

Standard State Hazard Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

State Point of Contact: Ray Morrell	Address: Fraine Barracks Lane - Building 35 P.O. Box 5511 Bismarck, ND 58506
Title: State Hazard Mitigation Officer	
Agency: North Dakota Office of Emergency Management	
Phone Number: 701-328-8100	E-Mail: rmorrell@nd.gov

FEMA Reviewer: Margaret Doherty Julie Baxter Sean McNabb Nikki Robles-Kyle Rich Hansen	Title: Community Planner Senior Community Planner GIS/Risk Analyst GIS/Risk Analyst HMA Grants Specialist	Date: February 9, 2011 March 1, 2011 February 22, 2011 February 22, 2011 March 1, 2011
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII	January 31, 2011	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption	March 1, 2011	
Plan Approved	March 2, 2011	

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

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

N	S
	X
	X
	X
	X
	X

Coordination of Local Mitigation Planning

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

N	S
	X
	X
	X

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

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

N	S
	NA
	NA

Plan Maintenance Process

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

N	S
	X
	X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED	
PLAN APPROVED	X

See Reviewer's Comments

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 new or updated plan?	Page 1-1	The Governor signed a letter on March 2, 2011 adopting the plan on behalf of the State of North Dakota.		X
B. Does the plan provide assurances that the State will continue to 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)?	Page 1-1	The Governor's adoption letter includes the required assurances.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

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 new or updated plan was prepared?	Pages 3-1 – 3-14 and Appendices A-F	The plan includes a thorough description of the process followed to prepare the plan. The Appendices include documentation of the planning process. Appendix E provides an excellent record of the comments received since the 2007 update.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan indicate who was involved in the current planning process?	Pages 3-2 – 3-7 and Appendices A-C and E	The plan explains that the North Dakota Department of Emergency Services (NDES) coordinated the plan update with assistance from a consultant, Big Sky Hazard Management, LLC. The plan lists the agencies represented in the State Hazard Mitigation Team (SHMT) and their responsibilities. The plan also lists the responsibilities of an Interagency Hazard Mitigation Team (IHMT), which included state and federal agencies.		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION VIII

State: North Dakota

Date of Plan: January 2011

		Additionally, Mitigation Planning Committees were formed for each identified hazard and for other key planning areas. Finally, stakeholder workshops were held to engage a larger audience. Documentation of participation is provided in the Appendices.		
C. Does the new or updated plan indicate how other agencies participated in the current planning process?	Pages 3-2 – 3-7, 7-36, and Appendices A-C and E	The four groups, SHMT, IHMT, Hazard Mitigation Teams, and Stakeholders allowed for the participation of numerous local, state, and federal agencies. Page 3-6 of the plan describes new strategies to reach stakeholders as part of this update including webinars. Page 7-36 describes how participation in the planning process has increased significantly with each update.		X
D. Does the updated plan document how the planning team reviewed and analyzed each section of the plan?	Page 3-2, 3-6 and Appendices D and F	At the first project meeting, in March 2010, participants were presented with a summary of the updates to the plan and were asked to sign up for a hazard committee to provide feedback. During the November 2010 workshop, participants were provided with an overview of the draft plan and were asked to provide comments. Appendix D includes notes of the November workshop. Appendix F highlights changes to the plan since 2005.		X
E. Does the updated plan indicate for each section whether or not it was revised as part of the update process?	Page 3-2 and Appendix F	The plan does an excellent job of tracking the updates and changes over time. Page 3-2 explains that geologic hazards was added as an identified hazard, further focus was added for vulnerabilities to new development, and all sections were reviewed, evaluated, and updated, but that basic methodologies and plan layout remained the same. Appendix F highlights all changes to the plan since 2005.		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 new or updated plan describe how Federal and State agencies were involved in the current planning process?	Pages 3-2 – 3-7 and Appendices A-C and E	The plan lists the responsibilities of an Interagency Hazard Mitigation Team (IHMT), which included numerous federal agencies. Documentation to support how these agencies were involved in meetings and workshops is included in the Appendices. <i>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i>		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION VIII

