

Bladen, Columbus, Robeson Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

HIRA Meeting – Thursday, April 17th, 2025 @ 3pm EDT

Meeting Attendees	
Ryan Cox, Insight Danielle Taliaferro, Insight (scribe) Melissa Graham, Insight Carl Baker, NCEM Mitigation Plans Manager Darren Norris, Columbus Regional Healthcare System, Emergency Manager Greg Elkins, Bladen County Joey Coleman, Bladen County, Emergency Management Renee Babson, Bladen County EM Teresa Smith, Columbus County EM Services Deputy Director Josh Ward, Brunswick (Columbus)	PH: 910-874-2102 PH: 910-653-3458 Doris Underwood, Parkton Mayor Nathan Slaughter, NCEM John Mello, NCEM Hazard Mitigation Planner Angela Pitchford, Town Manager, Maxton (Robeson) Peyton Campbell, AECOM Sean Martin, Town Administrator, White Lake (Bladen) Kelly Keefe, AECOM Justin Hunt, Interim EM Director, Robeson Claudia Bray, Sandyfield/Bolton (Columbus)

- I. Ryan Cox opens meeting
- II. Intros/Review Agenda
- III. Planning process
 - a. Review of steps
- IV. Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment (HIRA)
 - a. Steps 4 & 5 of the update process
- V. Review of major Disasters in the Bladen, Columbus, Robeson (BCR) Region
 - a. Existing plans review
 - b. Hazards not included in current plan – review
 - c. Any desire from group to add?
 - i. Joey Coleman, Bladen re: adding action items – Ryan suggests sending in email so it can be captured in the next meeting (Mitigation Strategy)
 - ii. Nathan Slaughter re: excluded hazards – extreme heat – it has been popular topic of discussion
 - iii. Joey – if we have extreme heat, do we add extreme cold? Severe winter weather?
 - iv. Requests to add extreme heat
 - v. Justin Hunt, Robeson – requests to add cyber threats
 - vi. Angela Pritchford – agrees re: cyber threat
 - vii. Ryan Cox – have to have hazard mitigation actions in place for every hazard identified, correct?
 - viii. Nathan – FEMA will only look at natural hazards
 - ix. John – can add anything you want to the plan – FEMA will only review natural hazards
 - x. Good to have ideas and add them to plan – doesn't mean you have to do anything about it, just addressing it and identifying it as an area of concern
 - xi. Ryan – do we still want to add cyber?
 - xii. Teresa Smith – wants to include it
 - xiii. Group confirms – will add Cyber & infectious disease and extreme heat to plan update
 - d. Hazards Profiled – Review
 - i. Will add 3 additional hazards discussed today

VI. Asset Inventory

- a. Review of Population
- b. 2020 Census for all counties
 - i. No comments from group
- c. Building exposure – does this look accurate?
 - i. Group believes so
- d. Critical Infrastructures and Key Resources – any discrepancies?
 - i. Joey – can you elaborate?
 - ii. Bladen needs 911 center
 - iii. Nathan or Kelly?
 - iv. Ryan will get back to Joey on 911 center re: stand alone?
 - v. Need updated numbers re: infrastructure
 - vi. Tier 2 for most counties is off... need folks to send in updated numbers if they have them
 - vii. Robeson does not have Nuclear reactor
 - viii. Justin Hunt – we have 39 total facilities re: emergency services
- e. Danielle to send out table (slide 15) to group for updating
- f. What are critical facilities – review definition
- g. Critical Facilities for Bladen – Review map
 - i. Joey – are they itemized? Ryan – we can get them to you, but the list is in current hazard mitigation plan
- h. Critical Facilities for Columbus _ Review Map
- i. Critical Facilities for Robeson – Review Map

VII. Agriculture Risk and Exposure

- a. Geospatial information
- b. Insurance information may differ
- c. Farmers only insure a portion of crops

VIII. Hazard Profiles

- a. What is PRI?
- b. How we calculate what risk is for each hazard
- c. What goes into it?; probability of occurrence, warning system?
- d. Spatial extent -what is vulnerable to hazard?
- e. Duration – how long will it last?

IX. PRI Scale

- a. Review of what's identified (See slide 23)
- b. Does it look accurate? – Group confirms it does

X. Profile Summary – Review Slide 24

- a. Any changes needed?
- b. Joey – after Florence, the duration was weeks with the fluctuation of flooding waters
- c. In Bladen County, Hurricane Florence was a 1000 year storm
- d. Haven't seen levy failure to that extent
- e. We can change if the group prefers – time frames listed are average
- f. Would take it to a moderate level
- g. Joey – suggests increasing probability of hurricane to “Highly Likely”
- h. Group agrees with this
- i. Will make the change in PRI to highly likely
- j. Will stick with 6 hr duration

- XI. Climate Change Effect
 - a. Influencing multiple hazards
- XII. Carl – FEMA does not have climate change effect requirement for natural hazards
- XIII. Dam/Levee Failure Review
 - a. Reference slide 27
- XIV. Review of Dam Failures
 - a. Matthew and Florence
 - b. Anymore we are not aware of?
 - c. To Justin – how to address for Robeson?
 - d. Justin – dam didn't fail, water just ended up going around it.
 - e. Let it ride
- XV. Drought
 - a. Categories based on crop loss
 - b. Keep in mind that Farmers do not insure all of crops
- XVI. Earthquake
 - a. 5 earthquakes experienced somewhat close to the region, but nothing of significance
- XVII. Hurricanes
 - a. Review of map
 - b. Some documentation is misleading relative to storm categories
- XVIII. Flood zone review for each county (slides 37-39)
- XIX. Severe weather
 - a. Average single cell thunderstorm is approx. 15 miles in diameter
 - b. Buildings at risk
 - c. Estimated damages
- XX. Lightening
- XXI. Hail
 - a. Highly likely
- XXII. Tornado
 - a. Several events
 - b. Review of track map
- XXIII. Wildfire Risk
 - a. Highly likely
 - b. 7 events recorded in the region
 - c. Ryan request additional info from the group if it's available
 - d. Has call into DOI
 - e. Justin – 2007 was bad year
 - f. Nathan – would depend on size of the 7 noted – why is limited to such small number
 - g. Review wildfire map
 - i. Nathan – turn out a ton of data – million different ways to slice the data
 - ii. They have good data
- XXIV. Winter storms
 - a. Past occurrences
 - b. Review of major risks included
- XXV. Back to PRI Review
 - a. Scoring and how it's achieved
 - b. Likely vs Highly Likely – will add one (1) point to score

- c. Review of results (slide 52)

XXVI. Next steps

- a. What needs to happen for next meetings
- b. Reach out to stakeholders
- c. Get folks involved
- d. Need to review current plan and provide updates to action items
- e. What are our goals, strategies, and actions
- f. Objectives are still not required. Nathan confirms.
- g. Need to have goals and actions
 - i. Very localized & specific to each jurisdiction participating in the plan
- h. Begin brainstorming for new mitigation strategies for the hazards that have been identified today
- i. Send new actions to Danielle, copy Ryan – need to make sure they are included in the update

XXVII. Nathan – can you send out existing actions to each county?

- a. Ryan – yes, we are working to update right now but can send out following review
- b. Once Insight completes review, we will send out individual action plans to corresponding counties

XXVIII. Questions/Open Floor

- a. Nathan – existing plan doesn't expire until October 6 but trying to get draft together and up to FEMA well in advance of expiration date.
- b. Following FEMA review, still need to go through adoption with resolutions.

-END-