

GUIDANCE MEMORANDUM #2



Plan Maintenance Procedures: Monitoring, Evaluating and Updating the Plan

To: Ed Conover
Atlantic County Office of Emergency Preparedness
For distribution to representatives from all participating jurisdictions

From: Anna Foley, URS

Date: January 6, 2009

Re: Atlantic County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning Project

DMA 2000:

The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000), also known as Public Law 106-390, amends the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act by, among other things, adding a new section, 322 - Mitigation Planning. It contains 44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(i) which states, "[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." A formal plan maintenance process must take place to ensure that the Hazard Mitigation Plan remains an active and pertinent document. Regularly scheduled evaluations during the five-year cycle are important to assess the effectiveness of the program and to reflect changes that may affect mitigation priorities.

Local mitigation plans must be updated and resubmitted to FEMA for approval every five years in order to continue eligibility for FEMA hazard mitigation assistance programs. Plan updates must demonstrate that progress has been made in the past five years for Local Mitigation Plans to fulfill commitments outlined in the previously approved plan. FEMA recommends that local jurisdictions develop a schedule that allows a plan update and approval to occur within five years from the last approval date, with sufficient time being allotted for all activities up to and including adoption such as: (a) application and award for mitigation planning grants (if applicable); (b) contracting for technical or professional services (if applicable); (c) review of the plan; (d) planning process to develop the update; (e) State and FEMA reviews; (f) revising the updated plan if necessary based on FEMA review comments; and (g) local jurisdiction adoption of the updated plan.

The Requirement:

To meet the requirement of periodically monitoring, evaluating and updating the plan, the new hazard mitigation plan must present the criteria that will be used by the Core Planning Group to perform its regularly scheduled evaluations and five-year update of the Plan. The plan should discuss specific plan update procedures, including what criteria will be used to evaluate the plan, what may trigger a plan update before the five-year minimum, who will lead the effort to update the document and under what time frame.



Memo Purpose:

FEMA's requirements regarding plan maintenance have been written to provide a substantial degree of flexibility. This allows communities across the country to identify unique plan maintenance processes that best accommodate local resources and preferences. There is quite a wide range of plan maintenance approaches that can be taken, working within the minimum requirements. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide you with an overview of the requirements, types of plan maintenance components that can be selected to meet the requirements, and some examples of plan maintenance strategies from other FEMA-approved plans in FEMA Region 2. **Core Planning Group Members are being asked to review this information, coordinate with their Jurisdictional Assessment Team, and provide comments back to ACOEP. What types of plan maintenance activities is your community in favor of? Are there any specific elements your community would like to see excluded?** Everyone's feedback will then be compiled to develop a single, county-wide plan maintenance strategy that best reflects the preferences of the full team.

This memorandum aims to present a summary of key information that is presented in FEMA's How-To Guide #3 entitled "Developing the Mitigation Plan; Identifying Mitigation Actions and Implementing Strategies" (available online at: <http://www.fema.gov/plan/mitplanning/howto3.shtm>) and How-To Guide #4 entitled "Bringing the Plan to Life: Implementing the Hazard Mitigation Plan" (available online at: <http://www.fema.gov/plan/mitplanning/howto4.shtm>). It is intended to serve as a supplement – and not as a replacement – for the FEMA documents. URS would strongly suggest that Core Planning Group members make every effort to familiarize themselves with applicable FEMA regulations and mitigation planning guidance (see "Sources of Information on Hazard Mitigation on Planning" handout from Core Planning Group Meeting #1 on August 18, 2008).

Keep In Mind:

URS Corporation (URS), as the consulting company, is able to provide the Group with guidance on potential means to satisfy the requirement for plan maintenance procedures. However, it is Atlantic County and the participating jurisdictions that are in the best position to define the process. The Core Planning Group must coordinate amongst themselves to consider URS' recommendations herein and agree upon a plan maintenance procedure for the County's Multi-Jurisdictional Plan, to be provided back to URS in order for URS to incorporate this information into the plan. URS will incorporate the plan maintenance procedures, obtained from the Core Planning Group through ACOEP, into the new Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Action Item:

Action items are discussed further throughout this memorandum. They are presented in summary here. To allow URS sufficient time to draft appropriate plan sections, the Planning Group must:

- Submit comments to ACOEP regarding what your community is in favor of, and/or what your community opposes, regarding plan maintenance. **Comments should be submitted to Ed Conover no later than February 7, 2009. Feedback is not required; lack of response will be interpreted to indicate that your jurisdiction has no particular preferences regarding this plan element.**



Section 1 – Monitoring

The Regulations: 44 CFR §201.6(c)(4)(i) states, “[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.”

