusive participation in recovery planning and processes, 6) build and promote local capacity in local businesses, nonprofits, and leaders, 7) use resources responsibly, and 8) communicate transparently. These eight principles were also drawn from the documents reviewed.
### Table 1. Guiding Principles of Housing Recovery

| **Address vulnerable populations** | Housing Recovery plans should explicitly identify and describe both physically and socially vulnerable populations within the community. Plans should carefully consider how planned actions and policies affect these populations, with emphasis on prioritizing their needs. |
| **Affirm resident choice** | Plans should, whenever possible, permit resident choice from among multiple options to best meet their families’ needs, both now and in the future. |
| **Promote resilience** | Plans, including programs, policies, and actions, should maintain a future orientation, working towards building resilience rather than returning to the status quo. |
| **Streamline return to permanent housing** | Housing recovery plans should strive to return residents to permanent housing as soon as possible by prioritizing or incentivizing solutions that maintain family togetherness, neighborhood cohesion, normal routines and spatial proximity to neighbors and neighborhood services such as schools, places of worship, groceries, and pharmacies. |
| **Foster inclusive participation in recovery planning and processes** | Both recovery plan-making processes and planned processes must encourage and provide full participation, transparency, and access to decision-making for the entire community, including traditionally marginalized groups and groups most impacted by disasters. |
| **Build and promote local capacity in local businesses, nonprofits, and leaders** | Housing recovery plans should prioritize the use of qualified local businesses, nonprofits, and leaders throughout the recovery process. When necessary, locals may partner with outside groups, but the emphasis should be on developing capacity among locals and retaining that capacity post-recovery as a means of building resilience. |
| **Use resources responsibly** | Disaster recovery funds, whether they come from charitable, local, state, or federal sources, must be handled with strong stewardship, with the aim of achieving an effective, efficient, and equitable outcome for all community members. |
| **Communicate transparently** | Planning processes must strive for openness and transparency in public outreach and communication. |

**What is the Final Structure of the HRPA Tool and Possible Scores?**
The final HRPA Tool includes 89 items across the eight principles. Table 2 shows the distribution of the items.
Table 2. Distribution of Items Across Plan Principles and Plan Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL ITEMS</th>
<th># of Must Pass Items</th>
<th>Vulnerable Populations</th>
<th>Resident Choice</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Streamline to Permanent</th>
<th>Inclusive Participation</th>
<th>Local Capacity</th>
<th>Resource Responsibility</th>
<th>Communicate Transparency</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact Basis</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interorganizational Coordination</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ITEMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two different scoring criteria. Some items are scored as Pass (=1) or Did Not Pass (=0). These items often indicate whether the specific topic or activity was or was not addressed in the plan. Other items are scored on a range of 0, 1, or 2. For these items, 0 means that the topic or activity was not addressed at all in the plan, 1 means that the item was partially addressed, and 2 means that the item was fully addressed in the plan.

The highest possible score on the HRPA Tool is 124. There is no overarching score that equals failure. Instead there are 37 items that would result in an “automatic failure” of the plan if they receive a 0. These items are indicated below and in the HRPA Tool with a ** next to them. Passing these items means the plan meets the bare minimum of a housing recovery plan. Best practice would be to pass many more items than just those.

Next we provide guidance for each item by section.
SECTION 1:

PLANNING PROCESS
Section 1: Planning Process

Planners and emergency managers acknowledge that the process of planning is as important, if not more important, as the plan itself. In other words, how the plan is created and with whom generates relationships and collective understanding of the situation and goals that are valuable beyond just the document itself. Thus, Section 1 of the HRPA Tool assesses aspects of the process used to develop the plan, with particular attention to stakeholder engagement. How stakeholders are included in the plan-making process critically influences whether the plan is successful. Engaging stakeholders throughout the planning process—from creating a community vision to defining goals, principles, objectives, and action steps, as well as in implementation and evaluation—is important to ensure that the plan accurately reflects community values and addresses community priority and needs. In addition, engagement builds public understanding and ownership of the adopted plan, leading to more effective implementation. For hazard related planning specifically, public engagement also generates learning opportunities for the community to learn about risks and for officials to learn about community experiences and needs. The questions in this section underscore the need to recognize residents’ knowledge and capture the community’s vision and priorities related to how housing recovery should proceed. The planning process should reflect an open, accessible, inclusive process that brings together individuals and/or groups that represent the range of different constituencies present within the community. Again, these eight questions are meant to encourage these values to help create a stronger plan.

Number of Questions: 8
Scores possible: 0-11
Required to pass: Score of 1 (or greater) on Q 1.1 and Q 1.7
**Q 1.1 How was the public involved in the development of the plan?**

*Justification:* Including the public is important to any plan development, because it helps improve the quality and content of the plans, builds trust and relationships between communities and government, and develops new modes of communication that can be used during and after the disaster (Steichen, Patterson, and Taylor, 2018).

*Scoring:* A zero here indicates that there was no mention of public involvement in the plan development. A 1 means that there was mention of some simple public involvement in the plan development (e.g., posting of the plan for public review, one public meeting, etc.). A 2 indicates that efforts were made to ensure representation from various stakeholders and community members, using broad and inclusive methods to gather feedback.

Q 1.2 Did the plan development process have designated community input periods?

*Justification:* Clearly identifying and communicating the time periods when the community can provide input or feedback is important to ensuring robust participation.

*Scoring:* A zero indicates no designated community input periods, while a 1 indicates that there were a few time periods for period input. A 2 indicates frequent and specific input periods where the public provided input.

Q 1.3 Did the plan development process allow for public participation to be completed in a timely manner?

*Justification:* The public should be provided enough time to provide thoughtful feedback and consider their options; this feedback should occur before major, potentially irreversible, decisions are made; and the feedback and changes made based on that feedback should be completed quickly. This feedback should also include mechanisms for feedback when people cannot physically attend meetings or other events.

*Scoring:* A zero indicates that public input periods were short or rushed. A 1 indicates that efforts were made to have broad and multiple methods for public engagement, allowing enough time for people to contribute, and contribute when not able to be physically present at community meetings.

Q 1.4 Did the plan development process include efforts to intentionally reach out to communities that would not normally participate in the public outreach process?

*Justification:* Communities that are often hit the hardest by disasters are often the most inadequately incorporated into the plans. By intentionally reaching out, the government can build trust within the community and hear the needs of the community (Steichen, Patterson, & Taylor, 2018).

*Scoring:* A zero indicates no mention of specific efforts to gather input from hard to reach populations or vulnerable populations (see Fact Basis for potential vulnerable populations to consider). A 1 indicates that efforts were described to gather input from these populations.

Q 1.5 Did community input periods occur with the support of local community organizations?

*Justification:* Engagement of local community organizations and working with these organizations to share information on the plan and en-
courage participation from their clients or constituents builds trust in the planning process, helps reach hard to reach populations, and can gather broader participation that represents the community. Community organizations, including religious institutions, can aid in gathering public input, host forums, and share how to reach hard to reach populations.

**Scoring:** A zero indicates no mention of community organizations used in plan development outreach and community input. A 1 indicates mention of which and how community organizations were used to support community input.

**Q 1.6 Were community input periods structured to be inclusive?**

*Justification:* Inclusive community input periods take into account access and functional needs, as well as other social needs to ensure all communities have the opportunity to participate. Populations to consider when reviewing the inclusivity of input periods include: persons with disabilities, low income, persons with caregiving responsibilities (such as parents), elderly, among others. Considerations to implement include hosting public input events at locations that meet ADA requirements, providing sign language or hearing devices, providing childcare or children’s activities, having multiple input periods at different times and days to accommodate work schedules, etc.

**Scoring:** A zero indicates no mention of the structure or accessibility of community input periods. A 1 indicates mention of how input periods addressed inclusivity for access and functional needs, childcare, accommodating locations and schedules.

**Q 1.7 Was public feedback incorporated into the plan?**

*Justification:* The public can provide valuable information to strengthen plans. By incorporating their feedback, the plan can be strengthened (Steichen, Patterson, and Taylor, 2018) and trust built between the local government and residents. The final plan should indicate how and what public input was incorporated into the final document.

**Scoring:** A zero indicates no discussion of how feedback was incorporated into the plan. A one indicates a notice and comment period was used. A two indicates that a notice and comment period was used and describes the process by which the feedback was addressed or added to the plan.

**Q 1.8 Was the data gathering process made available for public input?**

*Justification:* Besides the plan itself, the data gathering methods for the fact basis should also be available for public feedback. Often local residents know best about areas of their neighborhoods that are at risk of hazards, housing and population trends, and other insights that increase the validity of the fact basis.

**Scoring:** A score of zero means that the process for data gathering was not made available to the public for feedback. A score of one indicates that it was made available to the public for them to provide feedback.

*Additional Resources:* This resource provides information on how the Federal government can support local government in capacity building after a disaster. Additionally, the brochure highlights multiple Federal level partners that are part of community planning and capacity building. The brochure could be used to understand how
the Federal government may assist in local capacity building.


- The “In The Eye of the Storm” tool discusses how to incorporate equity in every step of the emergency management process. Specifically, module 1 and 2 focus on understanding equity and risk assessments. Module 3 specifically addresses how to develop an inclusive emergency response plan. Using general concepts and ideas from this tool could help structure more inclusive meetings.


- While this document focuses on the scientific community, it outlines why diversity and inclusion is important and provides a step-by-step guide on how to structure an inclusive meeting. Having meetings is one option for including the general public in plan development. This guide outlines how to structure an inclusive meeting.


diversity.ldeo.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/AGCI%20NCAR%20Inclusive%20Meeting%20Guide.pdf

- “Facilitation of a TIG Open Forum” resource is a short guide on how to run inclusive open forums. Open forums are an additional option for including the community into the plan development process. This resource helps guide leaders through an open forum.


- This online resource is focused towards local governments to help them understand their local communities, building long-term relationships, and strategically plan for their communities needs. This resource provides local governments with steps to building social cohesion within their communities.

SECTION 2: FACT BASIS
Section 2: Fact Basis

Planning should rest on facts—an evidence-based description and analysis of current conditions and the best possible projection of future trends, such as land use, development, environmental factors, the economy, and population changes. Developing plans without knowing what the community currently has is a recipe for failure. The questions in this section encourage assessment of several aspects of a community’s natural environment, physical infrastructure and built environment, and social demographics that are known to relate to housing damage and recovery rates during a disaster.

The natural environment assessment aims to identify historic and potential hazards present in the community. This information aligns with local emergency response or hazard mitigation plans. A natural environment assessment identifies geographic regions at most and at minimal risk of disaster impacts, both of which should be used later when creating goals and objectives to ensure housing recovery increases community resiliency.

The physical vulnerability of a community is assessed through evaluation of the built environment and its capacity to withstand disaster impacts. For a housing recovery plan, housing analysis is central to the fact basis along with sheltering and temporary housing capacity. The state of infrastructure in the community is also useful to identify which neighborhoods may need infrastructure renewal or additions during the recovery process.

The social vulnerability of a community helps identify populations in the community who may need additional support to mitigate, prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters. Every disaster, of all sizes, in the United States results in more inequality. It is consistently shown that working class people, lower income households, renters, elderly, racial minorities, non-English speakers, immigrants, and persons with access and functional needs are more likely to be displaced from their homes longer and even permanently pushed out of the community if appropriate housing support is not available in a timely manner. Several federal housing laws and recovery programs require attention to different aspects of these housing inequalities. The way to foster overall community recovery—and build resilience—is to recognize that the status quo will not be returned post-disaster, and that many vulnerable people in the community will be worse off without intervention and support. Furthermore, lack of attention to these inequalities could lead to violations of Fair Housing laws, various state laws around discrimination, and federal and state grant requirements.