State: North Dakota

Date of Plan: January 2011

<p>B. Does the new or updated plan describe how interested groups (e.g., businesses, non-profit organizations, and other interested parties) were involved in the current planning process?</p>	<p>Pages 3-2 – 3-7 and Appendices A-C and E</p>	<p>Businesses, non-profit organizations and other interested parties were included on the list of Stakeholders and were given the opportunity to participate through the November 2010 workshop and the various mitigation planning committees.</p> <p><i>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i></p>		<p>X</p>
<p>C. Does the updated plan discuss how coordination among Federal and State agencies changed since approval of the previous plan?</p>	<p>Pages 3-3 – 3-4</p>	<p>The only change noted is that during periods with high levels of disaster activity, FEMA has assisted the state with the review of local mitigation plans. There is not a specific discussion about how coordination among Federal and State agencies has changed since the approval of the previous plan.</p>	<p>X</p>	
<p>SUMMARY SCORE</p>			<p>X</p>	

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
<p>A. Does the new or updated plan describe how the State mitigation planning process is integrated with other ongoing State planning efforts?</p>	<p>Pages 3-7 - 3-10; Page 7-36</p>	<p>Mitigation planning committees were formed for each hazard and were used to engage relevant agencies into the planning process. The State planning process also included sending letters to each department/agency encouraging the review and integration of information provided in the plan. Tables 3.5A and 3.5B identify future opportunities and ongoing State planning efforts that are being integrated with the State mitigation plan. The plan does not describe how other ongoing State planning efforts are using information and furthering goals of the State's mitigation plan, but it does identify opportunities for such.</p> <p>Recommendation: Describe how the plan is integrated with other State and/or regional planning initiatives that provide primary guidance for hazard mitigation-related activities. Describe actual ongoing efforts where mitigation actions have been integrated into planning mechanisms and implementation tools.</p>		<p>X</p>

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION VIII

State: North Dakota

Date of Plan: January 2011

		<i>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i>		
B. Does the new or updated plan describe how the State mitigation planning process is integrated with FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives?	Page 7-3 – 7-12	<p>The five-year floodplain management work plan for the CAP program and FEMA-approved local mitigation planning efforts were reviewed during the planning process for opportunities to integrate information and mitigation actions. FEMA Regional staff is involved in the Interagency Hazard Mitigation Team. An evaluation of Mitigation Programs, including FEMA programs such as PDM, HMGP, PA, CAP, Risk MAP, RFC, FMA, and SRL was conducted as part of the planning process and is described in Chapter 7.</p> <p>Recommendation: Improve integration with the State's Administrative Plan for FEMA's HMA programs. This plan is referenced and incorporated; however, it is unclear how the goals and objectives are integrated. The Mitigation Plan states that the Governor sets the priorities for HMGP while the Administrative Plan states the priorities are identified in the State Mitigation Plan.</p> <p><i>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i></p>		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

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 new or updated plan provide a description of the type of all natural hazards 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.	Pages 3-10 – 3-17 and 5.2-1 – 5.13-3	The updated risk assessment identifies 13 hazard groups, including seven that address natural hazards: dam failure, drought, flood (riverine, closed basin, ice jam, and flash), geologic (landslide, earthquake, and other), summer storm (tornado, hail, downburst, strong wind, and lightning), wildland fire, and winter weather (blizzard, heavy snow,		X