An important step in any mitigation planning process is to document the method by which the Core Planning Group will monitor the Hazard Mitigation Plan throughout the five-year period of record. For instance, the Core Planning Group should describe the monitoring system it has established to oversee the new plan. Examples include:

1. Periodic work progress reports by agencies or Core Planning Group members involved in implementing projects or activities;
2. Site visits, phone calls and meetings conducted by the individual responsible for overseeing the plan; and
3. Preparation of an annual report that will summarize the scope of the plan and the milestones of the activities above-mentioned.

Statements like the ones above should be accompanied by additional details such as how, when, and by whom monitoring activities shall be conducted.

As mentioned in item number 1 above, agencies, departments, organizations and/or individual members, whose duties have been identified in the mitigation strategy, can be asked to periodically submit a work progress report on those projects being implemented. The plan should include specific details such as: whether this ‘periodic’ action is to be conducted annually, semi-annually, quarterly, or over some other time frame, making note of specific due dates; responsible parties who will be completing the progress reports; to whom progress reports shall be submitted; the individual or individuals who will be reviewing the progress reports (and when); and how this information will be incorporated. The progress report should include:

1. The hazard mitigation action(s) that the agency is responsible for;
2. The supporting agencies/entities responsible for implementation;
3. A delineation of the various stages of work along with timelines (milestones should be included);
4. Whether the resources needed for implementation, funding, staff time and technical assistance are available, or if other arrangements must be made to obtain them;
5. The types of permits or approvals necessary to implement the action;
6. Details on the ways the actions will be accomplished within the organization;
7. Whether the duties will be assigned to agency staff or contracted out;
8. The current status of the project; and
9. The identification of any issues that may hinder implementation.

This method of providing progress reports helps break the process into smaller, more manageable tasks. The plan maintenance process is an ongoing activity; thus, periodic review of the plan will help keep the plan current, reflecting the changing needs of the community. URS would suggest that the Core Planning Group review the sample worksheet “Progress Report” on pages 2-13 through 2-15 of FEMA’s How-To Guide #4 which can be utilized as a tool in the monitoring and documentation process of the plan (see Attachment A for a blank template of the report).

It is recommended that the Core Planning Group establish Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) that measure the effectiveness of the projects and of those involved in the projects so that team members better understand how their



actions contribute to the overall success of the projects. When identifying the Core Planning Group's KPI's, quantifiable measurements, it is critical to limit them to the areas under discussion that are essential to the Core Planning Group successfully reaching its goals. Thus, KPI's should be directly tied to the goals and objectives of the plan and the projects, and should be used as a performance management tool.

KPI's assist the team members by providing a clear focus of what's important and what needs to be accomplished. URS would suggest that the Core Planning Group review the sample worksheet "Evaluate Your Projects Results" on pages 3-6 through 3-7 of FEMA's How-To Guide #4 which can be utilized as a tool in the project evaluation process of the plan (see Attachment B for a blank template of the worksheet).

Section 2 – Evaluation

The Regulations: 44 CFR §201.6(c)(4)(i) states, *"[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."*

Post adoption and implementation, a mitigation plan should be evaluated on an annual basis in order to assess the effectiveness of the plan and to reflect changes that may affect the mitigation priorities. It should include the criteria that will be utilized to evaluate the plan, for example:

1. Do the goals and objectives address current and expected conditions;
2. Has the nature and magnitude of risks changed;
3. Are the current resources appropriate for implementing the plan;
4. Are there any implementation problems (such as technical, political and/or legal), or coordination issues with the other agencies and/or Core Planning Group members;
5. Have the outcomes occurred as expected;
6. Whether the agencies and other Core Planning Group partners participated, as proposed; and
7. Where shortcomings are identified, and what can be done to bring things back on track?

Statements like the ones above should be accompanied by additional details such as how, when, and by whom evaluation activities shall be conducted.

The Core Planning Group may choose to meet on an annual basis to discuss monitoring results, and to evaluate progress according to specific criteria.