Number of Questions: 16
Scores possible: 0-25
Required to pass: Score of 1 (or greater) on 8 questions: 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.9, 2.10, and 2.11
**Q 2.1 Does the plan include or reference a historical hazard analysis for the jurisdiction?**

*Key Definitions:* Hazards are considered something that can cause harm, like hydrological and meteorological (e.g., floods, storms), geophysical (e.g., earthquakes, mudslides), technological (oil spills, explosions), acute (e.g., tornadoes), long-term (e.g., sea level rise, subsidence)

*Guidance:* Looking at historical hazards can help identify areas that are prone to disaster and provide evidence of historically record-setting events to use in planning. This information is commonly in emergency response plans and hazard mitigation plans for a jurisdiction. To reduce duplication but also foster integration across planning documents, this housing recovery plan should reference the current hazard analysis in those other plans to satisfy this question. A new hazard analysis is required only if the jurisdiction does not have this available in these other plans.

*Scoring:* A zero indicates no mention of historic hazards; a one means there is a quick reference to historic hazards with no reference to how the information was created; and a two means that there is a historic hazard analysis with description of a scientific method for the analysis.

*Additional Resources:* This report walks the user through a community based vulnerability assessment.


**Q 2.2 Does the plan include or reference a future hazard analysis for the jurisdiction?**

*Guidance:* Looking at future hazards can help identify areas that may become prone to disaster and should be avoided. Increased disaster frequency due to climate change and changes in exposure due to land use changes or changes in the impervious surfaces of a community both mean that future hazards will not align with historical hazards. More areas of a community will be at risk of flooding as the 100-year floodplain changes. Thus estimates of the expanding floodplain, reduced coastal areas, and other changes should be accounted for in long-term housing recovery planning. This information is commonly available in emergency response plans and hazard mitigation plans for a jurisdiction. To reduce duplication while fostering integration across planning documents, this housing recovery plan should reference the future hazard analysis from those other plans to satisfy this question. A new future hazard analysis is required only if the jurisdiction does not have this available in these other plans.

*Scoring:* A zero indicates no mention of future hazards; a one means there is a quick reference to future hazards with no reference to how the information was created; and a two means that there is a future hazard analysis with description of a scientific method for the analysis.

**Q 2.3 Does the plan identify areas that are less susceptible to disaster damage?**

*Guidance:* Identifying areas that might weather the disaster better can be used to help stage material or supplies for faster access or placing shelters and temporary housing. Additional resilience for the whole community is improved if less hazardous areas are already pre-identified for future permanent housing development. For example, housing in the floodplain may be eligible for outs, but those individuals will need new housing else-
where. Communities could offer incentives to developers for purchase and development outside hazardous zones, or could use HUD CDBG (Housing and Urban Development Department Community Development Block Grant, for disaster recovery or mitigation) funding to support construction of mixed income or low-to-moderate income housing in areas not at risk of hazards.

Scoring: A zero indicates no mention; a one means there is a quick reference with no reference to how the information was created; and a two means that areas are identified with a description of a scientific method for the analysis.

**Q 2.4 Does the plan include or reference a demographic profile of the jurisdiction?**

*Key Definitions:* Demographics is the study of a population based on factors such as age, race, and sex. Demographic data refers to socio-economic information expressed statistically, also including employment, education, income, marriage rates, birth and death rates and more factors. This information is available for every community from the Census Bureau and other sources (Community Risk Reduction, N.d.).

*Justification:* Demographic information important for housing analysis should include but not limited to: population size, population growth/change trajectory, age, gender, race, ethnicity, income, household size. These factors affect the types, style, and costs of housing that is currently needed and will be needed in the near future.

Scoring: A zero indicates no mention; a one means there is a quick reference with limited population information; and a two means that demographic profile is provided with detailed information on the full population.

*Additional Resources:* This is the website for the U.S. Census. Information from this page can help planners gain an idea of how many individuals with disabilities live within the community. United States Census Bureau. (2019). Explore Data. https://data.census.gov/cedsci/all?q=disability&g=0400000US48

This website hosts a variety of different links and resources to demographic information. Information from these sources can be used to help understand the demographics of the local community.


**Q 2.5 Does the plan identify socially vulnerable groups within the local government jurisdiction?**

*Key Definitions:* Social vulnerability refers to the socioeconomic and demographic factors that affect the resilience of communities (Van Zandt). Social vulnerability indicators are based on years of cumulative disaster research that show which populations, due to historical discrimination (such as segregation of Black populations into lower quality areas) and current inequalities.

*Guidance:* Due to historic and ongoing segregation and disparities, many population groups face greater hazard risk and have more difficulty recovering and access recovery aid than other populations. Those who have been made socially vulnerable to hazards within a community can include, but are not limited to: persons living in or
near poverty, people with access and functional needs or medical needs, children and the elderly population, transient populations, communities of color, low-income families, single parent households, non-English speakers, undocumented immigrants. Information to answer this question should be found using a fact-based method. Typically information can be found in a risk assessment and includes maps of areas or a description of groups (e.g., low socioeconomic, homeless) offers a visual way to assess location of populations in need with hazard risk.

Scoring: A zero indicates no mention; a one means there is a quick reference with limited population information or missing populations; and a two means that detailed information is provided accounting for various populations groups.

Additional Resources: The Center for Disaster Control and Prevention (CDC) offers an online map of social vulnerability indicators. This tool can help a community understand their social vulnerabilities.


The Hazard Reduction and Recovery Center have the capacity to measure social vulnerability for local jurisdictions. This report describes social vulnerability concepts and the process of mapping.


Summaries available here: http://ttc.arch.tamu.edu/_common/files/K2A%202015.1.pdf
Or here: http://ttc.arch.tamu.edu/_common/files/VanZandt_Mapping%20ResilienceFINAL.pdf

**Q 2.6 Does the plan identify people with disabilities within the local government jurisdiction?**

Key Definitions: The ADA defines a person with a disability as a person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activity (ADA National Network n.d.)

Guidance: Persons with disabilities face disproportionate impacts from disasters. Planning for housing recovery, sheltering, and temporary housing, will require accommodations that meet ADA legal standards at a minimum. Disabilities can include but not limited to physical disabilities - difficulty hearing, mobility difficulties, vision impairment, and others - or emotional or cognitive difficulties - post-traumatic stress disorder, major depressive order, developmental disabilities, and others.

Scoring: A zero indicates no mention; a one means there is a quick reference with limited population information; and a two means that detailed information is provided accounting for the challenges this population faces during disaster recovery.

Additional Resources: This resource helps provide an understanding of what a disability is, how
Q 2.9 Does the plan identify features of the built environment within the local government jurisdiction that are physically vulnerable to disasters?

Key Definitions: Physical vulnerability is the susceptibility to damage and loss based on the interaction between exposure and physical characteristics. These include the following: structures (homes, schools, and businesses, as well as potential shelter locations), infrastructure (such as roads, water and sewer systems, utilities, hazardous facilities, and critical facilities), and the natural environment (often that which protects or buffers the community) (Masterson et al., 2014).

Guidance: Physical resources that should be identified and mapped include, but not limited to, those listed above that are in proximity to fault line or shore line, flood plain, storm surge areas, wind zones, landslide areas, areas of subsidence (sinking ground), and many others. Information to answer this question should have been found using a fact-based method and drawing upon existing maps available in the local community’s emergency response or hazard mitigation plan.

Information can be provided in a hazard analysis with maps of areas or a description of where they are.

Scoring: A zero indicates no mention; a one means there is a quick reference with limited information; and a two means that detailed information is provided and how the information was developed.

Additional Resources: This report walks the user through a community based vulnerability assessment.


Q 2.10 Does the plan include or reference the current land use, future land use map, and zoning map?

Key Definitions: Zoning is a legislative process through which the local governing body (under power delegated it by the state zoning enabling law) divides the municipality into districts or zones, and adopts regulations concerning the use of land and the placement, spacing, and size of buildings (Dale and Chandler, 2015). Most cities will include these maps in their comprehensive plans or as part of their municipal codes.

Guidance: The current land use maps provide an understanding of how the community currently uses land for public and private purposes, while the future land use map or zoning map provides an understanding of the community’s future area of development. A future land use map or zoning map assists with recovery by determining where future residents can move to or housing can be built in accordance with the community’s goals. These plans and references should be cited or ref-
**Q 2.11 Does the plan include or reference a housing analysis of the jurisdiction?**

**Key Definitions:** A housing analysis is a specific assessment of the existing housing market and potential trends in the local housing market. According to HUD, “Each analysis takes into consideration changes in the economic, demographic, and housing inventory characteristics of a specific housing market area during three periods: the decade before the plan (e.g., 2000-2010); the decade of the plan (2010-date plan completed); and from the as-of date to a forecast date.”

**Guidance:** A housing analysis is important, because housing recovery is critical for the whole community’s recovery (Community Development Corporation of Brownsville and WORKSHOP, 2015). A housing analysis can include, but is not limited to: total housing units, proportion vacant/occupied, affordability, percent owner-occupied, percent single family, percent of different types of multifamily, congregate care or institutional housing, average rent, average mortgage, and other assessments of cost burden. If a current housing analysis exists for the community (such as part of a previous Comprehensive Plan process), it can be referenced in this section and does not need to be duplicated. If one has not been completed recently, it should be updated or undertaken.

Scoring: A zero indicates no mention; a one means there is a quick reference with limited information; and a two means that detailed information is provided and how the information was developed.

**Additional Resources:**


Example of a housing needs assessments:


**Q 2.12 Does the plan identify the use of public housing choice vouchers within the local jurisdiction?**

**Key Definitions:** Housing vouchers are what was formerly known as public housing. They are used...
by qualified households to afford rental housing on the existing housing market (HUD n.d.).

_Justification:_ Public housing residents are especially vulnerable to displacement post-disaster due to their low-income and if their rental unit is repaired too slowly, rent is increased, or their landlord decides to no longer participate in the Voucher program. Damage to these units will likely require larger and longer emergency sheltering and temporary housing operations.

_Guidance:_ Local Public Housing Authorities should be able to provide location and counts of these residents.

_Scoring:_ A zero indicates no mention; a one indicates this is discussed and amount of housing quantified.

**Q 2.13 Does the plan identify project-based public housing units within the local jurisdiction?**

_Justification:_ These units are recommended to coordinate with local emergency management to develop evacuation, sheltering, and temporary sheltering plans. Hurricanes in 2020 revealed that this voluntary suggestion is not often undertaken, leaving low-income, and often elderly and disabled residents without housing (Campbell, Morss, Lindell, Gutmann 2021).

_Guidance:_ Local Public Housing Authorities should be able to provide location and counts of these residences.

_Scoring:_ A zero indicates no mention; a one indicates this is discussed and amount of housing quantified.

**Q 2.14 Does the plan include an inventory of available facilities that can aid in recovery?**

_Guidance:_ Available facilities include, but are not limited to: schools, churches, libraries, and community centers. Facilities are buildings or structures capable of holding resources, hosting volunteers, supporting displaced residents needs, or anything else associated with disaster recovery. These facilities often become storage locations for donated materials, a place for volunteers to gather and identify their assignments, a place for businesses to drop off supplies, as well as a location for affected residents to have meetings, access laundry facilities or shower facilities, and meet with case managers or recovery support nonprofits. It is important that these identified facilities are outside of hazardous areas (such as floodplains) and offer easy access for community members and volunteers. Privately-owned facilities, such as warehouses or other available structures, can be included with permission and support from the facility owner acquired during this planning process.

_Scoring:_ A zero indicates no mention of these facilities, while a one indicates that an inventory is provided with contact information for the manager/owner.