		ice storm, and extreme cold). The plan describes the characteristics of each identified hazard in the hazard profiles. The plan also includes a rationale for excluding some hazards from consideration such as the geologic hazards - landslides, earthquakes, avalanches, subsidence - from the risk assessment.		
			SUMMARY SCORE	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 location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazards addressed in the new or updated plan?	Pages 5.2-6, 5.3-2, 5.4-6, 5.5-3, 5.5-7, 5.9-8 – 5.9-13, 5.9-19 – 5.9-21, 5.12-8, and 5.13-9 Flood (pp. 5.4-21 – 5.4-27)	The plan includes a map showing the location of high, significant, and low hazard dams; a map of normal annual precipitation for drought; Devils Lake elevations since 1940; a fault map for earthquake; wildfire risk by county; and maps of previous occurrences for landslide, tornado, high wind, hail, and winter storm. The plan explains that local DFIRMS and FIRMS are a better depiction of flooding than statewide maps and directs readers to FEMA for the latest mapping. The flood profile includes state maps showing Presidential Declared flood disasters from 1989-2010, flash flood events 2000-2009, HAZUS estimated 100-year losses by, flood insurance policies, and NFIP repetitive loss properties.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the plan?	5.2-5 – 5.5-12, 5.9-5 – 5.9-21, 5.12-3 – 5.12-5, 5, 5.13-4 – 5.13-9, and 5.14-1 – 5.14-6	Each hazard profile includes a thorough listing of previous occurrences with descriptions of the events. Also, each hazard profile includes Presidential declaration information. Finally, the Risk Assessment Summary includes all Presidential declarations by county.		X
C. Does the new or updated plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pages 3-11, 5.2-5 – 5.2-6, 5.5-8 – 5.3-9, 5.4-20 – 5.4-21, 5.5-5 – 5.5-6, 5.9-17, 5.12-5 – 5.12-6, 5.13-8, and 5.14-11 – 5.14-17	Probability and magnitude are ranked as negligible, limited, critical, or catastrophic for each hazard identified in the plan. The methodology is described on p. 3-11. The Risk Assessment Summary (p. 5.14-11) includes hazard probability and magnitude rankings by county derived from the local plans.		X
			SUMMARY SCORE	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 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 new or updated plan describe the State’s vulnerability based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the State risk assessment?	Pages 3-12, 5.2-7 – 5.2-13, 5.3-13 – 5.3-20, 5.4-28 – 5.4-37, 5.5-9 – 5.5-12, 5.8-4 – 5.8-9, 5.9-22 – 5.9-33, 5.12-8 – 5.12-13, 5.13-10 – 5.13-14.	The plan does an excellent job incorporating information from local risk assessments. Page 3-12 explains how local risk assessments, including potential loss information were utilized in the statewide assessment and incorporated into the vulnerabilities to jurisdictions section. Each hazard profile describes the vulnerabilities to jurisdictions, of state-owned buildings and property, of critical facilities and infrastructure, and to new and future development.		X
B. Does the new or updated 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)?	Pages 5.14-11 – 5.14-17	The plan includes Table 5.14.3: Statewide Hazard Rankings by County/Reservation, a map of multi-hazard rankings, and local hazard classifications from the local plans.		X
C. Does the updated plan explain the process used to analyze the information from the local risk assessments, as necessary?	Pages 3-12 and 5.14-14	The plan explains the methodologies used by most counties and how it is summarized in the plan. The plan acknowledges that the information is useful in providing the local perspective but does not allow for a very consistent statewide picture since not all counties utilize the same methodology.		X
D. Does the updated plan reflect changes in development for jurisdictions in hazard prone areas?	Pages 3-13, 5.2-13, 5.3-19 – 5.3-20, 5.4-36 - 5.4-37, 5.5-12, 5.8-9, 5.9-32 – 5.9-33, 5.12-12 – 5.12-13, 5.13-14, and 5.14-10	Each hazard profile includes a narrative regarding how new and future development could be impacted by the hazard given current regulations. The plan acknowledges that potential loss estimates have not changed significantly due to new development; however improvements in data have occurred. The Risk Assessment Summary includes Table 5.14.2D: new and Future Development Losses, with a ranking per hazard. The counties with expected population increases are listed after the table. Recommendation: Provide more detail on the Devil’s Lake closed basin area		X

		with respect to the history of acquisitions in this area, changes in the development patterns, its future hazards with respect to development.		
			SUMMARY SCORE	