Attachment C includes a blank template of FEMA's "Revise the Plan" worksheet (from How-To #4). Annual evaluations using this worksheet may be helpful to determine whether a full update (in advance of the five-year minimum) would be useful.



Section 3 – Update

The Regulations: 44 CFR §201.6(c)(4)(i) states, *“[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.”*

44 CFR §201.6(d)(3) states, *“Plans must be reviewed, revised if appropriate, and resubmitted for approval within five years in order to continue to be eligible for HMGP Project grant funding.”*

As stated in the above regulations, the plan must be reviewed and revised (if updated), by the local jurisdiction and resubmitted to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer for initial review and coordination within five years of the plan's approval by FEMA. This is the minimum required. The Core Planning Group may choose to update more frequently, on an as-needed basis. The plan should identify what may trigger plan updates before the minimum five-year window. It should also identify the specific update procedures, the responsible individual(s) for updating the document, and the specific timelines.

URS suggests that Mr. Ed Conover of the Atlantic County Office of Emergency Preparedness, who was identified as Coordinator for this mitigation planning project, may be a good candidate for overseeing the monitoring, evaluation and updating process (with help from the rest of the County Mitigation Planning Jurisdictional Assessment Team), and the County's Planning Department may be a good candidate for taking the lead on plan updates (again, with help from Mr. Conover and the rest of the County Mitigation Planning Jurisdictional Assessment Team). The plan must be updated and revised, at a minimum, every five years in order to keep the Mitigation Plan relevant and meet DMA 2000 requirements.

Section 4 – Public Participation in Plan Maintenance

The Regulations: 44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(iii) states, *“[The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.”*

To meet this requirement, the new Hazard Mitigation Plan should describe what opportunities the public and other stakeholders will have during the plan's periodic review to comment on the progress made to date and on any proposed plan revisions.

Note that this is a separate issue from the public's participation to-date in plan *development*. The plan must also discuss specific procedures for how the Core Planning Group will invite the public to participate in *future* plan monitoring, evaluating, and updating. Will the Core Planning Group send an annual newsletter out to the public, with a survey form to fill out? Will the Core Planning Group hold annual public meetings to discuss the status of the plan recommendations? What process will be in place for public comments to be incorporated into future plan updates?



The following pages provide action item suggestions that the Core Planning Group could consider for selection as opportunities for continued participation on the part of the public and other stakeholders. The Core Planning Group members should select items that they feel are most appropriate and provide feedback to URS on what was selected as a final course of action to be incorporated into the plan.

Continued Public Involvement in Plan Maintenance

URS recommends that the Core Planning Group pursue a wide array of activities to involve the public during future plan monitoring, evaluating, and updates. Options include but are not limited to:

- **Share the findings of future progress reports** with interested groups, elected officials, neighborhood representatives and citizens as one way to keep the parties informed and involved. This could be done by posting progress reports in local libraries, clerk's offices, web sites, etc. Furthermore, this keeps those responsible for implementing the mitigation actions motivated.
- Conduct **town hall meetings**, which are an effective way to bring citizens and Core Planning Group members together to learn about the progress being made on the plan;
- Provide **facilitated meetings**. An experienced facilitator would assist with the process of obtaining public opinions, suggestions and other pertinent information relevant to the goals and objectives of the plan.
- Provide the public with **surveys** that assess how well the public education and outreach projects are working and how the community perceives the planning efforts. Samples are included in the FEMA How-To's. Questionnaires/surveys are excellent tools to assist the Core Planning Group in obtaining valuable feedback on the plan. By their nature, questionnaires also provide recipients with an excellent vehicle to provide comments.

Once the Core Planning Group has gathered the feedback from the general public and local community, URS suggests organizing the data by topic, by types of responses and suggestions or by Core Planning Group members' related tasks in the plan. This will facilitate the process of incorporating the feedback into the plan.

One method of organizing the data is to build a database that would contain community member/general public responses to the plan and the surveys. This data could then be used to conduct statistical analyses by topic (such as land use or environment); calculate total numbers in support of or against policies of the mitigation process; and gather suggestions and comments regarding the natural hazards, among other concerns that may arise out of the public's awareness.