**Q 2.15 Does the plan include or reference emergency sheltering capacity, including hotel/motel capacity?**

_Justification:_ Sheltering refers to an existing facility (or facilities), such as a school, community center, convention center, or church
temporarily converted to provide safe, accessible, and secure short term housing for disaster survivors (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2017). Pre-identified shelters must meet ADA accessibility standards, and the American Red Cross is equipped for evaluating and confirming facilities to host shelters.

**Guidance**: Goal of sheltering should work to get all survivors into a safe place. Compare the housing plan with emergency management mass sheltering plan to ensure compatibility and no competing conflicts. If emergency sheltering capacity is assessed in the emergency operations plan for the community, then this housing recovery plan can reference that information into this plan. Hotels and motels provide additional emergency sheltering options.

**Scoring**: A zero indicates no mention of these facilities, while a one indicates that an inventory is provided with contact information for the manager/owner.

**Q 2.16 Does the plan include or reference an economic profile of the jurisdiction?**

**Key Definitions**: Economic profile of the jurisdiction should provide an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the area’s economy, especially related to employment characteristics.

**Guidance**: Understanding the economic needs of a community is important to ensure that housing plans align with these economic activities. For example, a tourist economy will need housing plans that support service workers to ensure that industry recovers. An economic analysis can include, but is not limited to: employment rate, major industries, major employers, and average wages. If a current economic analysis exists for the community (such as part of a previous Comprehensive Plan process), it can be referenced in this section. If one has not been completed recently, it should be updated and undertaken.

**Scoring**: A zero indicates no mention. A one indicates inclusion of basic economic information. A two indicates a comprehensive economic profile is provided or referenced.


**Q 2.17 Does the plan provide more detail with Appendices?**

**Guidance**: Appendices can include, but are not limited to, methods of fact basis data collection and analysis, maps, timetables for implementation, partners and organizations involved with creating the plans.

**Scoring**: A zero indicates no mention, while a one indicates Appendices are included.

**Q 2.18 Does the plan provide a reference list?**

**Guidance**: List what supporting documents were used to develop this fact basis. Providing references supports transparency and allows for the public to assess the accuracy and reliability of the data provided.

**Scoring**: A zero indicates no mention, while a one indicates references are provided.
SECTION 3:

GOALS & OBJECTIVES
Section 3: Goals & Objectives

Nearly all plans include goals and objectives for the community; in this case for the housing recovery process. Goals state the desired future state for the community. In a housing recovery plan or plan element, goals would address what stakeholders want to see the recovery process achieve. There may be goals related to damage assessment, sheltering, temporary housing, and finally permanent housing. Goals might also include ways in which the recovery process might strive for increased resilience, sustainability, or overcoming pre-existing housing problems related to affordability, quality, or supply, for example. Objectives offer more detail on what goal achievement would look like. They should establish measurable targets, as well as timelines for achievement of those targets. In a housing recovery plan or plan element, goals would address what stakeholders want to see the recovery process achieve. There may be goals related to damage assessment, sheltering, temporary housing, and permanent housing. Goals might also include ways in which the recovery process might strive for increased resilience, sustainability, or overcoming pre-existing housing problems related to affordability, quality, or supply, for example. Objectives offer more detail on what goal achievement would look like.

Number of Questions: 15
Scores possible: 0-18
Required to pass: Score of 1 (or greater) on 6 questions: 3.6, 3.7, 3.9, 3.14, 3.15, and 3.30

Additional Resources: The resources listed below provide general information on how to develop concrete and constructive goals for a plan.


Q 3.1 Does the plan reference evidence-based shelter locations?

*Justification*: Goal of emergency shelters should be to provide safety to survivors in danger, therefore the need to use evidence-based locations are critical to ensure safety. Evidence-based means that shelter locations align with the hazard and vulnerability analyses that occurred in the Fact Basis above.

*Guidance*: Locations should be in conjunction with the emergency mass sheltering plan or similar document. Information from those plans can be referenced here and does not have to be recreated.

*Scoring*: A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion is included and grounded in the fact basis.

Q 3.2 Does the plan identify a goal for moving people out of emergency shelters within 6 weeks post-event?

*Justification*: The ability for families to return to their regular routines is critical for each family member’s mental health, as well as the stability of the family’s income. Plans should set specific timeline goals for moving people out of shelters and back into permanent housing, or temporary housing if necessary. Six weeks is a reasonable length of time to expect plans for temporary housing to be in place, except under the most extreme circumstances.

*Scoring*: A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion is included.

Q 3.3 Does the plan identify how temporary housing will be provided?

*Key Definitions*: Temporary housing is housing that individual households can live in while their permanent home is being repaired or rebuilt. In some cases it may be provided by rental vouchers that allow households to rent on the private market, or it may be provided by the state or federal government as a trailer or recreational vehicle.

*Justification*: Temporary housing is intended to help families return to their regular household, school, and job routines while their homes are repaired or rebuilt. Failing to plan for it will delay the return to normalcy.


*Scoring*: A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion is included.

Q 3.4 Does the plan offer a goal to provide temporary housing within six months of disaster?

*Justification*: Return to permanent housing as quickly as possible is the ultimate goal of any post-disaster housing program. Temporary housing provides a more settled situation for survivors as they wait for permanent housing. Temporary housing, such as FEMA trailers or other temporary rentals, should be provided within 6 months post-disaster to get households into some degree of normalcy.

*Scoring*: A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion is included.

** Q 3.6 Does the plan identify processes for assessing and reporting housing damage, disaggregated by insured and uninsured losses?

*Justification*: This process is required by SB 289 (2018). Separating insured and uninsured losses is
critical to applications for funding from state and federal agencies. Insured losses are not eligible for inclusion in “unmet needs” assessments or as justification of damage quantification for various aid programs. Separating insured and uninsured losses reduces potential for duplication of benefits.

**Q 3.7 Does the plan address the repair/rebuilding of permanent homes?**

*Justification:* Permanent housing recovery is the central goal of any housing recovery plan and crucial for the whole community recovery. Having a clearly defined process will aid in permanent housing recovery and by proxy community recovery (Community Development Corporation of Brownsville and WORKSHOP, 2015).

*Additional Resources:*

*Scoring:* A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion is included.

**Q 3.9 Does the plan identify metrics that can be used to identify progress to achieving the overarching timeline's goals?**

*Justification:* Identifiable metrics allow for the recovery committee or manager to ensure that policies and plan actions are working and make changes during the recovery process as needed. Metrics also are central to the transparency principle of housing recovery planning that ensures the public has the data needed to assess progress towards the end goals of the plan.

*Additional Resources:* The following resources offer overview and instructions on community disaster recovery that includes housing.


*Scoring:* A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion is included.

**Q 3.13 Is new construction encouraged to be ADA compliant?**

*Justification:* Recovery offers an opportunity to improve accessibility for all residents. New houses, especially multifamily housing and housing developed through the case management processes should consider the number of residents with disabilities in the community and include accessible units or accessible features.

*Additional resources:* This website provides 6 chapters on ADA requirements from flooring to bathrooms to zoning rules. The website can be
used to help contractors and planners understand ADA requirements.

Scoring: A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion is included.

** Q 3.14 Does the plan provide a range of housing options?

**Justification**: Allowing residents to make decisions regarding their home can foster a sense of ownership and pride, which in turn fosters long-term attachment to the community. Additionally, it can help the residents feel empowered during the difficult time of recovery (Community Development Corporation of Brownsville and WORKSHOP, 2015, pg iv)

**Guidance**: A range of housing types is characterized by the presence of residential units of different sizes, configurations, tenures, and price points located in buildings of different sizes, configurations, ages, and ownership structures. Providing a range of housing types accommodates varying lifestyle choices and affordability needs and makes it possible for households of different sizes and income levels to live in close proximity to one another.

Scoring: A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion of some housing options available. A two indicates comprehensive discussion of housing options that is based on the fact basis and populations needs.

** Q 3.15 Does the plan prioritize the rebuilding of affordable homes?

**Justification**: Providing affordable housing at different levels increases household stability, reduces homelessness, and strengthens the community. Disaster research has shown that low to moderate income households return and rebuild slower post-disaster and are more likely to be permanently displaced from a community often due to loss of affordable housing. To ensure that all residents can return to the community, affordable housing should meet the demand. Furthermore, nearly all US communities are currently experiencing an affordability crisis, thus disaster recovery should at a minimum return as much affordable housing as existed pre-disaster and preferably expand affordable housing options.

**Key Definitions**: Affordable housing is characterized by residents spending less than 30% of their income on housing costs.

**Additional Resources**: The brochure outlines the importance of affordable housing and provides suggestions for achieving affordable housing within the community.

Scoring: A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates quick mention of affordable housing. A two indicates strong commitment to affordable housing that is based on the fact basis, housing needs assessments, and population demographics.
Q 3.21 Does the plan discuss Case Management?

_Justification:_ Case management is an incredibly important part of aiding survivors through long-term recovery. Case management provides a point of contact of survivors accessing recovery resources and provides accountability for tax payers by ensuring proper documentation and potential for reducing waste of resources (Community Development Corporation of Brownsville and WORKSHOP, 2015, pg 18).

_Scoring:_ A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion is included.

Q 3.24 Does the plan discuss the rebuilding of neighborhood infrastructure?

_Justification:_ During long-term recovery affluent communities typically receive support while low-income communities or communities of color are ignored. By ignoring the needs of these communities, the communities face greater displacement (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020).

_Guidance:_ According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, there are 16 forms of critical infrastructure covering areas from dams to the finance sector to the area of transportation (Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, N.d.).

_Scoring:_ A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion is included.

Q 3.26 Does the plan discuss the homeless population within the community?

_Justification:_ Housing recovery is critical for the whole community’s recovery (Community Development Corporation of Brownsville and WORKSHOP, 2015). By ignoring the needs of marginalized populations, those populations face greater displacement (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020). People experiencing homelessness are perhaps the most vulnerable among us. While they may not have had homes prior to the disaster, care should be taken to address these concerns as part of the recovery process.

_Guidance:_ Consider legislation that “ensures equitable treatment” for individuals experiencing homelessness after the disaster (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020).

_Scoring:_ A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates discussion is included.

Q 3.27 Does the plan have a process for directing undocumented populations to eligible support services?

_Justification:_ Housing recovery is critical for the whole community’s recovery (Community Development Corporation of Brownsville and WORKSHOP, 2015). By ignoring the needs of marginalized communities, those communities face greater displacement (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020). In many communities in Texas and elsewhere, undocumented immigrants are critical to the functioning of the local economy, and may also be part of households that include citizens. Undocumented immigrants will not be eligible for various governmental aid programs, and also may avoid seeking support for fear of deportation. Eligible private support services through nonprofits should be identified.

_Guidance:_ Partner with different community organizations (e.g., faith-based and other non-profit) that deal with undocumented residents will help direct undocumented residents access resources to aid in their recovery.
Q 3.30 Does the plan promote overarching community resilience to future hazards?

Justification: Disaster frequency and magnitude are increasing. Stable communities allow for all other areas of society to function (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2020). Recovery provides an opportunity to build back better or “bounce forward” rather than just bounce back to the previous building stock. This time should be used for addressing resilience challenges and implementing land use, building codes, or other standards that ensure new housing is built to withstand the next disaster.

Guidance: Household hazard mitigation strategies should be considered for policy and encouraged to homeowners, developers, and nonprofits who are rebuilding housing. Examples of resilience building efforts possible during recovery include: higher freeboard over the base flood elevation, rebuilding fewer homes in flood prone areas, encouraging tie-downs or other wind resistant features, reducing housing around toxic or hazardous facilities, among other. Schwab (2014) provides many examples. Determining these policy changes pre-disaster with public input can speed the implementation post-disaster to ensure rebuilding can meet new standards immediately.