Assessing Vulnerability of State Facilities

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the new or updated plan describe the types of State owned or operated critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Pages 4.1-1 – 4.1-3, 4.2-2 – 4.2-3, 5.2-10, 5.3-17 – 5.3-19, 5.4-32 – 5.4-36, 5.5-11, 5.9-26 – 5.9-33, 5.12-11 – 5.12-12, 5.13-12 – 5.13-13, and 5.14-8 – 5.14-9	Each hazard profile includes a description of the risk to State owned buildings or a table of State owned buildings in hazard prone areas, by county, including the value. The Risk Assessment Summary includes Table 5.14.2B: State Owned Buildings and Property Losses by hazard and Table 5.14.2C Critical Facilities and Infrastructure Losses by hazard. Recommendation: Map facilities located in identified hazard prone areas once GIS data for State-owned or operated facilities has been obtained.		X
			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 new or updated plan present an overview and analysis of the potential losses to the identified vulnerable structures?	Pages 3-12, 5.2-7 – 5.2-13, 5.3-13 – 5.3-20, 5.4-28 – 5.4-37, 5.5-9 – 5.5-12, 5.8-4 – 5.8-9, 5.9-22 – 5.9-33, 5.12-8 – 5.12-13, 5.13-10 – 5.13-14, and 5.14-1 – 5.14-10	The plan provides loss estimates within each hazard profile. The Risk Assessment Summary includes Table 5.14.1A Presidentially Declared Disasters and Emergencies in North Dakota, including damages since 1957 and estimated historical and potential losses by hazard in three tables: jurisdictional, State owned, and critical facilities and infrastructure.		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION VIII

State: North Dakota

Date of Plan: January 2011

<p>B. Are the potential losses based on estimates provided in local risk assessments as well as the State risk assessment?</p>	<p>Pages 4.2-1, throughout the hazard profiles, and 5.14-1 – 5.14-10</p>	<p>The plan explains that when developing the critical facilities and infrastructure list for this plan local data was utilized as available. Throughout the hazard profiles, the plan includes vulnerabilities to jurisdictions, which includes information from local plans, including loss estimates, where the data was available.</p>		<p>X</p>
<p>C. Does the updated plan reflect the effects of changes in development on loss estimates?</p>	<p>Pages 3-13, 4.7-1 – 4.8-7, 5.2-13, 5.3-19 – 5.3-20, 5.4-36 - 5.4-37, 5.5-12, 5.8-9, 5.9-32 – 5.9-33, 5.12-12 – 5.12-13, 5.13-14, and 5.14-10</p>	<p>The plan explains that potential loss estimates have not changed significantly due to new development; however improvements in data have occurred. Sections 4.7 and 4.8 discuss building permit activity throughout the state, and communities with known flood hazards that do not participate in the NFIP, and growing counties that do not participate in the NFIP and lack building codes. The Risk Assessment Summary includes Table 5.14.2D: new and Future Development Losses, with a ranking per hazard. The counties with expected population increases are listed after the table.</p>		<p>X</p>
<p>SUMMARY SCORE</p>				<p>X</p>

Estimating Potential Losses of State Facilities

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
<p>A. Does the new or updated plan present an estimate of the potential dollar losses to State owned or operated buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities in the identified hazard areas?</p>	<p>Pages 4.1-1 – 4.1-3, 4.2-2 – 4.2-3, 5.2-10, 5.3-17 – 5.3-19, 5.4-32 – 5.4-36, 5.5-11, 5.9-26 – 5.9-33, 5.12-11 – 5.12-12, 5.13-12 – 5.13-13, and 5.14-8 – 5.14-9</p>	<p>Each hazard profile includes a description of the risk to State-owned buildings or a table of State owned buildings in hazard prone areas, by county, including the value. The Risk Assessment Summary includes Table 5.14.2B: State Owned Buildings and Property Losses by hazard and Table 5.14.2C Critical Facilities and Infrastructure Losses by hazard.</p>		<p>X</p>
<p>SUMMARY SCORE</p>				<p>X</p>