- Offer **working groups** or advisory groups by topic areas such as land use, environmental protection and transportation;
- Conduct planned or impromptu **interviews** with community members and publicize their comments;
- Use the **media** to inform the public of the plan, through press releases, handing out flyers, newsletters or placing local ads on TV, and in newspapers and magazines;
- Offer **telephone hotline services** (preferably a toll-free number).
- Establish an **online presence** with a Web site or the use of an existing Web site of the participating jurisdiction members. The easy accessibility to a Web site that the public can access at any time to read about the latest natural hazards or obtain the latest hazard mitigation planning information is an excellent method of keeping the public involved and informed on a continuous basis. For instance, the Core Planning Group could provide a section where the community can fill-out questionnaires as well as email Core Planning Group members with issues or success stories. Additionally, by offering online services, the general public could:
 - participate in message boards on the site (open to all for comments on specific mitigation topics);
 - review meeting minutes and notes;
 - review the Plan itself;



- follow links to natural hazards information;
- fill out online surveys and questionnaires;
- obtain contact information for key persons involved in the mitigation planning process; and
- vote on various mitigation-related issues, questions, processes, goals, objectives, etc.

Opportunities selected by the Core Planning Group for public participation in plan maintenance should be very specific in terms of: exactly *when* these opportunities will be available; *how* the public will be notified of their opportunity to participate; where the plan and any progress reports, meeting minutes, etc. will be maintained for review; how and to whom comments can be submitted.

Statements “that” certain things will happen are not sufficient in themselves to meet FEMA criteria. Details must be provided to show that a process has been clearly thought out and identified. For example, stating “that the public will be invited to participate in future plan monitoring, evaluation, and updates” is not sufficient. Additional information should be included so that the reader knows how and when members of the public will be invited to participate; what they will be invited to do (i.e., an annual meeting? a questionnaire or survey?); how and when they will be notified of this opportunity; how they can submit comments; what will be done with their comments. In our opinion, it would be more important to have a few, well thought out options defined in detail than a multitude of options defined only in part. If participating jurisdictions have public outreach persons on staff, it may be a good idea for the Core Planning Group to consider soliciting their support.

Section 5 – Key Points and Draft Text For Your Review/Comment

Key Points to Consider

The two simple questions that the Core Planning Group should ensure are answered in the plan are:

1. Does the plan describe the method for monitoring, evaluating and updating the plan? (i.e., department/staff responsible for monitoring, criteria for evaluation and department/staff responsible for updating).
2. Does the plan describe a schedule for monitoring, evaluating and updating the plan within the five-year cycle?

Each participating jurisdiction should have a role in the process of monitoring, evaluating and updating the plan. One way to obtain this input would be to require that each participating jurisdiction complete each of Attachments A through C and submit to ACOEP once per year.

Draft Atlantic County Plan Section Regarding Plan Maintenance

The text below represents a draft section for the Atlantic County plan regarding plan maintenance. **Please comment on anything your jurisdiction would like to see changed in the final Atlantic County Plan.**

It is required by FEMA (as per 44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(i) that, “[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.” A formal plan maintenance process must take place to ensure that the Hazard Mitigation Plan remains an active and pertinent document. Regularly scheduled evaluations during the five-year cycle are important to assess the effectiveness of the program and to reflect changes that may affect mitigation priorities.

URS Corporation (URS), as the consulting company, was able to provide the Core Planning Group with guidance on potential means to satisfy the requirement for plan maintenance procedures. However, it was the members of the Core Planning Group who were in the best position to define the process. URS submitted a Guidance Memorandum (Guidance Memorandum #2 – Plan Maintenance Procedures) to



ACOEP on January 6, 2009, to summarize FEMA requirements for plan monitoring, evaluation, and updates. It was also posted to the mitigation planning web site soon after for review by Core Planning Group members, the public, and other stakeholders.

Team members were asked to provide feedback regarding their desires for plan maintenance to ACOEP. ACOEP, in turn, worked with the Consultant to develop this mitigation strategy to best reflect expressed preferences. The information presented below represents these decisions, as provided to URS through ACOEP. These methods will ensure that regular review and updating of the Hazard Mitigation Plan will occur.

Mr. Edward Conover of the ACOEP, who was identified as Coordinator for this mitigation planning project, will oversee the overall plan maintenance process. ACOEP will take the lead on plan monitoring and evaluation steps (with help from the rest of the County Mitigation Planning Jurisdictional Assessment Team), and the County's Department of Planning will take the lead on any required plan updates (with help from Mr. Conover and the rest of the County Mitigation Planning Jurisdictional Assessment Team).

