

**APPENDIX N: STANDARD STATE HAZARD  
MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK**

**Instructions for Using the Plan Review Crosswalk for Review of Standard 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, with revisions dated November 2006. 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, Interim Final Rule* (the Rule), published February 26, 2002.

**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.

Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards and assessing vulnerability are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

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

**Example**

**Assessing Vulnerability by Jurisdiction**

**Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(ii):** *[The State risk assessment shall include an] overview and analysis of the State’s vulnerability to the hazards described in this paragraph (c)(2), based on estimates provided in local risk assessments ... . The State shall describe vulnerability in terms of the jurisdictions most threatened by the identified hazards, and most vulnerable to damage and loss associated with hazard event.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe the State’s vulnerability based on information from the local risk assessments?	Section III, pp. 12-28	The plan includes a description of local vulnerable structures. The plan presented a vulnerability summary by regions in the state. This information was collected from the approved plans on file.		✓
B. Does the plan present information on those jurisdictions that face the most risk?	Section III, pp. 30-36	The vulnerability description did not indicate which jurisdictions were the most vulnerable.  <b>Required Revisions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use the information provided in the summaries to determine which jurisdictions are most threatened by the identified hazards.</li> <li>Identify which jurisdictions have suffered or are likely to suffer the most losses.</li> <li>If data are not readily available, note these data limitations in the plan. Include actions in the mitigation strategy to obtain these data for the plan update.</li> </ul>	✓	
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>			✓	

**Standard State Hazard Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status**

<b>State Point of Contact:</b> Roxanne Gray	<b>Address:</b> WEM 2400 Wright Street—P.O. Box 7865 Madison, Wisconsin 53707
<b>Title:</b> State Hazard Mitigation Officer	
<b>Agency:</b> Wisconsin Emergency Management Agency	
<b>Phone Number:</b> 608-242-3211	<b>E-Mail:</b> Roxanne.gray@wisconsin.gov

<b>FEMA Reviewer:</b> Tom Smith	<b>Title:</b> Community Planner	<b>Date:</b> November 8, 2011 and November 21, 2011
<b>Date Received in FEMA Region [Insert #]</b>		
<b>Plan Not Approved</b>		
<b>Plan Approved</b>	X	
<b>Date Approved</b>		

STANDARD 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. 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.

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
Adoption by the State: §201.4(c)(6) and §201.4(c)(7)	X	

Planning Process	N	S
Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.4(c)(1)		X
Coordination Among Agencies: §201.4(b)		X
Program Integration: §201.4(b)		X

Risk Assessment	N	S
Identifying Hazards: §201.4(c)(2)(i)		X
Profiling Hazards: §201.4(c)(2)(i)		X
Assessing Vulnerability by Jurisdiction: §201.4(c)(2)(ii)		X
Assessing Vulnerability of State Facilities: §201.4(c)(2)(ii)		X
Estimating Potential Losses by Jurisdiction: §201.4(c)(2)(iii)		X
Estimating Potential Losses of State Facilities: §201.4(c)(2)(iii)		X

Mitigation Strategy

	N	S
Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.4(c)(3)(i)		X
State Capability Assessment: §201.4(c)(3)(ii)		X
Local Capability Assessment: §201.4(c)(3)(ii)		X
Mitigation Actions: §201.4(c)(3)(iii)		X
Funding Sources: §201.4(c)(3)(iv)		X

Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning

	N	S
Local Funding and Technical Assistance: §201.4(c)(4)(i)		X
Local Plan Integration: §201.4(c)(4)(ii)		X
Prioritizing Local Assistance: §201.4(c)(4)(iii)		X

Severe Repetitive Loss Mitigation Strategy  
*(only required for 90/10 under FMA & SRL)*

	N	S
Repetitive Loss Mitigation Strategy: §201.4(c)(3)(v)		X
Coordination with Repetitive Loss Jurisdictions §201.4(c)(3)(v)		X

Plan Maintenance Process

	N	S
Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan: §201.4(c)(5)(i)		X
Monitoring Progress of Mitigation Activities: §201.4(c)(5)(ii) and (iii)		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED  
(\*\*Pending Plan Adoption)

X**

PLAN APPROVED

See Reviewer's Comments

State:

Date of Plan:

PREREQUISITE

Adoption by the State

**Requirement §201.4(c)(6):** *The plan must be formally adopted by the State prior to submittal to [FEMA] for final review and approval.*