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 new or updated plan provide a description of State mitigation goals that guide the selection of mitigation activities?	Pages 6-1 – 6-13	The plan includes seven goals outlining the overall hazard mitigation strategy of the State. Specific objectives and activities are described for each goal.		X
B. Does the updated plan demonstrate that the goals were assessed and either remain valid or have been revised?	Page 6-1	The plan describes the changes made to update the goals and objectives from the previously approved plan.		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 new or updated plan include an evaluation of the State’s pre-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities?	Pages 7-3 – 7-35, and Appendix J	Section 7.1.1 provides an excellent evaluation of the State’s pre- and post-disaster programs, which includes strengths and weaknesses, changes over the planning cycles, and ideas for improvement. Section 17.1.2 evaluates the strengths and limitations of state laws, regulations, and policies important to hazard mitigation. Appendix J includes completed Year in Review reports.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan include an evaluation of the State’s post-disaster hazard management policies, programs, and capabilities?	Pages 7-3 – 7-35, and Appendix J	See comments in Element A above.		X
C. Does the new or updated plan include an evaluation of the State’s policies related to development in hazard prone areas ?	Pages 4.8-2 – 4.8-7 and 7-23 – 7-35	The plan discusses local and state land use regulations in developing areas in Section 4. Table 7.1.2A includes a summary of State laws and regulations related to mitigation and their strengths/weaknesses. The summary		X