Monitoring the Plan

An important step in any mitigation planning process is to document the method by which the Core Planning Group will monitor the Hazard Mitigation Plan throughout the five-year period of record.

First, to accomplish this objective, the Core Planning Group has elected to prepare Annual Work Progress Monitoring Reports, prepared by entities responsible for implementing mitigation actions (as identified in the Mitigation Strategy). Progress Monitoring Reports shall be submitted by Core Planning Group members on an annual basis to ACOEP, beginning one year from the date of FEMA's approval of the Final plan. Work progress reports shall be the FEMA How-To #4 (FEMA 386-4), Worksheet #1, Progress Report and will contain the key performance indicators identified in that document. Using the FEMA Progress Reports will answer the following questions:

- ✚ the hazard mitigation action(s) that the agency is responsible for
- ✚ the supporting agencies/entities responsible for implementation;
- ✚ a delineation of the various stages of work along with timelines (milestones should be included);
- ✚ whether the resources needed for implementation, funding, staff time and technical assistance are available, or if other arrangements must be made to obtain them;
- ✚ the types of permits or approvals necessary to implement the action;
- ✚ details on the ways the actions will be accomplished within the organization;
- ✚ whether the duties will be assigned to agency staff or contracted out;
- ✚ the current status of the project; and
- ✚ identifying any issues that may hinder implementation.

On a case-by-case basis, ACOEP will determine if site visits, phone calls, and/or meetings would be beneficial to supplement Annual Work Progress Monitoring Reports. If so, ACOEP will initiate the site visits/calls/meetings as applicable.

Evaluating the Plan

Post adoption, a mitigation plan should be evaluated on a regular basis in order to assess the effectiveness of the plan's implementation and to reflect changes that may affect the mitigation priorities.

To accomplish this objective, the Core Planning Group will convene once per year for an Annual Plan Evaluation Meeting. Plan Evaluation Meetings will be conducted within three months after each annual batch of Progress Reports are due (see "Monitoring", above). At each Plan Evaluation Meeting, the Core Planning Group will review Progress Reports, and use the following criteria to evaluate the plan:

- ✚ do the goals and objectives address current and expected conditions?
- ✚ has the nature and magnitude of risks changed?
- ✚ are the current resources appropriate for implementing the plan?



- ✦ are there any implementation problems (such as technical, political and/or legal), or coordination issues with the other agencies and/or Committee members?
- ✦ have the outcomes occurred as expected?
- ✦ have the agencies and other Committee partners participated as proposed?; and
- ✦ where shortcomings are identified, what can be done to bring things back on track?

Following each Annual Plan Evaluation Meeting, the ACOEP will prepare meeting minutes summarizing the outcome of the evaluation meeting. ACOEP will distribute meeting minutes to Core Planning Group members via email, and will post meeting minutes on the web site.

Updating the Plan

As part of the process to maintain FEMA mitigation funding eligibility, a plan update must always be submitted to NYSEMO/FEMA for their review. This must occur within five years of the plan's approval by FEMA (and during subsequent five-year cycles thereafter).

To accomplish this objective, ACOEP will take the lead on Plan updates, with support from the Core Planning Group members and the County Planning Department. ACOEP will conduct Update Appraisals. During the Update Appraisal, ACOEP will evaluate the current Plan, Annual Progress Reports, and Annual Plan Evaluation Meeting Minutes. ACOEP will conduct the Update Appraisals at 3.5 years from the date of FEMA's approval of the Final plan, and at the same point in time during subsequent five-year windows (i.e., from the date of FEMA's approval of the final plan, Update Appraisals will occur at Year 3.5, Year 8.5, Year 13.5, etc.). The Planning Group has selected Year 3.5 as the point for the Update Appraisals to ensure that sufficient time (18 months) will be available to update the document within the five year cycle, receive FEMA's re-approval, and for local jurisdictions to formally adopt the updated plan.

The plan update will not only involve a comprehensive review and evaluation of each section of the plan, but also a discussion of the results of evaluation and monitoring activities detailed in the Plan Maintenance section of the previously approved plan. Plan updates may validate the information in the previously approved plan, or may involve a major plan rewrite. A plan update cannot be an annex referring to the previously approved plan; it must stand on its own as a complete and current plan.

