

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

State: Iowa

Date of Plan: September 2010

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

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

SCORING SYSTEM

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

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

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated “Satisfactory” in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of “Satisfactory.”

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

Example

6. Effective Use of Available Mitigation Funding

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

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

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

State: Iowa

Date of Plan: September 2010

Enhanced State Hazard Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

| | |
|---|---|
| State Point of Contact: John Wageman Completed by Michael Raes, Mitigation Planner | Address: Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management Division 7105 NW 70 th Ave. Camp Dodge Bldg. W-4 Johnston, IA 50131 |
| Title: State Hazard Mitigation Officer | |
| Agency: Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management Division | |
| Phone Number: (515) 253-2581 | |
| E-Mail: john.wageman@iowa.gov & mike.raes@iowa.gov | |

| | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| FEMA Reviewer: | Title: | Date: |
| Date Received in FEMA Region VII | | |
| Plan Not Approved | | |
| Plan Approved | | |
| Date Approved | | |

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN SUMMARY CROSSWALK

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated “Satisfactory” in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of “Satisfactory.” Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. Reviewer’s comments must be provided for requirements receiving a “Needs Improvement” score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement:

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

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

Prerequisite

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

| NOT MET | MET |
|---------|-----|
| | |

Comprehensive State Hazard Mitigation Planning Program

- 2. Integration with Other Planning Initiatives: §201.5(b)(1)
- 3. Project Implementation Capability: §201.5(b)(2)(i) and (ii)
- 4. Program Management Capability: §201.5(b)(2)(iii A-D)
- 5. Assessment of Mitigation Actions: §201.5(b)(2)(iv)
- 6. Effective Use of Available Mitigation Funding: §201.5(b)(3)
- 7. Commitment to a Comprehensive Mitigation Program: §201.5(b)(4)(i-vi)

| N | S |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

PLAN APPROVED

See Reviewer’s Comments

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

State:: Iowa

Date of Plan: September 2010

PREREQUISITE

1. Compliance with Standard State Plan Requirements

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

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

COMPREHENSIVE STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING PROGRAM

2. Integration with Other Planning Initiatives

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

| Element | Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #) | Reviewer's Comments | SCORE | |
|---|--|---------------------|-------|---|
| | | | N | S |
| A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan demonstrate how it is integrated to the extent practicable with other State and regional planning initiatives (comprehensive, growth management, economic development, capital improvement, land development, and/or emergency management plans)? | Section 2.0 Subsection 1.0 – 1.5 | | | |
| B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan demonstrate how it has been integrated to the extent practicable with FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives that provide guidance to State and regional agencies? | Section 2.0 Subsection 1.6 | | | |
| SUMMARY SCORE | | | | |

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

State:: Iowa

Date of Plan: September 2010

3. Project Implementation Capability

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

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

| Element | Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #) | Reviewer’s Comments | SCORE | |
|---|--|----------------------|-------|---|
| | | | N | S |
| A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan demonstrate that the State has established eligibility criteria for multi-hazard mitigation measures? Does the updated Plan describe changes, if any, to those criteria? | Section 2.0 Subsection 2.1 - 2.5 | | | |
| B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan describe the State’s system for determining the cost effectiveness of mitigation measures, consistent with OMB Circular A-94? Does the updated Plan describe changes, if any, to this system? | Section 2.0 Subsection 2.6 | | | |
| C. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan describe the State’s system to rank the measures according to the State’s eligibility criteria, including a process to prioritize projects between jurisdictions and between proposals that address different or multiple hazards? | Section 2.0 Subsection 2.1 Subsection 2.5 | | | |
| | | SUMMARY SCORE | | |

4. Program Management Capability

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

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

| Element | Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #) | Reviewer's Comments | SCORE | |
|---|--|--|-------|---|
| | | | N | S |
| A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan describe the State's capability to effectively manage the HMGP as well as other mitigation grant programs? | Section 2.0 Subsection 2.4-3.4 | [See Regional Certification to Determine Score] | | |
| B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan provide a record for meeting HMGP and other mitigation grant application timeframes and submitting complete, technically feasible, and eligible project applications with appropriate supporting documentation? | Section 2.0 Subsection 2.4-3.4 | [See Regional Certification to Determine Score] | | |
| C. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan provide a record for preparing and submitting accurate environmental reviews and benefit-cost analyses? | Section 2.0 Subsection 3.4 Subsection 3.5 | [See Regional Certification to Determine Score] | | |
| D. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan provide a record for submitting complete and accurate quarterly progress and financial reports on time? | Section 2.0 Subsection 3.6 | [See Regional Certification to Determine Score] | | |
| E. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan provide a record for completing HMGP and other mitigation grant projects within established performance periods, including financial reconciliation? | Section 2.0 Subsection 3.6 | [See Regional Certification to Determine Score] | | |
| SUMMARY SCORE | | | | |

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

State: Iowa

Date of Plan: September 2010

5. Assessment of Mitigation Actions

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

| Element | Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #) | Reviewer's Comments | SCORE | |
|--|--|---------------------|-------|---|
| | | | N | S |
| A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan describe the system and strategy by which the State will conduct an assessment of the completed mitigation actions? | Section 2.0 Subsection 4.0 Annex 1.4-A | | | |
| B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan include the record of the effectiveness (i.e., actual cost avoidance) of each mitigation actions, including how the assessment was completed? | Section 2.0 Subsection 4.0 | | | |
| SUMMARY SCORE | | | | |

6. Effective Use of Available Mitigation Funding

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

| Element | Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #) | Reviewer's Comments | SCORE | |
|---|--|---------------------|-------|---|
| | | | N | S |
| A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan document how the State has made full use of funding available from FEMA mitigation grant programs, and if the State has not made full use of this funding, does the plan explain the reasons why? | Section 2.0 Subsection 5.0 | | | |
| B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan document how the State is effectively using existing programs to achieve its mitigation goals? | Section 2.0 Subsection 5.0 | | | |
| SUMMARY SCORE | | | | |

7. Commitment to a Comprehensive Mitigation Program

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

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

| Element | Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #) | Reviewer's Comments | SCORE | |
|---|---|---------------------|-------|---|
| | | | N | S |
| A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan demonstrate that the State is committed to a comprehensive State mitigation program? | Section 2.0 Subsection 6.0 | | | |
| B. Does the updated Enhanced Plan demonstrate progress in implementing a comprehensive State mitigation program, including new mitigation initiatives developed or implemented by the State? | Section 2.0 Subsection 1.0 Subsection 1.1.3 Subsection 1.5 Subsection 1.6 Subsection 3.6 | | | |
| SUMMARY SCORE | | | | |