Additional Resources: This book details community recovery planning including possible policy changes that promote resilience.

This website provides example policies and language for improving resilience. While developed in Colorado in response to flooding hazards, the model ordinance and tools are applicable to other states.

This resource covers a variety of topics that impact a community’s resilience. This resource could be used to gain an understanding of areas that need to be addressed and recommendations for it.

Scoring: A zero indicates no discussion, while a one indicates some discussion or action are included. A two indicates a dedication to resilience throughout the housing plan with metrics to show the effect of resilience efforts to be undertaken.
SECTION 4: IMPLEMENTATION
Section 4: Implementation

The implementation section of a plan corresponds to the goals and objectives section by providing detailed information about how the goals and objectives will be achieved. These may include the design of new strategies or programs to achieve stated objectives, or may identify alterations to existing policies, programs, codes, or regulations (e.g., suspensions or moratoria) in a post-disaster situation. This section will also identify the actors (vendors, suppliers, professionals, etc.) needed to enact the plan.

Number of Questions: 37
Scores possible: 0-53
Required to pass: Score of 1 (or greater) on 16 questions: 4.3, 4.8, 4.11, 4.13, 4.15, 4.17, 4.18, 4.19, 4.20, 4.26, 4.44, 4.45, 4.61, 4.62, 4.63, 4.64
Q 4.1 Does the plan highlight what general information will be available to the public?

*Justification:* Transparency is important for the recovery process, because it ensures informed public policy decisions, fosters greater public participation, and helps identify gaps in services for public and private entities to fill (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020).

*Guidance:* Areas for increased transparency can include but not limited “damage assessments, determination of unmet needs, program design and implementation, grantee and subgrantee performance, and how federal dollars are spent” (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020, p. 4).

*Scoring:* Scored as a zero if no specific discussion on what information will be provided to the public; a one if specific discussion of what information will be available to the public.

Q 4.2 Does the plan address how the government will share information with the public?

*Justification:* Regular communication improves public trust in recovery processes. Further, multiple channels and methods of communication are needed to ensure all populations can access information.

*Guidance:* Communication should be pushed through multiple channels, different languages, communicated to key leaders in different communities at regular intervals.

*Scoring:* Scored as zero if no discussion included. A one is received when simple discussion is included about how information is shared. A two is received if transparency, frequency, and inclusivity of information sharing is emphasized.

Q 4.3 Is all information pertaining to the housing process available to the public?

*Justification:* Transparency of information on housing recovery and decisions are critical to long-term recovery success (Community Development Corporation of Brownsville and WORKSHOP, 2015).

*Guidance:* Areas for increased transparency can include but not limited “damage assessments, determination of unmet needs, program design and implementation, grantee and subgrantee performance, and how federal dollars are spent” (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020, p. 4).

*Scoring:* Lack of discussion will result in a zero. A score of one is received if discussion is included on where the information is stored and how the public can access it.

Q 4.4 Does the plan highlight what general information will be available to stakeholders?

*Justification:* Stakeholders should have access to additional and more frequent information about the housing recovery process to support their role and missions in the planning process.

*Definitions:* Stakeholders include internal and external organizations and representatives who have an important role or contribution to the housing recovery process. These stakeholders may include local, state, and federal Emergency Management representatives, local, state, and federal recovery funding organizations, philanthropic funders, representatives of particular population groups in the community, political officials, among others.

**Q 4.3 Is all information pertaining to the housing process available to the public?**
**Q 4.5** Question Does the plan address how the government will share information with stakeholders?

*Guidance:* To ensure that stakeholders can best fulfill their positions determine in advance what information they will receive, for example: stakeholders may receive detailed information on housing damages reports, while news reports receive general information. This information is information stakeholders need to complete their responsibilities in a disaster, but might cause anxiety and stress in the public.

*Scoring:* Scored as a zero if no specific discussion on what information will be provided to stakeholders; a one if specific discussion of what information will be available to stakeholders.

*Justification:* How information is communicated to stakeholders is as important as what information to ensure a smooth recovery process. Thus frequency and channels of communication should be outlined ahead of time. Stakeholders who know their responsibilities in housing recovery pre-disaster can also speed the recovery process.

*Guidance:* Consider having a wide array of stakeholders from private to public organizations, having multiple pre-identified channels of communication, and clear information on the frequency of communication. Furthermore stakeholders should be named with their contact information and responsibilities during housing recovery outlined in the plan.

*Scoring:* Scored as zero if no discussion included. A one is received when simple discussion is included about how information is shared. A two is received if transparency, frequency, and inclusivity of information sharing is emphasized along with stakeholders identified with contact information and responsibilities to the housing recovery process.

**Q 4.8** Does this plan protect public review in the immediate aftermath of a disaster?

*Justification:* Public review needs to be protected in the immediate aftermath of a disaster, because public review ensures that the plan accurately reflects the values of the community and their priorities. Additionally, it helps build public support for the plan (Godschalk and Rouse, 2015).

*Guidance:* Because residents may be displaced or distracted by their immediate needs post-disaster, additional efforts should be made to ensure all residents have access to review recovery decisions made by their local government.

*Key Definitions* Public review is a period of time before a government decision is passed that allows the general public to comment on the proposed decision. (Legal Dictionary 2021).

*Scoring:* A zero is received if public review is not discussed or affirmed. A one is received if public review is affirmed and protected.

**Q 4.9** Are there designated community input points during the recovery phase?

*Justification:* Engaging the public in the aftermath of a disaster is important, because public review ensures that the plan accurately reflects the values of the community and their priorities. Additionally, it helps build public support for the plan (Godschalk and Rouse, 2015). Having outlined when these input periods occur in advance ensures that the public has the time to review and provide feedback.
Q 4.10 Does the recovery phase include efforts to intentionally reach out to communities that would not normally participate?

**Justification:** Engaging the public in the aftermath of a disaster is important, because public review ensures that the plan accurately reflects the values of the community and their priorities (Godschalk and Rouse, 2015). Furthermore, low-income or communities of color needs are traditionally ignored and can lead to higher rates of displacement (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020). Additionally, it helps build public support for the plan (Godschalk and Rouse, 2015).

**Guidance:** Engage with a wide range of community stakeholders, especially groups that are not normally included. Intentionally invite leaders and respected members of low-income communities, communities of color, disability community, or other marginalized communities to the planning process.

**Additional Resources:** The “In The Eye of the Storm” tool discusses how to incorporate equity in every step of the emergency management process. Specifically, module 1 and 2 focus on understanding equity and risk assessments. Module 3 specifically addresses how to develop an inclusive emergency response plan. Using general concepts and ideas from this tool could help structure more inclusive meetings.


"Facilitation of a TIG Open Forum" resource is a short guide on how to run inclusive open forums. Open forums are an additional option for including the community into the plan development process. This resource helps guide leaders through an open forum.


Scoring: Receives a zero if no discussion of input periods; a one for vague discussion of input periods; a two for specific and frequent input periods described.


Scoring: Receives a zero if no discussion; receives a one if methods are discussed that specifically include outreach to populations vulnerable to disasters in inclusive ways.

**Q 4.11 Is community feedback incorporated in the recovery process?**

Justification: Gathering feedback from the community is important only because it is then incorporated into the actual recovery plan and processes. This question aims to understand how the community feedback will be used to informed the recovery process.

Scoring: Receives a zero if no discussion of how feedback was used for the plan. Receives a one if the plan describes how community feedback informed, changed, or revised aspects of the plan or was determined not to be included.

**Q 4.12 Does the plan identify areas of temporary affordable housing within the community?**

Justification: Temporary housing is crucial to short-term recovery goals, and having affordable temporary housing ensures equitable housing recovery outcomes.

Key Definitions: Affordable housing means a family spends 30% of their income on housing expenses at any income level (HUD User, n.d.).

Guidance: Use data collected in the fact basis section to guide how much affordable housing is needed during this phase, and then identify potential partner organizations, private institutions, and others who could provide temporary housing.

Scoring: Zero means no discussion; a one means identification of temporary affordable housing; a two indicates the temporary affordable housing is provided in locations that promote resilience (low hazard risk).

**Q 4.13 Does this plan provide a list of temporary housing options that have ADA accommodation?**

Justification: Accommodations are required by federal law.
Key Definitions: Americans with Disability Act (ADA) protects individuals with disabilities from discrimination (ADA National Network, n.d.)

Guidance: Using data collected in the fact finding section to guide how much and what type of ADA accommodations are needed during temporary housing


This resource is a platform that has consolidated various topics and research pertaining to the disability community. It could be a useful tool for gaining an understanding of the needs of the disability community.

Texas A&M University. (2020). Project REDD. Available at: https://redd.tamu.edu

Scoring: A zero is received if no mention of ADA accommodations; a one is received for brief mention; a two is received if discussion of ADA accommodations is based in the Fact Basis.

Q 4.14 Do the temporary housing specs meet the community’s housing codes?

Justification: Temporary housing should meet safety and design codes for the community. Design standards should be appropriate for the community context, since they help dictate development of a neighborhood. The standards should help improve or protect both function and aesthetic of the neighborhood. They should enhance a sense of place (Godschalk and Rouse, 2015).

Scoring: Receives a zero if the housing specs do not meet code or are not referenced; received a one if temporary housing specs are aligned with community codes.

** Q 4.15 Does the plan address how to permanently re-house low-income households?

Justification: The majority of residents will be able to recover permanent housing on their own, though insurance and private resources. Marginalized populations, especially low-income, face the slowest recovery rates and will be the main beneficiaries of various housing recovery aid programs, whether through HUD, local aid, or non-profits. By ignoring the needs of marginalized communities, those communities face greater displacement, with research showing that disasters and the recovery aid process itself increases wealth inequality (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020). Furthermore, low-income households often make up the majority of workforce populations that are crucial to economic recovery of a community. Local and state governments are also eligible for additional funding programs if those recovery programs are targeted to low-to-moderate income populations, such as through HUD’s CDBG-DR and DDBG-MIT programs.

Key Definitions: Low-income households are defined as households whose incomes do not exceed 80 percent of the median family income for the area, subject to adjustments for areas with unusually high or low incomes or housing costs.

Additional Resources: Starting on page 17, this report has a method for how to support low-income households as they navigate through the recovery process. Additionally, the report high-
lights areas of critical importance in the recovery process that might often be overlooked.

**Q 4.17 Does the plan provide a procedure to encourage residents to rebuild outside of the vulnerable areas?**

*Scoring:* Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

*Justification:* As disasters occur with more frequency and greater veracity, it is important to build homes and communities with resiliency to help the home weather the disaster. One of the most cost-effective strategies for many disasters, but especially flood-related disasters, is to encourage construction outside of flood-prone areas. This “non-structural” mitigation tool reduces the amount of property in harm’s way (Peacock et al. 2011).

*Guidance:* Using information from Fact Basis to gain an understanding of hazard prone areas within the community jurisdiction and encourage through education, buyouts, or relocation for residents to leave these areas.

*Additional Resources:* This website provides a broad overview of buyouts and the Federal government’s involvement with the buyout program. This resource can help planners further their understanding of this tool.

This handbook provides an in-depth overview of federal laws and regulations surrounding buyouts and how to implement buyouts in the community. This is a very practical resource that planners can use when deciding how to implement buyouts in their community.

**Q 4.18 Does the plan address affordable housing supply needs?**

*Scoring:* Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

*Justification:* Often, communities lose a large proportion of their affordable housing during disasters, much of which may not be replaced. It is critical to plan for the replacement and even enhancement of the supply of affordable housing. Particularly for low-wage workers who are necessary for the recovery of the local economy, the supply of affordable housing can determine whether they are able to stay in a community or have to relocate to a community with a better supply of affordable housing.