**Requirement §201.4(c)(7):** *The plan must include assurances that the State will comply with all applicable Federal statutes and regulations in effect with respect to the periods for which it receives grant funding, in compliance with 44 CFR 13.11(c). The State will amend its plan whenever necessary to reflect changes in State or Federal laws and statutes as required in 44 CFR 13.11(d).*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Has the State formally adopted the <b>new or updated</b> plan?				
B. Does the plan provide assurances that the State will <b>continue to</b> comply with all applicable Federal statutes and regulations during the periods for which it receives grant funding, in compliance with 44 CFR 13.11(c), and will amend its plan whenever necessary to reflect changes in State or Federal laws and statutes as required in 44 CFR 13.11(d)?	Section 1.3, page 1-2	Fine		X
SUMMARY SCORE				

PLANNING PROCESS: §201.4(b): *An effective planning process is essential in developing and maintaining a good plan.*

Documentation of the Planning Process

**Requirement §201.4(c)(1):** *[The State plan must include a] description of the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how other agencies participated.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of how the <b>new or updated</b> plan was prepared?	Section 2.1.4, pp. 2-6 to 2-8	Good.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan indicate who was involved in the <b>current</b> planning process?	Section 1.4, page 2-2 and Section 2.1.4, pp.2-6 to 2-8.	State mitigation staff conducted interviews of personnel in other state agencies and representatives of public and private institutions. The agencies interviewed included Transportation, DNR, Division of Housing, National Weather Service, and USGS.		X
C. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan indicate how other agencies participated in the <b>current</b> planning process?	Section 2.1.4, page 2-7; Section 2.2, pp. 2-8 to 2-17	Plan includes a detailed description of outreach efforts over an extended time period. Recent outreach efforts have been to agencies involved in RiskMAP projects and to the state's rural electrical cooperatives.		X
D. Does the updated plan document how the planning team reviewed and analyzed each section of the plan?	Section 2.1.4, pp. 2-6 to 2-8	Fine		X

State:

Date of Plan:

<b>E. Does the updated plan indicate for each section whether or not it was revised as part of the update process?</b>	Section 2.1.4, pp. 2-6 to 2-8	Fine		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Coordination Among Agencies

**Requirement §201.4(b):** *The [State] mitigation planning process should include coordination with other State agencies, appropriate Federal agencies, interested groups, and ... .*

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 describe how Federal and State agencies were involved in the <b>current</b> planning process?	Section 2.2, pp. 2-8 to 2-17	The plan describes a long-term effort of cooperation and collaboration with other state and federal agencies.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe how interested groups (e.g., businesses, non-profit organizations, and other interested parties) were involved in the <b>current</b> planning process?	Section 2.2, pp. 2-8 to 2-17	Good outreach to rural electrical cooperatives. Good outreach to non-profits involved in flood plain management and environmental protection.		X
<b>C. Does the updated plan discuss how coordination among Federal and State agencies changed since approval of the previous plan?</b>	Section 2.1.4, pp. 2-6 to 2-8	State shifted from group meetings with state agencies to a strategy of one-on-one interviews and surveys. This one-on-one approach appears to be a successful strategy.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Program Integration

**Requirement §201.4(b):** *[The State mitigation planning process should] be integrated to the extent possible with other ongoing State planning efforts as well as other FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives.*

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 describe how the State mitigation planning process is integrated with other ongoing State planning efforts?	Section 2.3, pp. 2-17 to 2-21	The Wisconsin Mitigation effort supports other state efforts supporting flood plain management and state mitigation efforts support other preparedness, response, and recovery efforts.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe how the State mitigation planning process is integrated with FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives?	Section 2.3, pp. 2-20 and 2-21	The state hazard mitigation staff coordinates with federal flood plain management and flood insurance programs. The state has coordinated a statewide HAZUS analysis for flooding and has participated in statewide RiskMAP efforts.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

State:

Date of Plan:

**RISK ASSESSMENT:** §201.4(c)(2): *[The State plan must include a risk assessment] that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy portion of the mitigation plan. Statewide risk assessments must characterize and analyze natural hazards and risks to provide a statewide overview. This overview will allow the State to compare potential losses throughout the State and to determine their priorities for implementing mitigation measures under the strategy, and to prioritize jurisdictions for receiving technical and financial support in developing more detailed local risk and vulnerability assessments.*

