

**APPENDIX O: ENHANCED STATE HAZARD
MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK**

Instructions for Using the Attached Plan Review Crosswalk for Review of Enhanced State Hazard Mitigation Plans

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000*, published by FEMA, dated March 2004, and revised June 2007. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and *44 CFR Part 201 – Mitigation Planning* (the Rule).

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.”

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

Example

6. Effective Use of Available Mitigation Funding

Requirement §201.5(b)(3): [The Enhanced Plan must demonstrate] that the State effectively uses existing mitigation programs to achieve its mitigation goals.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan document how the State has made full use of funding available from FEMA mitigation grant programs, and if the State has not made full use of this funding, does the plan explain the reasons why?	Section VI, pp. 2-3	The plan contains information that the State has not made full use of funding from FEMA grant programs, without explaining why this is the case. Required Revision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss why all available funding from FEMA grant programs was not used. 	✓	
SUMMARY SCORE			✓	

Enhanced State Hazard Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

State Point of Contact: Roxanne Gray	Address: 2400 Wright Street Madison, WI 53707-7865
Title: State Hazard Mitigation Officer	
Agency: Wisconsin Emergency Management	
Phone Number: 608-242-3211	E-Mail: Roxanne.Gray@wisconsin.gov

FEMA Reviewer: Tom Smith	Title: Community Planner	Date: 11-25-2011
Date Received in FEMA Region [insert #]		
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved	X	
Date Approved		

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN SUMMARY CROSSWALK

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. Reviewer’s comments must be provided for requirements receiving a “Needs Improvement” score.

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.

Prerequisite

NOT MET	MET
	X

1. Compliance with Standard State Plan Requirements: §201.5(b)

Comprehensive State Hazard Mitigation Planning Program

N	S
	X
	X
	X
	X
	X
	X

2. Integration with Other Planning Initiatives: §201.5(b)(1)

3. Project Implementation Capability: §201.5(b)(2)(i) and (ii)

4. Program Management Capability: §201.5(b)(2)(iii A-D)

5. Assessment of Mitigation Actions: §201.5(b)(2)(iv)

6. Effective Use of Available Mitigation Funding: §201.5(b)(3)

7. Commitment to a Comprehensive Mitigation Program: §201.5(b)(4)(i-vi)

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

PLAN APPROVED

See Reviewer’s Comments

PREREQUISITE

1. Compliance with Standard State Plan Requirements

*Requirement §201.5(b): Enhanced State Mitigation Plans **must** include all elements of the Standard State Mitigation Plan identified in §201.4 ...*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan meet all the Standard State Mitigation Plan requirements?		See standard plan crosswalk.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

COMPREHENSIVE STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING PROGRAM

2. Integration with Other Planning Initiatives

*Requirement §201.5(b)(1): [An Enhanced Plan **must** demonstrate] that the plan is integrated to the extent practicable with other State and/or regional planning initiatives (comprehensive, growth management, economic development, capital improvement, land development, and/or emergency management plans) and FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives that provide guidance to State and regional agencies.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan demonstrate how it is integrated to the extent practicable with other State and regional planning initiatives (comprehensive, growth management, economic development, capital improvement, land development, and/or emergency management plans)?	Section 7.1 pp.7-1 to 7-11 and Section 2.3, pp.2-17 to 2-21	The state's plan documents a strong effort to integrate hazard mitigation in to other state and regional planning initiatives. The SHMO has made significant efforts to coordinate hazard mitigation with statewide efforts promoting comprehensive planning and resource protection plans.		X
B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan demonstrate how it has been integrated to the extent practicable with FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives that provide guidance to State and regional agencies?	Section 7.2, pp. 7-12 to 7-37	Excellent		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

3. Project Implementation Capability

Requirement §201.5(b)(2)(i) and (ii): *[The Enhanced Plan must document] the State’s project implementation capability, identifying and demonstrating the ability to implement the plan, including:*

- *Established eligibility criteria for multi-hazard mitigation measures.*
- *A system to determine the cost effectiveness of mitigation measures, consistent with OMB Circular A-94, Guidelines and Discount Rates for Benefit-Cost Analysis of Federal Programs, and*
- *[A system] to rank the measures according to the State’s eligibility criteria.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan demonstrate that the State has established eligibility criteria for multi-hazard mitigation measures? Does the updated Plan describe changes, if any, to those criteria?	Section 7.3, pp. 7-37 to 7-41 and Appendix F, see attachment C	The plan contains a clear statement on project eligibility criteria. These criteria have not changed from the last plan update. The plan incorporates criteria suggested in FEMA guidance as well as criteria developed by the state.		X
B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan describe the State’s system for determining the cost effectiveness of mitigation measures, consistent with OMB Circular A-94? Does the updated Plan describe changes, if any, to this system?	Section 7.4.2, pp. 7-47 to 7-49. Appendix F	This section has been updated to reflect all of FEMA’s benefit/cost analysis guidance.		X
C. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan describe the State’s system to rank the measures according to the State’s eligibility criteria, including a process to prioritize projects between jurisdictions and between proposals that address different or multiple hazards?	Section 7.3, pp. 7-37 to 7-41 and Attachment C of Appendix F	Plan includes a detailed scoring system. The projects that get the highest number of points are given funding priority.		X
		SUMMARY SCORE		X

4. Program Management Capability

Requirement §201.5(b)(2)(iii A-D): *[The Enhanced Plan must demonstrate] that the State has the capability to effectively manage the HMGP as well as other mitigation grant programs, [and provide] a record of the following:*

- *Meeting HMGP and other mitigation grant application timeframes and submitting complete, technically feasible, and eligible project applications with appropriate supporting documentation;*
- *Preparing and submitting accurate environmental reviews and benefit-cost analyses;*
- *Submitting complete and accurate quarterly progress and financial reports on time; and*
- *Completing HMGP and other mitigation grant projects within established performance periods, including financial reconciliation.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan describe the State's capability to effectively manage the HMGP as well as other mitigation grant programs?	Section 7.4, pp. 7-44 to 7-56 and Section 7.4.5, page 7-55 and Appendix F	<i>[See Regional Certification to Determine Score]</i> <i>See attachment.</i>		X
B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan provide a record for meeting HMGP and other mitigation grant application timeframes and submitting complete, technically feasible, and eligible project applications with appropriate supporting documentation?	Section 7.4. pp. 7-41 to 7-52 and Attachment D of Appendix F	<i>[See Regional Certification to Determine Score]</i> <i>See attachment.</i>		X
C. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan provide a record for preparing and submitting accurate environmental reviews and benefit-cost analyses?	Section 7.4.1 pp. 7-45 to 7-50	<i>[See Regional Certification to Determine Score]</i> <i>See attachment.</i>		X
D. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan provide a record for submitting complete and accurate quarterly progress and financial reports on time?	Section 7.4.3 pp. 7-49 to 7-50	<i>[See Regional Certification to Determine Score]</i> <i>See attachment.</i>		X
E. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan provide a record for completing HMGP and other mitigation grant projects within established performance periods, including financial reconciliation?	Section 7.4.3 pp. 7-49 to 7-50 and Section 7.4.5, pg.7-52	<i>[See Regional Certification to Determine Score]</i> <i>See attachment.</i>		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

5. Assessment of Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.5(b)(2)(iv): [The Enhanced Plan **must** document the] system and strategy by which the State will conduct an assessment of the completed mitigation actions and include a record of the effectiveness (actual cost avoidance) of each mitigation action.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan describe the system and strategy by which the State will conduct an assessment of the completed mitigation actions?	Section 7.5 pp. 7-52 to 7-64	Excellent record and assessment of completed mitigation projects.		X
B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan include the record of the effectiveness (i.e., actual cost avoidance) of each mitigation actions, including how the assessment was completed?	Section 7.5.1 pp. 7-53 to 7-58 and Appendices I and J	The plan includes the results of two detailed loss avoidance studies. These assessments involved extensive documentation and a rigorous methodology.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

6. Effective Use of Available Mitigation Funding

Requirement §201.5(b)(3): [The Enhanced Plan **must** demonstrate] that the State effectively uses existing mitigation programs to achieve its mitigation goals.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan document how the State has made full use of funding available from FEMA mitigation grant programs, and if the State has not made full use of this funding, does the plan explain the reasons why?	Section 7.2.6 thru 7.2.12, pp. 7-20 to 7-35 and Section 7.6, pp.7-64 to 7-66 and Appendices B and C	Plan includes an extensive record of how the state has administered various FEMA grants programs.		X
B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan document how the State is effectively using existing programs to achieve its mitigation goals?	Section 7.6, pp.7-64 to 7-66 and Appendices B and C	The plan indicates that the state has administered approximately \$100 million in HMA grants since 1991. With these grants, the state has administered a impressive list of mitigation projects. The plan includes clear priorities and the state has accomplished many of its priority projects.		X

SUMMARY SCORE

X

7. Commitment to a Comprehensive Mitigation Program

Requirement §201.5(b)(4)(i-vi): [The Enhanced Plan **must** demonstrate] that the State is committed to a comprehensive state mitigation program, which might include any of the following:

- A commitment to support local mitigation planning by providing workshops and training, State planning grants, or coordinated capability development of local officials, including Emergency Management and Floodplain Management certifications.
- A Statewide program of hazard mitigation through the development of legislative initiatives, mitigation councils, formation of public/private partnerships, and/or other executive actions that promote hazard mitigation.
- The State provides a portion of the non-Federal match for HMGP and/or other mitigation projects.
- To the extent allowed by State Law, the State requires or encourages local governments to use a current version of a nationally applicable model building code or standard that addresses natural hazards as a basis for design and construction of State sponsored mitigation projects.
- A comprehensive, multi-year plan to mitigate the risks posed to the existing buildings that have been identified as necessary for post-disaster response and recovery operations.
- A comprehensive description of how the State integrates mitigation into its post-disaster recovery operations.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan demonstrate that the State is committed to a comprehensive State mitigation program?	Section 7.7, pp. 7-66 to 7-89	Excellent		X
B. Does the updated Enhanced Plan demonstrate progress in implementing a comprehensive State mitigation program, including new mitigation initiatives developed or implemented by the State?	Section 7.1.3, page 7-10 and Appendices G, D, and H	For this update, the state planning team made outreach to numerous Rural Electrical Cooperatives and developed an annex to the state plan for these companies. This annex will create the opportunity for the state to initiate significant mitigation projects in cooperation with the rural cooperatives. The state also continues demonstrate significant results in promoting local hazard mitigation projects and effective coordination with other state agencies.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X