*Key Definitions:* Affordable housing means a family spends 30% of their income on housing expenses at any income level (HUD User, n.d.).

*Guidance:* Using data collected in the fact basis section to guide how much affordable housing is needed for the community.

*Scoring:* Scored as a zero if not discussed; scored as a one if mentioned with attempts to only maintain the current amount of affordable housing. Scored as a two if affordable housing is affirmed and discussed to expand access.
**Q 4.19 Does the plan address the public housing supply needs?**

*Justification:* Public housing includes housing for the most marginalized populations (including low-income, elderly, and persons with disabilities). This housing is subsidized by the federal government, and, unfortunately, is affected by disasters. Rising rental rates post-disaster due to changes in supply and demand affect the ability of public housing residents to access rental units that accept their aid. These populations and public housing itself can become a contentious issue post-disaster, thus efforts should be made to ensure public input and access to decision-making.

*Key Definitions:* According to HUD public housing is a way for “decent and safe” housing to be provided to low-income residents. Public housing includes both project-based spaces (multi-family units) as well as housing voucher (Section 8) recipients.

*Guidance:* Using data collected in the fact basis section to guide how much public housing is needed for the community.

*Scoring:* Scored as a zero if not discussed; scored as a one if mentioned with attempts to only maintain the current amount of public housing. Scored as a two if public housing is affirmed and discussed to expand access.

**Q 4.20 Does the plan identify temporary waiver or modification of an existing local code, ordinance, or regulation on an emergency basis that may apply in the event of a disaster declaration in order to expedite the process of providing temporary housing or rebuilding residential structures for persons displaced by a disaster?**

*Justification:* This item is required by SB 289 legislation. Having pre-identified changes to the existing code will help expedite recovery. But these changes should instill resilience and equity, not undermine future resilience. For example, waiving certain building codes themselves may actually increase vulnerability to future events. Waivers around placement of temporary mobile homes or FEMA trailers are also common modifications needed post-disaster (see Schwab 2014 for additional information on types of modifications that can speed recovery without undermining resilience).

*Guidance:* Clear guidelines on the circumstances that trigger modifications and waivers as well as timelines for when they expire should be detailed along with the exact codes, ordinances, and regulations to be waived.

*Scoring:* Receives a zero if not discussed; a one if waivers are mentioned; and a two if waivers are described along with consideration of potential negative impacts and timelines for implementation and removal of waivers.

**Q 4.21 Does the plan identify temporary changes to the tax code or assessment process following the disaster?**

*Justification:* Disaster damaged homes can be reassessed to ensure the taxation is appropriate to the post-disaster condition. Local jurisdictions get to choose whether and how these assessments are completed. Some jurisdictions have not completed post-disaster assessments, instead allowing individuals to ask for the reassessment on an individual property basis. Reassessment is expensive depending on the size of the jurisdiction, and must be balanced with the needs of residents for
taxation relief and the jurisdiction to ensure continued accurate and fair property tax collection.

Scoring: Receives a zero if not discussed; a one if changes are mentioned; and a two if changes are described along with consideration of potential negative impacts and timelines for implementation and removal of changes.

Q 4.22 Does the plan identify any temporary changes to the permitting process after a disaster?

Justification: Recovery requires many hours of permitting work to ensure properties are evaluated efficiently and quickly. Changes to the process of permitting that speed it, but also still ensure that building codes and requirements are not undermined can speed and ease rebuilding for property owners.

Scoring: Receives a zero if not discussed; a one if changes are mentioned; and a two if changes are described along with consideration of potential negative impacts and timelines for implementation and removal of changes.

Q 4.23 Does the plan identify any temporary changes to the inspection process after a disaster?

Justification: Similarly, recovery requires effective use of building inspectors. Additional inspectors are often hired or provided via MOU from neighboring jurisdictions. The jurisdiction should determine which inspections could be waived and which inspections must be completed.

Scoring: Receives a zero if not discussed; a one if changes are mentioned; and a two if changes are described along with consideration of potential negative impacts and timelines for implementation and removal of changes.

Q 4.24 For communities that have adopted NFIP standards locally, does the plan have a method to conduct damage assessments for the substantial damage determination process of individual buildings?

Justification: Substantial damage determinations are required by NFIP guidelines.

Key Definitions: Damage assessments are appraisals that are performed after the disaster to determine the damage in the area. (Community Development Corporation of Brownsville and WORKSHOP, 2015)

Guidance: Develop new guidelines for partnerships between local planning staff members and floodplain administrators (with GIS capabilities) and county tax assessor officials to develop a more streamlined process for determining market values for different sectors of the community (Lorente, Masterson, and Berke, 2019).

Additional Resources: This website is a library of damage assessment documents.

This manual outlines a methodology for damage assessments.

This manual outlines a methodology for damage assessments.

** Q 4.26 Does the plan have an unmet needs assessment at the beginning?

*Justification:* Unmet needs assessments are required to determine the amount of federal funding received for a federally declared disaster. The ultimate goal of an unmet needs assessment is to enable communities to better design recovery programs that are responsive to the types and locations of actual needs on the ground.

*Scoring:* Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.


** Q 4.34 Does the plan identify how material will be procured after a disaster?**

*Justification:* Pre-identifying and procurement of items before a disaster occurs can help avoid the price spike and keep cost lower for the community (Community Development Corporation of Brownsville and WORKSHOP, 2015, 123).

*Scoring:* Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

** Q 4.35 Does this plan have a process to check licensing credentials on contractors?**

*Justification:* After disasters, communities often deal with an influx of contractors that are not aware of communities regulation, codes, or hazard areas. These contractors can often do more harm than good when assisting during recovery (Lorente, Masterson, and Berke, 2019, p. 29).

*Guidance:* Local residents and businesses must be able to view and submit contractor reviews. A web-based consumer review system would allow for additional public input into the strengths and weaknesses of recovery and serve as an additional indicator for jurisdictions when deciding whether a specific contractor is suited to the recovery task in question (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020).
Scoring: Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

Q 4.41 Does the plan identify housing at risk to asbestos or lead?

**Justiceification**: Asbestos or lead can pose a health danger to residents after a disaster, and are common in older homes. They require contractors with specific licenses to ensure environmental and health safety during removal.

**Key Definitions**: Asbestos is a natural mineral composed of thin fibers. Housing built prior to 1970 is likely to have both asbestos and lead-based paint. Unless these toxins are encapsulated, they must be removed by qualified contractors.

**Guidance**: Provide education on Asbestos and lead after a disaster. Encourage testing for individuals.

Scoring: Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

Q 4.42 Does the plan address the use of tenant vouchers?

**Justiceification**: Tenant vouchers are commonly used by low-income residents post-disasters and aid in their recovery.

**Key Definitions**: Tenant-Based Vouchers provide rental assistance for low-income residents to access properties on the private rental market.

Scoring: Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

**Q 4.44 Does the plan have a process to educate residents about the rebuilding process?**

**Justiceification**: Education is important for residents to increase their understanding of the situation, reduce delays, and improve their system efficiency (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020). They also need to be aware of any building code changes, buy-out or aid opportunities, and permitting and inspection processes to ensure they do not rebuild in ways inappropriate to the standards set post-disaster.

**Guidance**: Education should be frequent and use multiple channels of dissemination to ensure all residents are able to access the information.

**Additional Resources**: While this resource focuses on educational outreach to Latino communities, there are best practices on educating disaster survivors that could be generalized to the local community.


Scoring: Receives a zero if not discussed; receives a one if mentioned and general description of education process; and receives a two if detailed education program is discussed that emphasizes transparency, inclusivity, and frequency of communication.

**Q 4.45 Does the plan identify a fair and efficient process for residents to access disaster recovery assistance?**
Q 4.47 Does the plan have a process to educate residents about outreach and case management services?

*Guidance:* Case management focuses on a variety of recovery needs and is often offered by non-profit organizations post-disaster. Residents will need to understand where and how to sign up for case management and what information will be required throughout the process.

*Additional Resources:* While this resource focuses on educational outreach to Latino communities, there are best practices on educating disaster survivors that could be generalized to the local community.


*Scoring:* Receives a zero if not discussed; receives a one if mentioned and general description of education process; and receives a two if detailed education program is discussed that emphasizes transparency, inclusivity, and frequency of communication.

---

Q 4.48 Does the plan have a triage system to help identify households most in need?

*Justification:* families and individuals will be at different levels of need and assistance, creating a process to help identify those most in need will help survivors access resources as quickly as possible.

*Guidance:* A triage system should be based on need, focus on centralized communication and streamlined for efficiency.


Starting on page 17, this report has a method for triaging and intaking for survivors of disasters that could be adapted for the local community.


*Scoring:* Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

Q 4.49 Does the plan have a system for matching households with case managers?

*Justification:* Case managers are important resources for families to rely on during the recovery process. Case managers should be a bridge be-
Q 4.58 Does this plan identify a means to protect the personal information within an application?

Scoring: Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

Guidance: Personal information on finances, health, family status, and many other factors are used during recovery by multiple organizations to assess need and provide resources. Protecting this information is crucial to ensure public trust and safety, but also must be considered within the context of recovery efficiency. Standard security measures should be used to safeguard the public’s private information from illegal use.

Scoring: Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

Q 4.59 Does this plan identify a means to back up data?

Justification: Backing up data helps increase transparency during emergencies. Backing up data also saves important files if a system crash or hard drive failure occurs.

Guidance: Expand HMGP funds to cover projects aimed at protecting data servers and/or set up cloud backup services storing information about housing inventory in SFHAs, permit records, appraisal information, and other critical local information for substantial damage on properties located in SFHAs. - Ensure that local officials are trained to maintain consistent, equitable and defendable records in all aspects of the substantial damage evaluation process (Lorente, Masterson, and Berke, 2019).

Scoring: Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

Q 4.61 Does the plan provide procedures to maximize cost efficiency?

Scoring: Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

** Q 4.62 Does the plan specify whether the local government that submitted the plan or GLO, as determined by GLO, will administer disaster rebuilding activities under the plan?

Justification: This process is required by SB 249.

Scoring: Receives a zero if not discussed; a one if mentioned; and a two if discussed and drawn from the fact basis.

** Q 4.63 Does the plan include specifics on additional deliverables, actions, and/or policies?

Justification: Any additional information that the community needs in order to have a strong housing recovery plan can be listed here.
Scoring: Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.

** Q 4.64 Does the plan identify which policies and actions come from other plans?

Guidance: The housing plan should not be in conflict with other plans within the community and region. Screen the plan against other regional and community plans.

Scoring: Scored as a zero if not discussed, scored as a one if discussed.
SECTION 5: INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL COORDINATION
Section 5: Interorganizational Coordination

Disaster resilience is greatly improved through better interorganizational coordination between governmental agencies, public, nonprofit, and private partners across local, state, and federal levels. In a recovery plan, interorganizational coordination should identify key agencies, nonprofits, or other organizations that will participate in implementation of the plan. It should identify under what conditions these organizations will be called upon, the nature of the relationship, and the role of these organizations in plan development and implementation. This section of the HRPA Tool assesses the many relationships specific to the housing recovery process that improve the likelihood of successful plan creation, implementation, and support. Interorganizational coordination also refers to integration of the plan with other planning initiatives, such as the community’s comprehensive plan, emergency management plan, hazard mitigation plan, and the consolidated housing plan. It should also address consistency with plans in which it may be nested, such as any county or regional plans.

Number of Questions: 12
Scores possible: 0-14
Required to pass: Score of 1 (or greater) on two questions: Q 5.17 and Q 5.19
Q 5.2 Does the plan have a section for local nonprofits that deal with housing?