Other criteria that will be considered during the update include:

- ✦ if changing situations have modified goals/objectives/actions and/or hazards;
- ✦ if additional information is available to perform more accurate vulnerability assessments;
- ✦ if it is determined that participating jurisdictions wish to be added to and/or removed from the Plan;
- or
- ✦ if it is determined that the Plan no longer addresses current and expected future conditions.

At the time of the update, ACOEP shall consult with FEMA for the latest Guidance in place regarding plan updates to ensure that the latest criteria are addressed in the update process.

ACOEP will prepare an updated plan, and circulate it to Core Planning Group members via email for their review and comment. Comments will be due back to ACOEP within 14 days; lack of response will be assumed to indicate concurrence with the ACOEP appraisal. Comments received which cannot be resolved remotely will trigger an Update Resolution Meeting of the Core Planning Group to resolve differences and develop a joint determination on how to modify the document.

Any plan updates will be released for public review and comment. The updated plan will be posted on the County web site, and made available in hard copy at the ACOEP offices. Notification to the public will also be issued to this same effect, and interested parties will be given 30 days to provide comments to ACOEP.

Public Participation in Plan Maintenance

As per 44 CFR Part 201.6 (c)(4)(iii) states, "[The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process." To meet this



requirement, the new Hazard Mitigation Plan should describe what opportunities the public will have during the plan's periodic review to comment on the progress made to date and on any proposed plan revisions.

The following array of activities was selected by ACOEP based on feedback received from Core Planning Group members.

- ✚ ACOEP will continue to maintain the mitigation planning website and document repositories.
- ✚ Each participating jurisdiction will add a link on their jurisdiction's web page to the County mitigation planning website, if they have not already done so as part of the plan development process.
- ✚ ACOEP will lead efforts to prepare an annual fact sheet on the plan. This fact sheet will be submitted via email to Core Planning Group members for posting on community notice boards, at a minimum, and preferable supplemented with distribution at meetings as applicable. ACOEP will post the fact sheet on the county mitigation plan web site.
- ✚ ACOEP will lead efforts to prepare a survey for the public and other stake holders which will be posted on the County mitigation planning web site and in document repositories. Survey forms will be shared with participating jurisdictions for their use, as well. All feedback will be directed to ACOEP as a central location. Survey feedback will be a topic of discussion at Annual Plan Evaluation Meetings.
- ✚ Participating jurisdictions will conduct annual interviews and/or smaller meetings with civic groups, the public and other stakeholders. This will be accomplished through incorporating discussion of the mitigation plan into other regularly attended meetings.
- ✚ Participating jurisdictions will consider annual flyers, newsletters, newspaper advertisements, and Radio/TV announcements, and will implement some or all of the above at the discretion of the jurisdiction.
- ✚ ACOEP will establish a telephone hotline service (preferably a toll-free number) where interested parties can ask questions or submit feedback regarding the plan.
- ✚ Participating jurisdictions will consider offering working groups by topic area (such as land use, hazard, mitigation action, etc.) if deemed necessary based upon feedback obtained during the plan maintenance cycles.
- ✚ Participating jurisdictions will each conduct an annual town hall meeting on the progress of the mitigation plan.

Section 6 – Core Planning Group Member Action Item

Please submit comments to ACOEP regarding what your community is in favor of, and/or what your community opposes, regarding plan maintenance. **Comments should be submitted to Ed Conover no later than February 7, 2009. Feedback is not required; lack of response will be interpreted to indicate that your jurisdiction has no particular preferences regarding this plan element.**



ATTACHMENT A

FEMA's How-To Guide #4, "Bringing the Plan to Life: Implementing the Hazard Mitigation Plan"

Worksheet #1, Progress Report

Pages 1 through 3



Worksheet # 1: Progress Report

Progress Report Period: _____ to _____
(date) (date)

Project Title: _____ Project ID#: _____

Responsible Agency: _____

Address: _____

City/County: _____

Contact Person: _____ Title: _____

Phone #(s): _____ e-mail address: _____

List Supporting Agencies and Contacts: _____

Total Project Cost: \$ _____ Anticipated Cost Overrun/Underrun: _____

Date of Project Approval: _____ Start date of the project: _____

Anticipated completion date: _____

Description of the Project (include a description of each phase, if applicable, and the time frame for completing each phase).