**Identifying Hazards**

**Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(i):** *[The State risk assessment shall include an] overview of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the State ... .*

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 provide a description of the type of <b>all natural hazards</b> that can affect the State? If the hazard identification omits (without explanation) any hazards commonly recognized as threats to the State, this part of the plan cannot receive a Satisfactory score.	Section 3.2.1, pp. 3-3 to 3-5	Ok. The state plan begins to discuss issues regarding climate change. The discussion is preliminary and general and the next plan update should include more a more detailed risk assessment for climate change and a more detailed treatment of mitigation strategies.		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

**Profiling Hazards**

**Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(i):** *[The State risk assessment shall include an overview of the] location of all natural hazards that can affect the State, including information on previous occurrences of hazard events, as well as the probability of future hazard events, using maps where appropriate ... .*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the <b>location</b> (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazards addressed in the <b>new or updated</b> plan?	Section 3.3 -- Section 3.16, pp. 3-7 to 3-169	Plan includes maps and written text describing the locations most vulnerable to different hazards.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan provide information on <b>previous occurrences</b> of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Section 3.3 -- Section 3.16, pp. 3-7 to 3-169	Good. Plan describes the history of previous events and it ranks hazards based on past frequency.		X
C. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include the <b>probability of future events</b> (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	Section 3.3 -- Section 3.16, pp. 3-7 to 3-169	All hazards are ranked in terms of probability—high, medium, or low.		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

**Assessing Vulnerability**

**Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(ii):** *[The State risk assessment shall include an] overview and analysis of the State's vulnerability to the hazards described in this*

State:

Date of Plan:

paragraph (c)(2), based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the State risk assessment. The State **shall** describe vulnerability in terms of the jurisdictions most threatened by the identified hazards, and most vulnerable to damage and loss associated with hazard events. State owned critical or operated facilities located in the identified hazard areas shall also be addressed ... .

**Requirement §201.4(d): Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development...**

Assessing Vulnerability by Jurisdiction

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 describe the State's vulnerability based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the State risk assessment?	Section 3.19, pp. 3-199 to 3-211	Plan integrates local hazard mitigation plan data from communities located along the Mississippi and Wisconsin Rivers and higher-risk counties such as Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Racine. <b>Recommended Revisions:</b> <i>Future updates should include a comparison of the local plan estimates for flood losses versus the estimated losses identified in the statewide HAZUS run.</i>		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe the State's vulnerability in terms of the jurisdictions most threatened and most vulnerable to damage and loss associated with hazard event(s)?	Section 3.19, pp. 3-199 to 3-211	Plan describes hazard risks in many of the state's southern counties (these are the highest risk counties) and Appendix D identifies those communities with the highest number of repetitive loss properties.		X
<b>C. Does the updated plan explain the process used to analyze the information from the local risk assessments, as necessary?</b>	Section 3.19, pp. 3-199 to 3-211	The plan highlights local risk analysis information and describes some of the methodology. Some of the processes differ depending on the sophistication of the local government staff.		X
<b>D. Does the updated plan reflect changes in development for jurisdictions in hazard prone areas?</b>	Section 3.2.1, page 3-6; Section 3.19.2, pp. 3-205 to 3-211	The plan highlights those communities in the state with the highest building exposure to various hazards types and those communities with the highest potential losses associated with different hazard events.		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

Assessing Vulnerability of State Facilities

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 describe the types of State owned or operated critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Section 3.17.4, pp. 3-188	The plan has been updated to include information on the risks associated with facilities managed by the Department of Corrections. The risk assessment for other state-owned facilities relies on a 2005 analysis that was prepared by the URS Corporation and the state is committed to updating this 2005 data.  <b>Recommended Revisions:</b> <i>The state should continue to</i>		X

State:

Date of Plan:

		<i>improve its inventory of state owned facilities and state critical facilities.</i>		
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Estimating Potential Losses

**Requirement §201.4(c)(2)(iii):** [The State risk assessment **shall** include an] overview and analysis of potential losses to the identified vulnerable structures, based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the State risk assessment. The State **shall** estimate the potential dollar losses to State owned or operated buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas.

**Requirement §201.4(d):** *Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development...*

Estimating Potential Losses by Jurisdiction

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 present an overview and analysis of the potential losses to the identified vulnerable structures?	Section 3.3 to 3.16, pp. 3-7 to 3-169	The plan highlights the areas and structures at risk based on an analysis of past losses and damages related to hazard events. The plan includes estimates of buildings and structures at risk based on local assessment data. The plan also includes the results of a HAZUS analysis for flooding and an inventory of buildings at risk for coastal erosion.		X
B. Are the potential losses based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the State risk assessment?	Section 3.19, pp. 3-199 to 3-211	Fine.		X
<b>C. Does the updated plan reflect the effects of changes in development on loss estimates?</b>	Section 3.19.2, pp. 3-205 to 3-211	The plan highlights the highest risk counties based on population and building characteristics  <b>Recommended Revisions:</b> The state plan should factor in some consideration of the growth rates of different communities based on the 2010 census. It appears that 2010 census data was not available for the 2011 plan update but this should not be an issue for the next plan update.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Estimating Potential Losses of State Facilities

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 present an estimate of the potential dollar losses to State owned or operated buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities in the identified hazard areas?	Section 3.17 and 3.18 pp. 3-170 to 3-199	Rough estimates of the numbers and types of buildings potentially at risk. The HAZUS analysis for flood risks includes some estimates of potential losses.		X

State:

Date of Plan:

SUMMARY SCORE

X

MITIGATION STRATEGY: §201.4(c)(3) [To be effective the plan must include a] Mitigation Strategy that provides the State’s blueprint for reducing the losses identified in the risk assessment.

Hazard Mitigation Goals

**Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(i):** [The State mitigation strategy shall include a] description of State goals to guide the selection of activities to mitigate and reduce potential losses.

**Requirement §201.4(d):** Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development, progress in statewide mitigation efforts, and changes in priorities...

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 provide a description of State mitigation <b>goals</b> that guide the selection of mitigation activities?	Section 4.1, page 4-1	Fine.		X
<b>B. Does the updated plan demonstrate that the goals were assessed and either remain valid or have been revised?</b>	Section 4.1, page 4-1	Some refinement.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

State Capability Assessment **Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(ii):** [The State mitigation strategy shall include a] discussion of the State’s pre-and post-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities to mitigate the hazards in the area, including: an evaluation of State laws, regulations, policies, and programs related to hazard mitigation as well as to development in hazard-prone areas [and] a discussion of State funding capabilities for hazard mitigation projects ... .

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 evaluation of the State’s <b>pre-disaster</b> hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities?	Section 4.2, pp. 4-2 to 4-4	Fine		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include an evaluation of the State’s <b>post-disaster</b> hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities?	Section 4.2, pp. 4-2 to 4-4	Fine		X
C. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include an evaluation of the State’s policies related to <b>development in hazard prone areas</b> ?	Table 4.2-3, pp. 4-93 to 4-98	State law authorizes local actions. State law requires the development of comprehensive plans and the SHMO has made efforts to promote the consideration of hazard mitigation into comprehensive planning.		X
D. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan include a discussion of State <b>funding capabilities</b> for hazard mitigation projects?	Table 4.2.1, pp. 4-51 to 4-82	Analyzes state laws and state and federal resources that can be used for recovery and hazard mitigation.		X

State:

Date of Plan:

<b>E. Does the updated plan address any hazard management capabilities of the State that have changed since approval of the previous plan?</b>	Table 4.2.1, pp. 4-51 to 4-82	Includes up-to-date information regarding funding and budget limitations.		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

Local Capability Assessment

**Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(ii):** [The State mitigation strategy **shall** include] a general description and analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities.

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 present a general description of the local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities?	Table 4.2-3. pp. 4-93 to 4-98	Fine.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan provide a general analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities?	Table 4.2-3. pp. 4-93 to 4-98	State plan analyzes the limitations and barriers to effective mitigation at the local level. The plan highlights some of the most successful local programs.		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

Mitigation Actions

**Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(iii):** [State plans **shall** include an] identification, evaluation, and prioritization of cost-effective, environmentally sound, and technically feasible mitigation actions and activities the State is considering and an explanation of how each activity contributes to the overall mitigation strategy. This section **should** be linked to local plans, where specific local actions and projects are identified.

**Requirement §201.4(d):** Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development, progress in statewide mitigation efforts, and changes in priorities...

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 identify cost-effective, environmentally sound, and technically feasible mitigation actions and activities the State is considering?	Section 4.3.17, pp. 4-47 to 4-49	Action items are evaluated on the basis of criteria related to cost effectiveness, environmental impacts, and technical feasibility.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan evaluate these actions and activities?	Table 4.3-2, pp. 4-100 to 4-112	Action items are evaluated based on their contribution to the overall statewide goals on the basis of their contribution to overall mitigation strategies.		X
C. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan prioritize these actions and activities?	Section 4.3.16, pp. 4-45 and 4-46 and Table 4.3-2, pp. 4-100 to 4-112	The plan conveys a good sense of its priorities for mitigation actions. Since 1993, the state hazard mitigation program has given priority to the acquisition, demolition, relocation, and/or floodproofing of floodprone properties. The <b>“items considered in evaluating proposed projects”</b> appear logical and thorough.		X
D. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan explain how each activity contributes to the overall State mitigation strategy?	Table 4.3-2, pp. 4-100 to 4-112	A statement on this is provided for each strategy.		X

State:

Date of Plan:

E. Does the mitigation strategy <b>in the new or updated</b> section reflect actions and projects identified in local plans?	Section 5.4.1, pp. 5-10 to 5-13	Good summary of local strategies and how these strategies are coordinated with the state plan.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Funding Sources

**Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(iv):** *[The State mitigation strategy shall include an] identification of current and potential sources of Federal, State, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities.*

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 identify <b>current</b> sources of Federal, State, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities?	Section 4.4, pp. 4-50 to 4-98	Excellent		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan identify <b>potential</b> sources of Federal, State, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities?	Section 4.4, pp. 4-50 to 4-98	Fine		X
<b>C. Does the updated plan identify the sources of mitigation funding used to implement activities in the mitigation strategy since approval of the previous plan?</b>	Appendix C	Fine		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

COORDINATION OF LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING

Local Funding and Technical Assistance

**Requirement §201.4(c)(4)(i):** *[The section on the Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning must include a] description of the State process to support, through funding and technical assistance, the development of local mitigation plans.*

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 provide a description of the State process to support, through funding and technical assistance, the development of local mitigation plans?	Section 5.1 to 5.3, pp. 5-1 to 5-9 and Section 7.7.1 pp. 7-66 to 7-69	Excellent		X
<b>B. Does the updated plan describe the funding and technical assistance the State has provided in the past three years to assist local jurisdictions in completing approvable mitigation plans?</b>	Section 5.1 to 5.3, pp. 5-1 to 5-9 and Section 7.7.1 pp. 7-66 to 7-69	Excellent		X

State:

Date of Plan:

SUMMARY SCORE

X

Local Plan Integration

**Requirement §201.4(c)(4)(ii):** [The section on the Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning **must** include a] description of the State process and timeframe by which the local plans will be reviewed, coordinated, and linked to the State Mitigation Plan.

**Requirement §201.4(d):** Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development, progress in statewide mitigation efforts, and changes in priorities...

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 provide a description of the <b>process and timeframe</b> the State established to <b>review</b> local plans?	Section 5.2, pp. 5-3 to 5-7	State provides technical assistance on grants and it monitors the status of local plans and plan updates.		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan provide a description of the <b>process and timeframe</b> the State established to <b>coordinate and link</b> local plans to the State Mitigation Plan?	Section 3.19.1, pp. 3-200 to 3-211	The state plan incorporates some risk assessment information from local plans. The plan highlights information regarding the frequency of disasters and the extent of risk to buildings and improvements by community or county within the state.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Prioritizing Local Assistance

**Requirement §201.4(c)(4)(iii):** [The section on the Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning **must** include] criteria for prioritizing communities and local jurisdictions that would receive planning and project grants under available funding programs, which **should** include consideration for communities with the highest risks, repetitive loss properties, and most intense development pressures.

Further, that for non-planning grants, a principal criterion for prioritizing grants **shall** be the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of proposed projects and their associated costs.

**Requirement §201.4(d):** Plan must be reviewed and revised to reflect changes in development, progress in statewide mitigation efforts, and changes in priorities...

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 provide a description of the criteria for prioritizing those communities and local jurisdictions that would receive planning and project grants under available mitigation funding programs?	Section 4.3.16 and Section 4.3.17, pp. 4-45 to 4-49 for project priorities.	Good description of priorities for project grants. Section 5.2 identifies the priorities for local planning grants.  <b>Recommended Revision.</b> The next state plan update should give some priority for mitigation programs for the state's fastest		X

State:

Date of Plan:

	Section 5.2, pp. 5-3 to 5-5	<i>growing communities.</i>		
B. <b>For the new or updated plan, do</b> the prioritization criteria include, for non-planning grants, the consideration of the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of proposed projects and their associated cost?	Section 4.3.17, page 4-48	Fine.		X
C. <b>For the new or updated plan, do</b> the criteria include considerations for communities with the highest risk?	Section 4.3.16, pp. 4-45 to 4-46; Section 5.1, pp. 5-1 to 5-3	Priority is given to communities most affected by hazards and communities with the greatest number of buildings and facilities at risk. <b>Recommended Revision.</b> <i>The next state plan update should give some special consideration to risks and mitigation priorities in fast growing communities in the state.</i>		X
D. <b>For the new or updated plan, do</b> the criteria include considerations for repetitive loss properties?	Section 7.3, pp. 7-37 to 7-38	The plan indicates that the mitigation of flood prone properties and repetitive loss properties has been a priority since 1993.		X
E. <b>For the new or updated plan, do</b> the criteria include considerations for communities with the most intense development pressures?	<i>Not in Plan.</i>	<b>Recommended Revisions:</b> <i>Wisconsin has several fast growing counties and communities according to the 2010 census. These communities are under intense pressure in terms of the administration for flood plain rules, building codes, and other basic health and safety regulations. A higher priority should be given to supporting mitigation projects and mitigation plans for these fast growth communities.</i>		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan **Requirement §201.4(c)(5)(i):** *[The Standard State Plan Maintenance Process **must** include an] established method and schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the plan.*

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 describe the method and schedule for monitoring the plan? (e.g., identifies the party responsible for <b>monitoring</b> , includes schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and/or meetings)	Section 6.1 to 6.2	Excellent		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe the method and schedule for <b>evaluating</b> the plan? (e.g., identifies the party responsible for evaluating the plan, includes the criteria used to evaluate the plan)	Section 6.1 and 6.2, page 6.1 to 6.3	Fine		X
C. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan describe the method and schedule for <b>updating</b> the plan?	Table 6.1-1, page 6-3	Excellent		X
<b>D. Does the updated plan include an analysis of whether the previously approved plan's method and schedule worked, and what elements or processes, if any, were changed?</b>	Section 6. pp. 6-1 to 6-5	The state appears to have established an effective schedule and method for updating its previous plan. The plan indicates that there is some difficulty in preparing an annual description of		X

State:

Date of Plan:

		progress related to mitigation actions. The plan indicates that the state intends to improve its annual assessment of mitigation actions.		
SUMMARY SCORE				X

**Monitoring Progress of Mitigation Activities Requirement §201.4(c)(5)(ii):** [The Standard State Plan Maintenance Process *must* include a] system for monitoring implementation of mitigation measures and project closeouts. **Requirement §201.4(c)(5)(iii):** [The Standard State Plan Maintenance Process *must* include a] system for reviewing progress on achieving goals as well as activities and projects in the Mitigation Strategy.

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 describe how mitigation measures and project closeouts will be monitored?	Section 6.3 page 6-4	Good		X
B. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan identify a system for reviewing progress on achieving goals in the Mitigation Strategy?	Section 6.2, page 6-4 and 6-5	Annual reports.		X
<b>C. Does the updated plan describe any modifications, if any, to the system identified in the previously approved plan to track the initiation, status, and completion of mitigation activities?</b>	Section 6.2, page 6-4 and 6-5	Shift from bi-annual to annual reports.		X
D. Does the <b>new or updated</b> plan identify a system for reviewing progress on implementing activities and projects of the Mitigation Strategy?	Section 6.2. page 6-4	Plan call for annual reports on progress but these reports were not completed during the last three year planning cycle.		X
<b>E. Does the updated plan discuss if mitigation actions were implemented as planned?</b>	Section 4.3.1 to Section 4.3.13, pp. 4-6 to 4-44	Plan describes to status of mitigation action items including those implemented and completed.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

SEVERE REPETITIVE LOSS STRATEGY (*only required for 90/10 under FMA & SRL*)

Repetitive Loss Mitigation Strategy

**Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(v):** A State may request the reduced cost share authorized under §79.4(c)(2) of this chapter for the FMA and SRL programs, if it has an approved State Mitigation Plan ... that also identifies specific actions the State has taken to reduce the number of repetitive loss properties (which *must* include severe repetitive loss properties), and specifies how the State intends to reduce the number of such repetitive loss properties.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
<b>A. Does the new or updated plan describe State mitigation goals that support the selection of mitigation activities for repetitive loss properties (see also Part 201.4(c)(3)(i))?</b>	Section 4.3.16, pp. 4-45 to 4-46; Section 7.2.9 to	A priority is for projects that “ <i>reduce the cost of repairing properties suffering repetitive damages</i> ”.		X

State:

Date of Plan:

	Section 7.3, pp. 7-31 to 7-42 and Appendix D			
<b>B. Does the new or updated plan consider repetitive loss properties in its evaluation of the State's hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities and its general description of the local mitigation capabilities (see also Part 201.4(c)(3)(ii))?</b>	Section 4.3.16, pp. 4-45 to 4-46; Section 7.2.9 to Section 7.3, pp. 7-31 to 7-42 and Appendix D	The state has been successful in acquiring, elevating, or flood-proofing properties classified as repetitive loss properties. Appendix D identifies 112 repetitive loss properties that have been mitigated under different federal and state mitigation programs.		X
<b>C. Does the new or updated plan address repetitive loss properties in its risk assessment (see also Part 201.4(c)(2))?</b>	Section 4.3.16, pp. 4-45 to 4-46; Section 7.2.9 to Section 7.3, pp. 7-31 to 7-42 and Appendix D	Appendix D identifies the communities in the state most vulnerable to adverse economic impacts due to repetitive loss properties. Appendix D includes a ranking of the ten communities in the state with the highest number of repetitive loss properties.		X
<b>D. Does the new or updated plan identify, evaluate and prioritize cost-effective, environmentally sound, and technically feasible mitigation actions for repetitive loss properties (see also Part 201.4(c)(3)(iii))?</b>	Section 7.2.6 to Section 7.2.10, pp. 7-20 to 7-32 and Appendix D	Historically the state's priority has been the acquisition of repetitive loss properties but mitigation efforts have also included elevating structures and flood-proofing structures.		X
<b>E. Does the new or updated plan describe specific actions that have been implemented to mitigate repetitive loss properties, including actions taken to reduce the number of severe repetitive loss properties?</b>	Section 7.2.9 to 7.2.11, pp. 7-20 to 7-32 and Appendix D	Appendix D highlights some successful acquisition programs that took place following disasters.		X
<b>F. Does the new or updated plan identify current and potential sources of Federal, State, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities for repetitive loss properties (see also Part 201.4(c)(3)(iv))?</b>	Table 4.2.1, pp. 4-51 to 4-82	Most of the sources of funding identified are federal funding sources.		X
<b>SUMMARY SCORE</b>				X

Coordination with Repetitive Loss Jurisdictions

**Requirement §201.4(c)(3)(v):** In addition, the plan **must** describe the strategy the State has to ensure that local jurisdictions with severe repetitive loss properties take actions to reduce the number of these properties, including the development of local mitigation plans.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
<b>A. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the State process to support, through funding and technical assistance, the development of local mitigation plans in communities with severe repetitive loss properties (see also Part 201.4(c)(4)(i))?</b>	Appendix D	Appendix D identifies those communities with the most repetitive loss properties and it highlights the actions that have been taken by a variety of local jurisdictions to eliminate or mitigate these properties. Appendix D also highlights the funding sources the state uses to mitigate repetitive flood losses.		X

State:

Date of Plan:

<p><b>B. Does the new or updated plan include considerations for repetitive loss properties in its criteria for prioritizing communities and local jurisdictions that would receive planning and project grants under available mitigation funding programs (see also Part 201.4(c)(3)(iii))?</b></p>	<p>Section 7.2.9 to 7.2.11, pp. 7-20 to 7-32 and Appendix D</p>	<p>The plan indicates that the state supports local mitigation plans in counties with repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss properties. Appendix D identifies the communities most affected by repetitive losses associated with flooding.</p>		<p>X</p>
<p>SUMMARY SCORE</p>				<p>X</p>