*Justification:* Local community organizations and networks are often best suited to understand the local communities needs as well as are most trusted by community members for these services (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020). They also may already have lists of clients in need of housing support or programs that could be revised to meet disaster recovery needs quickly.

*Key Definitions:* Examples of local nonprofits can include, but are not limited to: utility assistance programs, rental housing support programs, agencies that operate housing vouchers and public housing units, the long-term recovery team or organization, local religious institutions, and many others.

*Guidance:* Reach out to nonprofits in your local community to determine if they have a housing aspect to their mission that could include emergency housing support, rental assistance, or volunteer and financial support for repair or rebuilding. A community asset assessment can prove useful in this effort.


*Scoring:* Scored 0 if no discussion of these organizations, and scored 1 if organizations are identified and their role is discussed.

---

Q 5.3 Does the plan have a section for local community leaders?

*Justification:* The support of community leaders is crucial to the successful plan creation, adoption, and implementation (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020). These leaders will encourage the public to participate in the plan development process, the use of the plan in the case of a disaster, as well as help the housing recovery team access resources needed to complete the planning and plan implementation process.

*Key Definitions:* Local community leaders can be those who widely represent the community, as well as those who represent specific sectors, population groups, or neighborhoods. Some examples are: elected officials, religious leaders, local business owners, teachers, philanthropic leaders in the community, neighborhood association or community organization leaders, etc.

*Guidance:* Identity and reach out to those leaders in the community to determine their contribution to plan development and implementation. Some elected officials will have specified roles in a disaster, such as county judges in Texas. But other leaders may not understand how they can use their influence to contribute to the housing recovery. Outline a variety of responsibilities & roles that you need from local community leaders. They could contribute to the fact basis of the plan, offer their leadership assistance post-disaster to housing coordination, bring their organizations volunteers and donations to support the coordinated housing recovery goals, among others.

*Scoring:* Scored 0 if no discussion of these leaders, and scored 1 if leaders are identified and their role is discussed.
Q 5.4 Does the plan have a section for regional organizations?

**Justification:** While all disasters are local, regional coordination is needed to ensure that housing recovery plans draw from available resources and coordinate with outside agencies that may have additional expertise, staff, and funding to support housing recovery (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020).

**Key Definitions:** Many regional agencies have specified support roles in disasters. In Texas these include Regional Advisory Councils, Councils of Governments, and Texas Department of Emergency Management Regional headquarters. Also many neighboring jurisdictions can support recovery efforts and coordinate needs and application efforts in both large and small disasters.

**Guidance:** Identify what regional organizations play a role in the housing sector in your community. Connect with regional governmental agencies that have some role in disaster.

**Scoring:** Scored 0 if no discussion of these organizations, and scored 1 if organizations are identified and their role is discussed.

Q 5.5 Does the plan have a section for VOADs and emerging volunteer organizations?

**Key Definitions:** Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (VOADs) are nonprofit organizations whose mission is focused on disaster.

**Justification:** VOADs offer a variety of support for both pre- and post-disaster needs including financial donations and grants, in kind support, grants, volunteer labor, training programs, case management, and housing repair and rebuilding.

**Guidance:** NVOAD provides educational materials on their website, and every state as a state chapter of the VOAD. The Texas state chapter is coordinated by OneStar Foundation as of 2021.

**Additional Resources:** This resource provides a great overview of VOADS and potential emerging volunteer organizations. It can be a useful tool in understanding these groups and planning for them.


This website specifically deals with the VOADs in Texas.


**Scoring:** Scored 0 if no discussion of these organizations, and scored 1 if organizations are identified and their role is discussed.

Q 5.6 Does the plan have a section for local businesses?

**Justification:** Whole community resilience calls for all local organizations, including businesses, to contribute to disaster preparedness (Saadian, Gordon, Patton, and Rambler 2020). As the backbone of the local economy and employment opportunities, local businesses have the leadership and the resources to contribute to housing recovery.
Q 5.7 Does the plan have a section for local housing inspectors?

*Justification:* Additional inspectors are often needed post-disaster to meet demand. Utilizing local inspectors can keep economic resources local and ensure that inspectors understand local codes.

*Key Definitions:* A housing inspector ensures that builders, property owners and managers comply with local regulations and codes.

*Guidance:* Look for contact information and define their responsibilities and role you need from housing inspectors.

*Scoring:* Scored 0 if no discussion of this position, and scored 1 if identified and their role is discussed.

Q 5.8 Does the plan have a section for emergency managers?

*Justification:* Emergency management plays an important coordinating role in disaster recovery, though they may not lead the housing recovery effort. They also coordinate hazard mitigation and emergency operations plans, which should be integrated with the housing recovery plan.

*Key Definitions:* Emergency managers are professionals who are tasked with the responsibility of helping communities and organizations anticipate hazards and vulnerability, and undertake measures to more effectively deal with disasters (e.g., mitigate, prepare for, respond to and recover from them).

*Guidance:* Emergency management should help develop this section of the plan, provide feedback, support access to grants and resources, and ensure integration with hazard mitigation and emergency response plans.

*Scoring:* Scored 0 if no discussion of emergency managers, and scored 1 if identified and their role is discussed.

Q 5.9 Does this plan discuss coordination with a federal disaster coordinator or similar position?

*Justification:* This role is defined by the federal government.

*Key Definitions:* The Federal Disaster Recovery Coordinator is responsible for facilitating disaster recovery coordination and collaboration between the Federal, Tribal, State and local governments, the private sector and voluntary, faith-based and community organizations.

*Scoring:* Scored 0 if no discussion of this position, and scored 1 if identified and their role is discussed.
**Q 5.10 Does this plan discuss coordination with a state disaster coordinator or similar position?**

*Justification:* This role is defined by the state government. Ensuring collaboration with the state can speed recovery resources.

*Key Definitions:* The State Disaster Recovery Coordinator is responsible for facilitating disaster recovery coordination and collaboration between the state and local governments, the private sector and voluntary, faith-based and community organizations. In Texas, the Texas Division of Emergency Management has one recovery coordinator in each region and then central recovery staff. Texas local jurisdictions should coordinate with their TDEM Region recovery coordinator(s).


**Q 5.17 Does the plan identify potential areas that need support through MOUs with neighboring jurisdictions and other entities?**

*Scoring:* A 0 for lack of mention of this position; a 1 for definition of this position and potential names/contact information of the position holder.

*Justification:* Disasters cause widespread damage to communities and assistance may be required from other jurisdictions.

*Key Definitions:* Memorandum of Understanding or Agreement (MOU or MOA): an agreement between two or more parties outlined in a formal document. It is not legally binding but signals the willingness of the parties to move forward with a contract. Often used in disasters to support neighboring jurisdictions with supplies, equipment, or personnel.

*Guidance:* Areas of support to consider in MOUs include, but are not limited to: debris removal, construction assistance, additional case workers, volunteers, contractors, and first responder assistance.

*Scoring:* Lack of discussion of MOUs equals a 0, while mention of areas for MOUs and their purpose equal a 1. Description of MOU areas of need that are founded in the Fact Basis of the plan equal a 2.
**Q 5.19 Does the documentation include MOA between service providers to share information?**

*Justification:* A flexible system of documentation must accompany any system for distributing disaster recovery assistance. Disaster recovery involves numerous governmental, nongovernmental, and private organizations that support residents. Usually, survivors are forced to apply for aid at each organization separately.

*Guidance:* In order to employ full categorical eligibility, there must be a system in place that permits tools like alternative documentation to ensure all survivors can receive assistance. Further, a rider document included as an addendum to applications for aid can help in encouraging the sharing of family/household personal identifying information between agencies to reduce the burden of paperwork for survivors. The rider document that asks survivors to approve when and with whom their information is shared gives survivors the power to approve the sharing of their personally identifying information across different agencies. Establishing MOAs between different agencies and aid organizations to allow rider documents will reduce the burden on survivors and speed aid approval processes.

*Additional Resources:* This website hosts a variety of different tablets to help draft realistic messaging.


*Scoring:* No discussion equals a 0, mention and completion of MOA equals a 1; MOA and rider documents completed equals a 2

**Q 5.22 Does the plan reference which existing plans were integrated into the document?**

*Justification:* The housing plan should not be in conflict with any existing plans in the community such as hazard mitigation plan, comprehensive plan, economic development plan, land use plan, capital improvement plan or other plans. If in conflict, implementation will be challenging.

*Scoring:* Reference to which plans were integrated will result in a score of 1. Lack of reference will result in a 0.
SECTION 6:

MONITORING
Section 6: Monitoring

The final section of the HRPA Tool assesses the monitoring and update plan for the housing recovery plan. Monitoring guidance is a part of every community plan. The plan should also have provisions for monitoring progress towards goals and objectives, provisions and a timeline for regular updates and revisions. This section is also responsive to the legislative directive in Senate Bill 289 (2018).

Number of Questions: 3
Scores possible: 0-3
Required to pass: Score of 1 on all three questions, with an exception for post-disaster plans
**Q 6.1** Does the plan identify a procedure to review the plan every four to seven years?

*Justification:* Because community conditions change, pre-disaster housing recovery plans should be reviewed every 4-7 years. This aligns with common time frames for reviewing other hazard plans. Post-disaster housing recovery plans that address a single disaster would not have a review and update timeline.

*Scoring:* A statement on the timeline for review that occurs somewhere between 4 and seven years after completion will score a 1. Post-disaster housing recovery plans for a single disaster will receive a n/a on this question and it will not be used against them.

**Q 6.2** Does the plan have a process to provide the Texas General Land Office with the current document and necessary revisions as they occur?

*Justification:* SB 289 (2018) asks the Hazard Reduction & Recovery Center at Texas A&M University to coordinate with the Texas General Land Office to review and score plans. The housing plan should indicate the process through which they will submit the plan as well as updates and revisions.

*Scoring:* A statement on the process for submitting this information will score a 1.

**Q 6.3** Does the plan have a process to provide the center with a resolution or proclamation adopted by the local government that certifies continued local community support for the current document?
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Housing Recovery Plan Assessment Tool

- A total of 89 items are in the HRPA Tool. Each item will be scored as either pass (1)/ fail (0) or 0/1/2.
- There are 37 questions that are required to receive a 1 or more to pass the assessment. These are marked with **.
- There are 8 principles: address vulnerable populations; affirm resident choice, promote resilience; streamline return to permanent housing; foster inclusive participation in recovery planning and processes; build capacity and promote local business, nonprofits, and leadership; use resources responsible; and communicate transparently. The table below shows the distribution of the items across the principles and the plan sections. It helps us understand where the emphasis of the assessment lies.