Milestones	Complete	Projected Date of Completion



Plan Goal(s)/Objective(s) Addressed:

Goal: _____

Objective: _____

Indicator of Success (e.g., losses avoided as a result of the acquisition program):

In most cases, you will list losses avoided as the indicator. In cases where it is difficult to quantify the benefits in dollar amounts, you will use other indicators, such as the number of people who now know about mitigation or who are taking mitigation actions to reduce their vulnerability to hazards.

Status (Please check pertinent information and provide explanations for items with an asterisk. For completed or canceled projects, see Worksheet #2 — to complete a project evaluation):

Project Status

(1) Project on schedule

(2) Project completed

(3) Project delayed*
*explain: _____

(4) Project canceled

Project Cost Status

(1) Cost unchanged

(2) Cost overrun*
*explain: _____

(3) Cost underrun*
*explain: _____

Summary of progress on project for this report:

- A. What was accomplished during this reporting period?
- B. What obstacles, problems, or delays did you encounter, if any?
- C. How was each problem resolved?

Next Steps: What is/are the next step(s) to be accomplished over the next reporting period?

Other comments:

Adapted from the North Carolina HMGP Progress Report Form at http://www.dem.dcc.state.nc.us/mitigation/document_index.htm.



ATTACHMENT B

FEMA's How-To Guide #4, "Bringing the Plan to Life: Implementing the Hazard Mitigation Plan"

Worksheet #3, Evaluate Your Project Results

Pages 3-6 through 3-7



Worksheet #3: Evaluate Your Project Results

Project Name and Number:	<p><i>Insert location map</i></p> <p><i>include before and after photos if appropriate</i></p>
Project Budget:	
Project Description:	
Associated Goal and Objective (s):	
Indicator of Success (e.g., losses avoided):	

Was the action implemented?

IF YES



IF NO



What were the results of the implemented action?

Why not?

Was there political support for the action?	YES	NO
Were enough funds available?	YES	NO
Were workloads equitably or realistically distributed?	YES	NO
Was new information discovered about the risks or community that made implementation difficult or no longer sensible?	YES	NO
Was the estimated time of implementation reasonable?	YES	NO
Were sufficient resources (for example staff and technical assistance) available?	YES	NO



Were the outcomes as expected? YES NO Additional comments or other outcomes:
If No, please explain:

Did the results achieve the goal and objective (s)? YES NO
Explain how:

Was the action cost-effective? YES NO
Explain how or how not:

What were the losses avoided after having completed the project?

If it was a structural project, how did it change the hazard profile?

Date _____

Prepared by: _____



ATTACHMENT C

FEMA's How-To Guide #4, "Bringing the Plan to Life: Implementing the Hazard Mitigation Plan"

Worksheet #5, Revise the Plan

Pages 4-7 through 4-10



Worksheet #5: Revise the Plan

Prepare to update the plan.

When preparing to update the plan:

Check the box when addressed ✓

1. Gather information, including project evaluation worksheets, progress reports, studies, related plans, etc.

Comments:

2. Reconvene the planning team, making changes to the team composition as necessary (see results from *Worksheet #2*).

Comments:

Consider the results of the evaluation and new strategies for the future.

When examining the community consider:

Check the box when addressed ✓

1. The results of the planning and outreach efforts.

Comments:

2. The results of the mitigation efforts.

Comments:

3. Shifts in development trends.

Comments:

4. Areas affected by recent disasters.

Comments:

5. The recent magnitude, location, and type of the most recent hazard or disaster.

Comments:

6. New studies or technologies.

Comments:

7. Changes in local, state, or federal laws, policies, plans, priorities, or funding.

Comments:



8. Changes in the socioeconomic fabric of the community.

Comments:

9. Other changing conditions.

Comments:

Incorporate your findings into the plan.

When examining the plan:

Check the box when addressed ✓

1. Revisit the risk assessment.

Comments:

2. Update your goals and strategies.

Comments:

3. Recalculate benefit-cost analyses of projects to prioritize action items.

Comments:

Use the following criteria to evaluate the plan:

Criteria

YES NO Solution

Are the goals still applicable?

--	--	--

Have any changes in the state or community made the goals obsolete or irrelevant?

--	--	--

Do existing actions need to be reprioritized for implementation?

--	--	--

Do the plan's priorities correspond with state priorities?

--	--	--

Can actions be implemented with available resources?

--	--	--

Comments:

