

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

### INSTRUCTIONS FOR USING THE PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK FOR REVIEW OF LOCAL MITIGATION PLANS

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the **Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance**, published by FEMA in July, 2008. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act* (Stafford Act), as amended by Section 322 of the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), the *National Flood Insurance Act of 1968*, as amended by the *National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004* (P.L. 108-264) and *44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 201 – Mitigation Planning*, inclusive of all amendments through October 31, 2007.

#### SCORING SYSTEM

**N – Needs Improvement:** The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.

**S – Satisfactory:** The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of "Satisfactory." A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing.

When reviewing single jurisdiction plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the boxes for multi-jurisdictional plan requirements. When reviewing multi-jurisdictional plans, however, all elements apply. States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements. Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards, assessing vulnerability, and identifying and analyzing mitigation actions are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

**The example below illustrates how to fill in the Plan Review Crosswalk:**

<b>Assessing Vulnerability: Overview</b>				
<b>Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii):</b> <i>[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description shall include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.</i>				
Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include an <b>overall summary</b> description of the jurisdiction's <b>vulnerability</b> to each hazard?	Section II, pp. 4-10	The plan describes the types of assets that are located within geographically defined hazard areas as well as those that would be affected by winter storms.		<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan address the <b>impact</b> of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section II, pp. 10-20	The plan does not address the impact of two of the five hazards addressed in the plan. <b>Required Revisions:</b> • Include a description of the impact of floods and earthquakes on the assets. <b>Recommended Revisions:</b> This information can be presented in terms of dollar value or percentages of damage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>			<input type="checkbox"/>	

# LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted. Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of "Satisfactory." Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer's comments must be provided for requirements receiving a "Needs Improvement" score.

### Prerequisite(s) (Check Applicable Box)

1. Adoption by the Local Governing Body:  
§201.6(c)(5) OR

NOT MET	MET
X	N/A

2. Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5)  
AND

X	
---	--

3. Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation: §201.6(a)(3)

	X
--	---

### Planning Process

4. Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b) and §201.6(c)(1)

N	S
	X

### Risk Assessment

5. Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

N	S
	X

6. Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

	X
--	---

7. Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)

	X
--	---

8. Assessing Vulnerability: Addressing Repetitive Loss Properties. §201.6(c)(2)(ii)

	X
--	---

9. Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures, Infrastructure, and Critical Facilities: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)

	X
--	---

10. Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)

	X
--	---

11. Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)

	X
--	---

12. Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment: §201.6(c)(2)(iii)

	X
--	---

\*States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

## SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

**N – Needs Improvement:** The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.

**S – Satisfactory:** The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

### Mitigation Strategy

13. Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)

N	S
---	---

14. Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(ii)

	X
--	---

15. Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: NFIP Compliance. §201.6(c)(3)(ii)

	X
--	---

16. Implementation of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iii)

	X
--	---

17. Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iv)

	X
--	---

### Plan Maintenance Process

18. Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan: §201.6(c)(4)(ii)

N	S
	X

19. Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms: §201.6(c)(4)(ii)

	X
--	---

20. Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)

	X
--	---

### Additional State Requirements\*

Insert State Requirement

N	S
---	---

Insert State Requirement

--	--

Insert State Requirement

--	--

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

☐

See Reviewer's Comments

PLAN APPROVED

☐

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

### Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

<b>Jurisdiction:</b> Mahoning County, Ohio	<b>Title of Plan:</b> <i>Mahoning County Multi-Jurisdictional HMP</i>	<b>Date of Plan:</b> 2011
<b>Local Point of Contact:</b> Mr. Clark Jones	<b>Address:</b> 700 Industrial Road Youngstown, OH 44509	
<b>Title:</b> Director		
<b>Agency:</b> Y-MCDS & EMA		
<b>Phone Number:</b> 330-740-2200	<b>E-Mail:</b> <a href="mailto:cljones@mahoningcountyoh.gov">cljones@mahoningcountyoh.gov</a>	

<b>State Reviewer:</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
------------------------	---------------	--------------

<b>FEMA Reviewer:</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Date Received in FEMA Region [Insert #]</b>		
<b>Plan Not Approved</b>		
<b>Plan Approved</b>		
<b>Date Approved</b>		

Jurisdiction:	NFIP Status*			
	Y	N	N/A	CRS Class
1. Mahoning County	X			
2. City of Campbell	X			
3. City of Canfield	X			
4. City of Struthers	X			
5. City of Youngstown (*See attached sheet for remainder).	X			

\* Notes:                      Y = Participating                      N = Not Participating                      N/A = Not Mapped

Jurisdiction:	NFIP Status*			
	Y	N	N/A	CRS Class
6. Village of Beloit	X			
7. Village of Craig Beach	X			
8. Village of Lowellville	X			
9. Village of New Middletown	X			
10. Village of Poland	X			
11. Village of Sebring	X			

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

### PREREQUISITE(S)

#### 1. Adoption by the Local Governing Body

**Requirement §201.6(c)(5):** [The local hazard mitigation plan **shall** include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council).

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	N/A	Per OEMA recommendation, plan will be adopted following FEMA approval.	X	
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?	Appendix 5	Per OEMA recommendation, plan will be adopted following FEMA approval. Resolutions will be included upon adoption.	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

#### 2. Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption

**Requirement §201.6(c)(5):** For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan **must** document that it has been formally adopted.

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?	Section 2.1, pp. 35-37 Section 1.2, pp. 7,9,14-25	Section 2.1 lists all jurisdictions represented in the plan; section 1.2 provides description of planning including all participants.		X
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Appendix 5	Per OEMA recommendation, plan will adopted following FEMA approval.	X	
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?	Appendix 5	Per OEMA recommendation, plan will be adopted following FEMA approval. Resolutions will be included upon adoption.	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

#### 3. Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation

**Requirement §201.6(a)(3):** Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process ... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe <b>how</b> each jurisdiction participated in the plan's development?	Section 1.1.2, pp. 5-6 Appendix 4	Section 1.1.2 describes the updating process. All participating jurisdictions were invited to/attended HMC meetings. Sign-in sheets are included in Appendix 4.		X
B. Does the updated plan identify all participating jurisdictions, including new, continuing, and the jurisdictions that no longer participate in the plan?	N/A	All jurisdictions in Mahoning County that participated in the original plan development continued to participate.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

**PLANNING PROCESS:** §201.6(b): *An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan.*

### 4. Documentation of the Planning Process

**Requirement §201.6(b):** *In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process **shall** include:*

- (1) *An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;*
- (2) *An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and*
- (3) *Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.*

**Requirement §201.6(c)(1):** *[The plan **shall** document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Section 1.1.2, pp. 5-6	Section 1.1.2 describes timeframe of update, number of meetings held, process for obtaining public involvement, etc.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan indicate who was involved in the <b>current</b> planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, etc.?)	Section 1.1, pp. 1-6 Appendix 4	Section 1.1 lists the CPC members. Appendix 4 contains copies of sign-in sheets, public advertisements, returned questionnaires, etc. for both the 2005 plan development and 2011 update.		X
C. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan indicate how the public was involved? (Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval?)	Section 1.1, pp. 3-6 Appendix 4	Public meetings are described. Discussion runs to top of p. 7 where plan indicates an additional ad was published inviting public to review completed update. Copies of ads and sign-in sheets are in Appendix 4.		X
D. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan discuss the opportunity for neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, and other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?	Section 1.1.2, pp. 6	Plan indicates that Y-MCDS & EMA will make plan available on-line and notify neighboring county emergency managers via letter upon plan approval.		X
E. Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	Intro, pp. i Section 1.1, pp. 1 Appendix 4	P. 1 lists plans that were consulted as part of the update.		X
F. Does the <b>updated</b> plan document how the planning team reviewed and analyzed each section of the plan and whether each section was revised as part of the update process?	Section 1.1.2, pp. 5,6 Section 1.3, Table 1.5, pp. 26-29	Mentions the primary topics of each CPC meeting, which indicates what elements of the plan were reviewed. Table 1.3 is a "Record of Changes" matrix, listing each section of the plan and detailing what changes were made to that section.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

**RISK ASSESSMENT:** §201.6(c)(2): *The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.*

### 5. Identifying Hazards

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i):** *[The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include a <b>description</b> of the types of <b>all natural hazards</b> that affect the jurisdiction?	Section 2.1, Table 2.1, pp. 32-34 Section 2.1, Fig 2.1, pp. 36	Table 2.1 lists all hazards that were considered during the update, along with resources utilized and why some were included and others not. Fig. 2.1 compares vulnerability on a jurisdictional basis.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

### 6. Profiling Hazards

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i):** *[The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan **shall** include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the <b>location</b> ( <i>i.e.</i> , geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Appendix 1	Appendix 1 is organized by the hazards included in the plan. Behind each hazard tab is a map that depicts low, moderate, and high risk areas. Worksheet 3b "Asset Inventory" also categorizes hazard areas for each critical asset in the county.		X
B. Does the risk assessment identify the <b>extent</b> ( <i>i.e.</i> , magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Section 2.2, pp. 38-41 Section 2.2, Fig. 2.2 pp.38 Section 2.2, Fig. 2.3, pp.41 Appendix 1	Fig. 2.4 lists the estimated losses for each included hazard. Behind each tab in App. 1 is a profile that describes "how" the hazard affects the county and details major historical occurrences.		X
C. Does the plan provide information on <b>previous occurrences</b> of each hazard addressed in the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Appendix 1	On each hazard profile in Appendix 1, major historical occurrences are described in paragraph form. Each profile also contains a small table that includes the number of previous hazard occurrences.		X
D. Does the plan include the <b>probability of future events</b> ( <i>i.e.</i> , chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Section 2.2, Figure 2.2, pp. 38	Figure 2.2 is a probability vs. severity chart that graphically depicts the probability of future events (on a hazard-by-hazard basis). The methodology for developing the chart is described on the subsequent pages.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

### 7. Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii):** *[The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include an <b>overall summary</b> description of the jurisdiction's <b>vulnerability</b> to each hazard?	Section 2.4, Fig. 2.4, pp. 78 Appendix 1	The loss estimates in Fig. 2.4 (and behind each tab in App. 1) quantify vulnerability. Each hazard profile discusses risk and vulnerability concurrently.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan address the <b>impact</b> of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section 2.2, Fig. 2.2, pp. 38 Appendix 1	Figure 2.2 is a probability vs. severity chart that graphically depicts the severity of events (on a hazard-by-hazard basis). The methodology for developing the chart is described on the subsequent pages. Each hazard profile in Appendix 1 also has a Hazard Impact section.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

### 8. Assessing Vulnerability: Addressing Repetitive Loss Properties

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii):** *[The risk assessment] **must** also address National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) insured structures that have been repetitively damaged floods.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of <b>repetitive loss properties</b> located in the identified hazard areas?	Appendix 1, "Flooding" Profile	The profile identifies the number and type of RL properties on a jurisdictional basis.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

### 9. Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A):** *The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area ... .*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe vulnerability in terms of the <b>types and numbers</b> of <b>existing</b> buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Section 2.3, Tables 2.7-2.17, pp. 46-76 "Asset Inventory Map", pp. 45	Tables 2.7 through 2.17 are asset inventory listings for each participating jurisdiction. The map on p. 45 depicts these assets graphically.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe vulnerability in terms of the <b>types and numbers</b> of <b>future</b> buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Section 2.5, pp. 79-82	Discusses currently planned developments in Mahoning County that can be compared to mapping in App. 1. Briefly describes land uses on a jurisdictional basis, which again can be compared to the mapping in App. 1.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X



## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

### 10. Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B):** *[The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(ii)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate ... .*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan estimate <b>potential dollar losses</b> to vulnerable structures?	Section 2.4, Fig. 2.4, pp. 78 Appendix 1	Figure 2.4 summarizes the estimated losses on a hazard-by-hazard basis. Behind each tab in App. 1 is a spreadsheet calculating the structural, contents, and functional losses referenced in Figure 2.4.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe the <b>methodology</b> used to prepare the estimate?	Section 2.4, pp. 77-78 Appendix 2	Starting midway down p. 77, the loss estimate methodology is briefly described. Appendix 2 provides greater detail on a more targeted basis (i.e., hazard-by-hazard).		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

### 11. Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C):** *[The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe land uses and development trends?	Section 2.5, pp. 79-82	Section 2.5 describes land uses, planned developments, etc.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

### 12. Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment

**Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii):** *For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment **must** assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?	Section 2.0 (generally) Section 2.1, Fig. 2.1, pp. 36	Section 2.0 is the risk assessment portion of the plan for all participating jurisdictions. Fig. 2.1 lists all participating jurisdictions and compares their risks.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

**MITIGATION STRATEGY:** §201.6(c)(3): *The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.*

### 13. Local Hazard Mitigation Goals

**Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i):** *[The hazard mitigation strategy **shall** include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include a description of mitigation <b>goals</b> to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards?	Section 3.0, pp. 83-98	Section 3.0 lists all projects in the original and current plan, organized first by hazard and then by jurisdiction. Overall status is also noted.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

### 14. Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

**Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii):** *[The mitigation strategy **shall** include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan identify and analyze a <b>comprehensive range</b> of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?	Section 4.1, pp. 99-119	Section 4.1 lists all <i>current</i> projects in the plan organized by hazard and jurisdiction.		X
B Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on <b>new</b> buildings and infrastructure?	Section 4.1, pp. 99-119	Many projects address continued support of building codes, zoning ordinances, etc.		X
C. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on <b>existing</b> buildings and infrastructure?	Section 4.1, pp. 99-119	Many projects address risk to existing buildings.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

\*NOTE: The sample projects listed in 14 B & C are not comprehensive; they are meant to show the types of projects addressing new and existing buildings/infrastructure.

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

### 15. Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Compliance

**Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(ii):** [The mitigation strategy] must also address the jurisdiction's participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate.

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
<b>A. Does the new or updated plan describe the jurisdiction (s) participation in the NFIP?</b>	Appendix 1, "Flooding" Profile	The fifth page of the profile generally describes how the NFIP is implemented in participating jurisdictions.		X
<b>B. Does the mitigation strategy identify, analyze and prioritize actions related to continued compliance with the NFIP?</b>	Section 4.1, pp. 106, 128 Appendix 1, "Flooding" Profile	Strategies 4.3.2 address on-going NFIP compliance. These strategies are also mentioned in the flooding profile.		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

### 16. Implementation of Mitigation Actions

**Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(iii):** [The mitigation strategy section **shall** include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization **shall** include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
<b>A. Does the new or updated mitigation strategy include how the actions are prioritized? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)</b>	Section 4.2, pp. 121-127 Section 4.2, Tables 4.1-4.11, pp. 121-127	Pp. 121-127 describes the methodology used to prioritize projects. Tables 4.1 – 4.24 list priorities on a jurisdictional basis.		X
<b>B. Does the new or updated mitigation strategy address how the actions will be implemented and administered, including the responsible department, existing and potential resources and the timeframe to complete each action?</b>	Section 4.1, pp. 99-119	Each project is listed with a timeframe, coordinating agency, potential funding source, and a potential cost estimate.		X
<b>C. Does the new or updated prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a cost-benefit review to maximize benefits?</b>	Section 4.2, pp. 120	At the bottom of p. 120, the plan indicates that a "benefit cost review" per FEMA publication 386-5 was done.		X
<b>D. Does the updated plan identify the completed, deleted or deferred mitigation actions as a benchmark for progress, and if activities are unchanged (i.e., deferred), does the updated plan describe why no changes occurred?</b>	Section 3.0, pp. 85-98 Section 4.1, pp. 100-119	Section 3.0 lists all projects from the original plan and the update. Completed projects are noted as such; projects are also listed as "deleted" if appropriate. Section 4.1 lists current projects, and notes each as completed annually, on-going, new, etc.		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

### 17. Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

**Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv):** For multi-jurisdictional plans, there **must** be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include identifiable <b>action items</b> for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?	Section 3.0, pp. 85-98 Section 4.1, pp. 100-119 Section 4.2, pp. 121-127	Section 3.0 lists all projects from the original and updated plan for all participating jurisdictions. Section 4.1 lists all current projects for each participating jurisdiction. Section 4.2 lists the priorities for projects for all participating jurisdictions.		X
B. Does the <b>updated</b> plan identify the completed, deleted or deferred mitigation actions as a benchmark for progress, and if activities are unchanged ( <i>i.e.</i> , deferred), does the updated plan describe why no changes occurred?	Section 3.0, pp. 85-98 Section 4.1, pp. 100-119	In Section 3.0, each project is listed with a status ( <i>i.e.</i> , completed, deleted, deferred, or new. If a project was deleted, Section 3.0 explains why. If a project was deferred or is new, a description of its status is included in Section 4.1.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

### PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

### 18. Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan

**Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i):** [The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe the method and schedule for <b>monitoring</b> the plan, including the responsible department?	Section 5.1, pp. 128-132	The plan indicates that the HMC will generally monitor the performance of the plan and that the Y-MCDS & EMA will serve as its custodial agency and the coordinator for ensuring that HMC members have opportunities to review the plan.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe the method and schedule for <b>evaluating</b> the plan, including how, when and by whom ( <i>i.e.</i> the responsible department)?	Section 5.1, pp. 128	P. 128 indicates that the plan will be formally reviewed every 5 years & that the Y-MCDS & EMA will coordinate these updates.		X
C. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe the method and schedule for <b>updating</b> the plan within the five-year cycle?	Section 5.1, pp. 128 Section 5.3, pp. 132	Starting at middle of p. 128 and running through p. 129, potential meetings are described, as are criteria by which to review strategies.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

### 19. Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

**Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii):** *[The plan **shall** include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan identify other local planning mechanisms available for incorporating the mitigation requirements of the mitigation plan?	Section 5.2, pp. 131	Plans maintained by the Y-MCDS & EMA and county planning commission are mentioned as potential vehicles for mitigation or companions to mitigation efforts.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include a process by which the local government will incorporate the mitigation strategy and other information contained in the plan (e.g., risk assessment) into other planning mechanisms, when appropriate?	Section 5.2, pp. 131-132	Plan references code enforcement as a vehicle for mitigation. Plan also references review opportunities for such departments as county storm water, county engineer, planning commission, etc. Plan indicates that Y-MCDS & EMA and planning commission will coordinate as necessary regarding mitigation and general community development.		X
C. Does the <b>updated</b> plan explain how the local government incorporated the mitigation strategy and other information contained in the plan (e.g., risk assessment) into other planning mechanisms, when appropriate?	Section 5.2, pp. 131-132	See discussion in 19.B above.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

### 20. Continued Public Involvement

**Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii):** *[The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.*

Element	Location in the Plan	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan explain how <b>continued public participation</b> will be obtained? (For example, will there be public notices, an on-going mitigation plan committee, or annual review meetings with stakeholders?)	Section 1.1.2, pp. 5, 6 Section 5.3, pp. 132	Section 1.1.2 indicates that public will be given a chance to review completed update and provide written comments. Section 5.3 indicates that public will be involved during updates through meetings, questionnaires, etc.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X