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION VIII

State: North Dakota

Date of Plan: January 2011

		includes any changes since the previous plan was approved. Table 7.1.2C lists recommendations for legislative and policy changes, including improving state zoning laws related to floodplain management.		
D. Does the new or updated plan include a discussion of State funding capabilities for hazard mitigation projects?	Pages 7-39-43	The plan includes Table 7.2A: Current Mitigation Funding Sources and Table 7.2.B Potential Mitigation Funding Sources, which include descriptions, the managing agencies, and the typical annual funding amounts. The tables include State and Federal sources of funding. The plan evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the identified funding sources		X
E. Does the updated plan address any hazard management capabilities of the State that have changed since approval of the previous plan?	Pages 7-3 - 7-38	Section 7.1.1 discusses the changes that have occurred in active mitigation programs in North Dakota. Table 7.1.2A includes changes to State laws and regulations related to mitigation. Section 7.1.4 lists the State's capability strengths, weaknesses, emerging capabilities, and needs.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				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 new or updated plan present a general description of the local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities?	Pages 6-24 – 6-30 and 7-44 – 7-49	Table 6.3A lists the mitigation initiatives that are listed in the local plans, such as building codes and zoning ordinances. Section 7.3 provides a general summary of local capabilities including strengths and weaknesses.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan provide a general analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities?	Pages 6-24 – 6-30 and 7-44 – 7-49	The plan provides a general analysis of the effectiveness by listing the strengths and weaknesses of local capabilities. Recommendation: Consider analyzing effectiveness by assessing the types of local actions being implemented based on local plans and assessing changes in local capabilities over time, such as adoption of building codes, strengthening of floodplain ordinances, etc.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				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 new or updated plan identify cost-effective, environmentally sound, and technically feasible mitigation actions and activities the State is considering?	Pages 6-1 – 6-14	The plan describes the mitigation activities or initiatives the state is considering for each of its seven goals and their objectives. It also describes the changes from the 2007 plan.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan evaluate these actions and activities?	Pages 6-17 – 6-20	The SHMT used a prioritization model incorporating several factors and ranked these factors qualitatively for each project/initiative. The criteria are described in Table 6.2B and the scoring for each project/initiative listed in Table 6.2C.		X
C. Does the new or updated plan prioritize these actions and activities?	Pages 6-17 – 6-20	The SHMT used a prioritization model incorporating several factors and ranked these factors qualitatively for each project/initiative. The criteria are described in Table 6.2B and the scoring for each project/initiative listed in Table 6.2C.		X
D. Does the new or updated plan explain how each activity contributes to the overall State mitigation strategy?	Pages 6-1 – 6-14	Each activity is listed under an objective, which seeks to achieve a long-term goal of the State's mitigation strategy.		X
E. Does the mitigation strategy in the new or updated section reflect actions and projects identified in local plans?	Pages 6-1 – 6-14, and 6-24 – 6-30	<p>The State's Mitigation Strategy is based on local risk assessments and mitigation strategies, as well as the statewide risk assessment and additional recommendations by mitigation stakeholders. Table 6.3A lists the mitigation actions that are found in the local plans according to the state's initiatives.</p> <p>Recommendation: Consider providing some analysis of Table 6.3A, such as the types of actions that are most commonly listed in local plans.</p> <p><i>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i></p>		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 new or updated plan identify current sources of Federal, State, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities?	Pages 7-39 – 7-43	The plan includes Table 7.2A: Current Mitigation Funding Sources, which includes descriptions, the managing agencies, and the typical annual funding amounts. The tables include State and federal sources of funding. Funding sources strengths and weakness are listed as well.		x
B. Does the new or updated plan identify potential sources of Federal, State, local, or private funding to implement mitigation activities?	Pages 7-39 – 7-43	The plan includes Table 7.2.B Potential Mitigation Funding Sources, which includes descriptions, the managing agencies, and the typical annual funding amounts. The tables include State and federal sources of funding. Funding sources strengths and weakness are listed as well.		X
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?	Pages 6-21 – 6-23 and Appendix J	The plan includes Table 6.2D: Statewide Mitigation Initiative Implementation Scheme, which includes the status of ongoing projects and their funding sources. Appendix J includes the Year in Review Reports for 2005-2010, which include the funding sources utilized to implement mitigation actions.		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 new or updated plan provide a description of the State process to support, through funding and technical assistance, the development of local mitigation plans?	Pages 7-47 – 7-49	The plan describes the State's process for providing technical assistance and funding to develop local plans.		X
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?	Pages 7-47 – 7-49 and Appendix J	The plan includes a map of local plan status in Section 7. Appendix J describes the funding used to develop local plans and provide technical assistance in the past three years.		X
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 new or updated plan provide a description of the process and timeframe the State established to review local plans?	Pages 7-47 – 7-48	The plan describes how the NDES reviews local plans prior to submission to FEMA within approximately 60 days, unless assistance is requested.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan provide a description of the process and timeframe the State established to coordinate and link local plans to the State Mitigation Plan?	Page 7-49	The plan lists seven specific ways that local plans are integrated into the state plan at a minimum during the regular three-year update process.		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 new or updated 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?	Pages 7-56 – 7-59	The plan describes the prioritization criteria for projects, planning grants, State technical and financial assistance and provisions for small, impoverished communities.		X
B. For the new or updated plan, do 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?	Pages 7-57 – 7-59	The criteria for the prioritization of project grants include cost benefit review.		X
C. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for communities with the highest risk?	Pages 7-57	In addition to the typical prioritization criteria for projects, prioritization includes, when needed, the community which has the highest risk from hazards being mitigated. <i>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i>		X
D. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for repetitive loss properties?	Page 7-57 – 7-58	The prioritization criteria for project and planning grants, includes whether the project addresses repetitive loss properties or the number of insured repetitive loss structures in the community. <i>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i>		X
E. For the new or updated plan, do the criteria include considerations for communities with the most intense development pressures?	Page 7-58	The prioritization criteria for project grants includes whether the community is experiencing growth and/or intense development pressure. <i>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i>		X
SUMMARY SCORE				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 new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for monitoring the plan? (e.g., identifies the party responsible for monitoring , includes schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and/or meetings)	Page 8-1	The plan explains that NDES staff reviews the plan annually or after each disaster to review projects and initiatives to ensure there are no potential conflicts, that they complement the statewide mitigation strategy, and to ensure the State takes full advantage of possible state and federal funding sources.		X
B. Does the new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan? (e.g., identifies the party responsible for evaluating the plan, includes the criteria used to evaluate the plan)	Pages 8-1 – 8-2	The NDES reviews the plan on an annual basis or after each disaster. A general evaluation of the plan is conducted as needed by the SHMT. Methods of implementation are evaluated for success and improvements. Recommendation: Develop evaluation criteria for the SHMT's annual review of the plan.		X
C. Does the new or updated plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan?	Pages 8-2 – 8-3	The plan acknowledges the time and effort required to conduct a thorough update of a plan and describes the method and schedule for the next three-year update. The plan includes a good list of the steps to be taken in the plan update process.		X
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?	Pages 8-1 – 8-3, and Appendix F	The Plan Maintenance section explains how plan maintenance concepts were updated to better reflect the process used in recent years and to allow for more manageable maintenance during disaster periods.		X
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 new or updated plan describe how mitigation measures and project closeouts will be monitored?	Pages 7-50 and 7-60 and page 8-1.	The plan states that NDES staff uses spreadsheets, project files, quarterly reports, and other methods to track and monitor projects funded by the HMA grant programs.		