### Table 1. Assessment Items Distribution across Principles and Planning Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL ITEMS</th>
<th># of Must Pass Items</th>
<th>Vulnerable Populations</th>
<th>Resident Choice</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Streamline to Permanent</th>
<th>Inclusive Participation</th>
<th>Local Capacity</th>
<th>Resource Responsibility</th>
<th>Communicate Transparency</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact Basis</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interorganizational Coordination</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ITEMS</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback process:

The Texas General Land Office provided feedback on a first draft of the HRPA Tool in June 2020. This is the second draft based on their feedback. This document is being reviewed by stakeholders and those who would be end users rated by this tool. This feedback was received in August 2020 and then the HRPA Tool was revised.
Guiding Principles of Housing Recovery

Both research and practice related to housing recovery identify several principles which should guide any approach to housing recovery after disaster. Housing recovery plans should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Address vulnerable populations.</strong> Housing Recovery plans should explicitly identify and describe both physically and socially vulnerable populations within the community. Plans should carefully consider how planned actions and policies affect these populations, with emphasis on prioritizing their needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirm resident choice.</strong> Plans should, whenever possible, permit resident choice from among multiple options to best meet their families’ needs, both now and in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote Resilience.</strong> Plans, including programs, policies, and actions, should maintain a future orientation, working towards building resilience rather than returning to the status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streamline return to permanent housing</strong> Housing recovery plans should strive to return residents to permanent housing as soon as possible by prioritizing or incentivizing solutions that maintain family togetherness, neighborhood cohesion, normal routines and spatial proximity to neighbors and neighborhood services such as schools, places of worship, groceries, and pharmacies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foster inclusive participation in recovery planning and processes.</strong> Both recovery plan-making processes and planned processes must encourage and provide full participation, transparency, and access to decision-making for the entire community, including traditionally marginalized groups and groups most impacted by disasters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build and promote local capacity in local businesses, nonprofits, and leaders</strong> Housing recovery plans should prioritize the use of qualified local businesses, nonprofits, and leaders throughout the recovery process. When necessary, locals may partner with outside groups, but the emphasis should be on developing capacity among locals and retaining that capacity post-recovery as a means of building resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use resources responsibly.</strong> Disaster recovery funds, whether they come from charitable, local, state, or federal sources, must be handled with strong stewardship, with the aim of achieving an effective, efficient, and equitable outcome for all community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicate Transparently.</strong> Planning processes must strive for openness and transparency in public outreach and communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HRPA Tool Organization

The HRPA Tool is organized into elements that we expect to see in a housing (or general) recovery plan. Plans will use a wide variety of outlines and organizations, so we do not expect all (or any) plans to follow this structure exactly. However, each of these elements should be included in some way.

1. Planning Process
Dr. Van Zandt likes to say, “the process of planning is as important, if not more important, as the plan itself.” How stakeholders are included in the plan-making process can critically influence whether the plan is successful or not. In other words, it can make or break a plan. The process used to gather data, determine goals and objectives, and design policy or actions to implement the goals, should recognize local knowledge and capture the community’s vision and priorities related to how housing recovery should proceed. The plan should include a description of the timelines and activities that were used to gather information, values, visions, and ideas for the development of the plan. It should reflect an open, accessible, inclusive process that brings together individuals and/or groups that represent the range of different constituencies present within the community. A major reason for a PRE-disaster recovery plan is to permit a robust and inclusive process of developing the plan.

2. Fact Basis
A sound fact basis underlies all successful plans. Developing plans without knowing what the community currently has is a recipe for failure. For a housing recovery plan, the fact basis should include a thorough description of:

- Population demographics and trends
- Existing housing stock
- Profile of the local economy, including major industries and employers
- Land use and environmental features

Based on this data, a full vulnerability assessment is needed, including both an assessment of physical vulnerability to any disaster, as well as the social vulnerability of the population. These will identify where vulnerable populations are located and what their housing needs would be in a disaster situation.

Finally, the fact basis should identify administrative, technical, and policy capabilities—in other words, the capacity of the jurisdiction to undertake plan mandates.

3. Goals and Objectives
Nearly all plans include goals and objectives for the community, in this case for the housing recovery process. Goals state the desired future state for the community. In a housing recovery plan or plan element, goals would address what stakeholders want to see the recovery process achieve. There may be goals related to damage assessment, sheltering, temporary housing, and finally permanent housing. Goals might also include ways in which the recovery process might strive
for increased resilience, sustainability, or overcoming pre-existing housing problems related to affordability, quality, or supply, for example. Objectives offer more detail on what goal achievement would look like. They should establish measurable targets, as well as timelines for the achievement of those targets.

4. Implementation
The implementation section(s) of the plan describes how the goals and objectives will be achieved, and the actions that are needed. These may include the design of new strategies or programs to achieve stated objectives, or may identify alterations to existing policies, programs, codes, or regulations (e.g., suspensions or moratoria) in a post-disaster situation. This section will also identify the needed actors (vendors, suppliers, professionals, etc.) that are needed to enact the plan.

5. Interorganizational Coordination
Interorganizational coordination refers to the integration of the plan with other planning initiatives, such as the community’s comprehensive plan, emergency management plan, hazard mitigation plan, and consolidated housing plan. It should also address consistency with plans in which it may be nested, such as any county or regional plans.

In a recovery plan, interorganizational coordination would also identify key agencies, nonprofits, or other organizations that will participate in the implementation of the plan. It should identify under what conditions these organizations will be called upon and the nature of the relationship.

6. Monitoring
The plan should also have provisions for monitoring progress toward goals and objectives, provisions, and a timeline for regular updates and revisions.
## 1. Planning Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                | **1.1 How was the public involved in the development of the plan?   | 0 - No, the public was not included  
|                |                                                                     | 1 - Public opinion was incorporated  
|                |                                                                     | 2 - Public involvement was broad, representative, and consequential to plan development |
|                | 1.2 Did the plan development process have designated community input periods? | 0 - No designated points for community input  
|                |                                                                     | 1 - Few/vague input periods provided for the community  
|                |                                                                     | 2 - Frequent/specif input periods provided for the community |
|                | 1.3 Did the plan development process allow for public participation to be completed in a timely manner? | 0 - Public participation was short and rushed  
|                |                                                                     | 1 - Public participation period allowed time for robust public engagement |
|                | 1.4 Did the plan development process include efforts to intentionally reach out to communities that would not normally participate in the public outreach process? | 0 - No, the planning process did not include vulnerable populations  
|                |                                                                     | 1 - The plan articulates how vulnerable populations within the larger population were included in the plan development |
|                | 1.5 Did community input periods occur with the support of local community organizations? | 0 - Local community organizations are not included  
|                |                                                                     | 1 - Local community organizations support public input process |
|                | 1.6 Were community input periods structured to be inclusive? | 0 - The meetings are not inclusive or no information provided  
<p>|                |                                                                     | 1 - The meetings are inclusive |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**1.7 Was public feedback incorporated into the plan?</td>
<td>0 - Public is not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Notice and comment period is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Notice and comment period is provided AND a process to incorporate public feedback is listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8 Was the data gathering process made available for public input?</td>
<td>0 - The process is not available for the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - The process is available for the public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Fact Basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![icon] | **2.1 Does the plan include or reference a historical hazard analysis for the jurisdiction?** | 0 - No historical hazard analysis included  
1 - Historical hazard analysis included  
2 - Used scientific data collection and analysis to develop historical hazard analysis |
| ![icon] | **2.2 Does the plan include or reference a future hazard analysis for the jurisdiction?** | 0 - No future hazard analysis included  
1 - Future hazard analysis included  
2 - Used scientific data collection and analysis to develop future hazard analysis |
| ![icon] | **2.3 Does the plan identify areas that are less susceptible to disaster damage?** | 0 - No areas are identified  
1 - Areas are identified  
2 - Used scientific data collection and analysis to identify areas |
| ![icon] | **2.4 Does the plan include or reference a demographic profile of the jurisdiction?** | 0 - No demographic profile included  
1 - Basic demographic (population size, race, ethnicity, gender) profile included  
2 - Demographic profile provides a robust analysis of the population within the jurisdiction |
| ![icon] | **2.5 Does the plan identify socially vulnerable groups within the local government jurisdiction?** | 0 - No social vulnerable populations listed  
1 - Socially vulnerable populations are mentioned but not detailed adequately  
2 - Detailed profiles of social vulnerable populations within the jurisdiction are listed |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2.6** | Does the plan identify people with disabilities within the local government jurisdiction? | 0 - Populations with disabilities are not discussed  
1 - Populations with disabilities are mentioned but not detailed adequately  
2 - Using fact-based methods, particular challenges facing populations with disabilities have been identified. |
| **2.9** | Does the plan identify features of the built environment within the local government jurisdiction that are physically vulnerable to disasters? | 0 - No physical vulnerabilities listed  
1 - Physical vulnerabilities listed, with little analysis  
2 - Physical vulnerabilities listed, with robust analysis |
| **2.10** | Does the plan include or reference the current land use, future land use map, and zoning map? | 0 - No discussion on where displaced residents can move to  
1 - Maps are included or referenced OR a discussion on where displaced residents can move to |
| **2.11** | Does the plan include or reference a housing analysis of the jurisdiction? | 0 - No housing analysis included  
1 - Housing analysis included  
2 - Used scientific data collection and analysis to develop housing analysis of jurisdiction |
| 2.12 | Does the plan identify the use of public housing choice vouchers within the local jurisdiction? | 0 - No housing voucher analysis included  
1 - Housing voucher analysis included |
| 2.13 | Does the plan identify project-based public housing units within the local jurisdiction? | 0 - No project based public housing analysis included  
1 - Project based public housing analysis included |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|               | 2.14 Does the plan include an inventory of available facilities that can aid in recovery? | 0 - No inventory provided  
1 - A inventory is provided with contact information for owners/managers                                                                                     |
|               | 2.15 Does the plan include or reference emergency sheltering capacity, including motel/hotel capacity? | 0 - No reference to emergency sheltering capacity  
1 - References emergency sheltering capacity, including contact information for facilities managers/owners.                                           |
|               | 2.16 Does the plan include or reference an economic profile of the jurisdiction? | 0 - No economic profile of jurisdiction  
1 - Basic economic profile with minimal analysis included  
2 - Economic profile provides a robust analysis of the economic situation and conditions of the jurisdiction |
| n/a           | 2.17 Does the plan provide more detail with Appendices?               | 0 - No appendices  
1 - Appendices are provided                                                                                                                                   |
| n/a           | 2.18 Does the plan provide a reference list?                         | 0 - No appendices  
1 - References are provided                                                                                                                                     |
## 3. Goals & Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![House Icon] | 3.1 Does the plan reference evidence-based shelter locations? | 0 - The plan does not reference shelter locations  
1 - The plan references sheltering location grounded in fact |
| ![House Icon] | 3.2 Does the plan identify a goal for moving people out of emergency shelters within 6 weeks post-event? | 0 - The plan does not provide a timeline for moving households out of emergency shelters  
1 - The plan provides a timeline for moving households out of emergency shelters |
| ![House Icon] | 3.3 Does the plan identify how temporary housing will be provided? | 0 - The plan does not address temporary housing  
1 - The plan addresses temporary housing |
| ![House Icon] | 3.4 Does the plan offer a goal to provide temporary housing within six months of disaster? | 0 - The plan does not mention how temporary housing will be provided within six months of disaster  
1 - The plan does mention how temporary housing will be provided within six months of disaster |
| ![House Icon] | **3.6 Does the plan identify processes for assessing and reporting housing damage, disaggregated by insured and uninsured losses?** | 0 - Process is not mentioned or not clear  
1 - Process is clear and efficient providing different roles and responsibilities to get information to the Governor |
| ![House Icon] | **3.7 Does the plan address the repair/rebuilding of permanent homes?** | 0 - The plan does not address repair/rebuilding of permanent homes  
1 - The plan does address repair/rebuilding of permanent homes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.9</strong></td>
<td>Does the plan identify metrics that can be used to identify progress to achieving the overarching timeline’s goals?</td>
<td>0 - No metrics are identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Metrics to achieving the timeline’s goals are identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.13</strong></td>
<td>Is new construction encouraged to be ADA compliant?</td>
<td>0 - No language surrounding accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Language supporting accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.14</strong></td>
<td>Does the plan provide a range of housing options?</td>
<td>0 - No housing options provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Limited housing options provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Housing options provided based on community need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.15</strong></td>
<td>Does the plan prioritize the rebuilding of affordable homes?</td>
<td>0 - No language surrounding affordable homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Language supporting affordable homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Strong language supporting affordable homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.21</strong></td>
<td>Does the plan discuss Case Management?</td>
<td>0 - Case management is not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Case management is mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.24</strong></td>
<td>Does the plan discuss the rebuilding of neighborhood infrastructure?</td>
<td>0 - Infrastructure is not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Infrastructure is mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.26</strong></td>
<td>Does the plan discuss the homeless population within the community?</td>
<td>0 - No homeless population needs mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Brief discussion on homeless population’s needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle Icon</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description/Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>Does the plan have a process for directing undocumented populations to eligible support services?</td>
<td>0 - No mention of how to deal with undocumented populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - The plan has a process for providing government assistance that is available to undocumented populations OR a process to match undocumented populations to eligible support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.30</strong></td>
<td>Does the plan promote overarching community resilience to future hazards?</td>
<td>0 - Does not address resiliency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - The plan coordinates housing recovery with resiliency and reduction of damage from future disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - The plan strongly moves the whole community forward in advancing resilience, with metrics to show the effect of housing plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1            | Does the plan highlight what general information will be available to the public? | 0 - Specific information is not listed  
1 - Specific information is listed |
| 4.2            | Does the plan address how the government will share information with the public? | 0 - The plan does not define how the government will share information or no information will be shared  
1 - The plan somewhat defines what information will be shared with the public  
2 - The plan defines what information will be shared with an emphasis on transparency, frequency, and inclusion |
| **4.3**        | Is all information pertaining to the housing process available to the public? | 0 - Public does not have access to the information  
1 - Statement of where the information is located and how it is available to the public |
| 4.4            | Does the plan highlight what general information will be available to stakeholders? | 0 - Specific information is not listed  
1 - Specific information is listed |
| 4.5            | Does the plan address how the government will share information with stakeholders? | 0 - No, process for how information will be shared  
1 - Yes, with their contact information OR responsibility for executing this plan  
2 - Yes, with their contact information AND responsibility for executing this plan |
| **4.8**        | Does this plan protect public review in the immediate aftermath of a disaster? | 0 - The plan does not protect public review  
1 - A statement affirms and protects public review |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|               | 4.9 Are there designated community input points during the recovery phase? | 0 - No designated points for community input  
1 - Few/vague input periods provided for the community  
2 - Frequent/specific input periods provided for the community |
|               | 4.10 Does the recovery phase include efforts to intentionally reach out to communities that would not normally participate? | 0 - No the planning process did not include vulnerable communities  
1 - The plan articulates how vulnerable populations within the larger population were included in the plan development |
|               | 4.11 Is community feedback incorporated in the recovery process? | 0 - Public participation had a weak influence on recovery process  
1 - Public participation was incorporated into the recovery process |
|               | 4.12 Does the plan identify areas of temporary affordable housing within the community? | 0 - No areas are identified  
1 - Areas are identified  
2 - Areas are identified and encourage resiliency (i.e. locations away from a flood plain) |
|               | **4.13 Does this plan provide a list of temporary housing options that have ADA accommodation? | 0 - No ADA accommodations mentioned  
1 - ADA accommodations mentioned  
2 - ADA accommodations based on data collected in the fact basis |
|               | 4.14 Do the temporary housing specs meet the community’s housing codes? | 0 - The temporary housing specs do not meet community code  
1 - The temporary housing specs do meet community code |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**4.15 Does the plan address how to permanently re-house low-income households?</td>
<td>0 - The plan does not address this topic&lt;br&gt;1 - The plan addresses this topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**4.17 Does the plan provide a procedure to encourage residents to rebuild outside of the vulnerable areas?</td>
<td>0 - It does not encourage residents to move out of vulnerable areas&lt;br&gt;1 - It encourages residents to move out of vulnerable areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**4.18 Does the plan address affordable housing supply needs?</td>
<td>0 - No mention of affordable homes&lt;br&gt;1 - Mild language on affordable housing/maintaining pre-disaster affordable housing supply&lt;br&gt;2 - Strong language on affordable housing/expanding on pre-disaster affordable housing supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**4.19 Does the plan address the public housing supply needs?</td>
<td>0 - No mention of public housing&lt;br&gt;1 - Mild language on public housing/maintaining pre-disaster public housing supply&lt;br&gt;2 - Strong language on public housing/expanding on pre-disaster public housing supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle Icon</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description/Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|               | **4.20 Does the plan identify temporary waiver or modification of an existing local code, ordinance, or regulation on an emergency basis that may apply in the event of a disaster declaration in order to expedite the process of providing temporary housing or rebuilding residential structures for persons displaced by a disaster?** | 0 - No changes listed  
1 - Changes to expedite recovery are listed  
2 - Changes to expedite recovery are listed and consideration of negative externalities is provided; provides a timeframe on changes |
|               | 4.21 Does the plan identify temporary changes to the tax code or assessment process following the disaster? | 0 - No changes listed  
1 - Changes to expedite recovery are listed  
2 - Changes to expedite recovery are listed and consideration of negative externalities is provided; provides a timeframe on changes |
|               | 4.22 Does the plan identify any temporary changes to the permitting process after a disaster? | 0 - No changes listed  
1 - Changes to expedite recovery are listed  
2 - Changes to expedite recovery are listed and consideration of negative externalities is provided; provides a timeframe on changes |
|               | 4.23 Does the plan identify any temporary changes to the inspection process after a disaster? | 0 - No changes listed  
1 - Changes to expedite recovery are listed  
2 - Changes to expedite recovery are listed and consideration of negative externalities is provided; provides a timeframe on changes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![House Icon]  | 4.24 For communities that have adopted NFIP standards locally, does the plan have a method to conduct damage assessments for the substantial damage determination process of individual buildings? | 0 - There is no second damage assessment  
1 - There is a second damage assessment |
| ![House Icon]  | **4.26 Does the plan have an unmet needs assessment at the beginning?** | 0 - No description provided  
1 - A brief description of the unmet needs assessment is included  
2 - Unmet needs assessment emphasizes equity and grounded in fact basis |
| ![House Icon]  | 4.34 Does the plan identify how material will be procured after a disaster? | 0 - No procurement process is stated  
1 - A procurement process is explicitly stated |
| ![Brick Icon]  | 4.35 Does this plan have a process to check licensing credentials on contractors? | 0 - No means to check licensing  
1 - Statement affirming that licenses will be checked |
| ![Brick Icon]  | 4.41 Does the plan identify housing at risk to asbestos or lead? | 0 - A process for asbestos or lead abatement not stated  
1 - A process for asbestos or lead abatement is referenced |
| ![Brick Icon]  | 4.42 Does the plan address the use of tenant vouchers? | 0 - Tenant vouchers are not discussed  
1 - Tenant vouchers are discussed |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![Icon](image) | **4.44** Does the plan have a process to educate residents about the rebuilding process? | 0 - Not process to educate residents defined  
1 - The plan has a general statement on resident education programming  
2 - The plan defines the resident education program with an emphasis on transparency, frequency, and inclusion |
| ![Icon](image) | **4.45** Does the plan identify a fair and efficient process for residents to access disaster recovery assistance? | 0 - The plan does not identify process  
1 - The plan does identify a process  
2 - The plan identifies a process that is also fair and efficient |
| ![Icon](image) | 4.47 Does the plan have a process to educate residents about outreach and case management services? | 0 - Not process to educate residents defined  
1 - The plan has a general statement on resident education programming  
2 - The plan defines the resident education program with an emphasis on transparency, frequency, and inclusion |
| ![Icon](image) | 4.48 Does the plan have a triage system to help identify households most in need? | 0 - Triage process is not listed  
1 - Triage process is listed |
| ![Icon](image) | 4.49 Does the plan have a system for matching households with case managers? | 0 - No way to match households with case managers  
1 - Description of how the two parties are matched |
| ![Icon](image) | 4.58 Does this plan identify a means to protect the personal information within an application? | 0 - No protection of personal information  
1 - Language surrounding protection of personal information |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![House Icon](image) | 4.59 Does this plan identify a means to back up data? | 0 - A process to back up data is not identified  
1 - A process to back up data is identified |
| ![Dollar Icon](image) | **4.61 Does the plan provide procedures to maximize cost efficiency?** | 0 - No procedure identified  
1 - A procedure identified  
2 - A procedure to maximize cost efficiency grounded in fact base data |
| ![Wall Icon](image) | **4.62 Does the plan specify whether the local government that submitted the plan or GLO, as determined by GLO, will administer disaster rebuilding activities under the plan?** | 0 - There is no statement on the responsible state agency’s role in the plan  
1 - There is a statement on the responsible state agency’s role in the plan |
| ![Wall Icon](image) | **4.63 Does the plan include specifics on additional deliverables, actions, and/or policies?** | 0- No mention of additional material  
1- Additional material mentioned |
| ![Wall Icon](image) | **4.64 Does the plan identify which policies and actions come from other plans?** | 0 - No mention of policies and actions from other plans  
1- Yes, policies and actions include identification of other plans that they come from |
## 5. Interorganizational Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="People Icon" /></td>
<td>5.2 Does the plan have a section for local nonprofits that deal with housing?</td>
<td>0 - No, nonprofits listed 1 - Yes, with their contact information and responsibility for executing this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="People Icon" /></td>
<td>5.3 Does the plan have a section for local community leaders?</td>
<td>0 - No, local community leaders listed 1 - Yes, with their contact information and responsibility for executing this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="People Icon" /></td>
<td>5.4 Does the plan have a section for regional organizations?</td>
<td>0 - No, regional organizations listed 1 - Yes, with their contact information and responsibility for executing this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="People Icon" /></td>
<td>5.5 Does the plan have a section for VOADs and emerging volunteer organizations?</td>
<td>0 - No, VOADs and emerging volunteer organizations listed 1 - Yes, with their contact information and responsibility for executing this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="People Icon" /></td>
<td>5.6 Does the plan have a section for local businesses?</td>
<td>0 - No, local businesses listed 1 - Yes, with their contact information and responsibility for executing this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="People Icon" /></td>
<td>5.7 Does the plan have a section for local housing inspectors?</td>
<td>0 - No, local housing inspectors listed 1 - Yes, with their contact information and responsibility for executing this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="People Icon" /></td>
<td>5.8 Does the plan have a section for emergency managers?</td>
<td>0 - No, emergency managers listed 1 - Yes, with their contact information and responsibility for executing this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Buildings Icon" /></td>
<td>5.9 Does this plan discuss coordination with a federal disaster coordinator or similar position?</td>
<td>0 - No federal disaster coordinator or similar position identified 1 - Name of federal disaster coordinator or similar position identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle Icon</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description/Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10 Does this plan discuss coordination with a state disaster coordinator or similar position?</td>
<td>0 - No state disaster coordinator or similar position identified 1 - Name of state disaster coordinator or similar position identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.17</strong> Does the plan identify potential areas that need support through MOUs with neighboring jurisdictions and other entities?</td>
<td>0 - No areas have been identified 1 - The plan has identified areas of need 2 - The plan has identified areas of need, grounded in fact basis data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.19</strong> Does the documentation include MOA between service providers to share information?</td>
<td>0 - No MOAs are identified 1 - Majority of MOAs are in place 2 - MOAs in place and rider document included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.22 Does the plan reference which existing plans were integrated into the document?</td>
<td>0 - The plan does not identify how other plans were integrated into this document 1 - The plan does identify how other plans were integrated into this document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Icon</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>**6.1 Does the plan identify a procedure to review the plan every four to seven years?</td>
<td>0 - The plan is either not reviewed or reviewed either every 0-3 years or 8+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - The plan is reviewed every 4-7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a - Post-disaster recovery plans for a single event that already occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>**6.2 Does the plan have a process to provide the Texas General Land Office with the current document and necessary revisions as they occur?</td>
<td>0 - There is no system to provide revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - There is a system to provide with revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>**6.3 Does the plan have a process to provide the center with resolution or proclamation adopted by the local government that certifies continued local community support for the current document?</td>
<td>0 - No description of this process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Description of this process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>