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION VIII

State: North Dakota

Date of Plan: January 2011

		Upon completion, staff collects the documentation for project closeouts. The plan describes how the SHMT reviews the mitigation projects and initiatives after each disaster or annually.		
B. Does the new or updated plan identify a system for reviewing progress on achieving goals in the Mitigation Strategy?	Pages 7-60 – 7-62 and Appendix J	The Year in Review report includes a section entitled “Mitigation Successes” which is a mechanism for recording progress on achieving the goals in the mitigation strategy.		X
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?	Pages 7-50, 7-61-7-62, and Appendix J	The plan states that the process to track the initiation, status, and completion of mitigation activities has not changed since 2005 except to clarify the process and to add the new Mitigation Year in Review reports.		X
D. Does the new or updated plan identify a system for reviewing progress on implementing activities and projects of the Mitigation Strategy?	Pages 7-60 – 7-62 and Appendix J	Project monitoring and evaluation includes completing the Year in Review Reports and a system of evaluating losses avoided through acquisition of properties located within the flood prone areas. Successes are listed, where applicable, in FEMA’s Mitigation Best Practices Portfolio.		X
E. Does the updated plan discuss if mitigation actions were implemented as planned?	Appendix J	The Year in Review Reports include whether the projects were completed as planned, which indicates the project was completed within an acceptable timeframe, and the extent of the project completed was within the required scope of work. Recommendation: Describe the specific projects completed, when they were completed and indicate if they were implemented as planned in terms of timeframe and extent.		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
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))?	NA	[Note: Only required for SRL 90/10 under FMA & SRL]		

STANDARD STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION VIII

State: North Dakota

Date of Plan: January 2011

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))?	NA	[Note: Only required for SRL 90/10 under FMA & SRL]		
C. Does the new or updated plan address repetitive loss properties in its risk assessment (see also Part 201.4(c)(2))?	NA	[Note: Only required for SRL 90/10 under FMA & SRL]		
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))?	NA	[Note: Only required for SRL 90/10 under FMA & SRL]		
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?	NA	[Note: Only required for SRL 90/10 under FMA & SRL]		
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))?	NA	[Note: Only required for SRL 90/10 under FMA & SRL]		
SUMMARY SCORE				

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
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))?	NA	[Note: Only required for SRL 90/10 under FMA & SRL]		
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))?	NA	[Note: Only required for SRL 90/10 under FMA & SRL]		
SUMMARY SCORE				