**LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL 2019**

The *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool* demonstrates how the Local Mitigation Plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR §201.6 and offers States and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the community.

* The Regulation Checklist provides a summary of FEMA’s evaluation of whether the Plan has addressed all requirements.
* The Plan Assessment identifies the plan’s strengths as well as documents areas for future improvement.
* The Multi-jurisdiction Summary Sheet is an optional worksheet that can be used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of the each Element of the Plan (Planning Process; Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation; and Plan Adoption).

The FEMA Mitigation Planner must reference this *Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide* when completing the *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool*.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Jurisdiction:** **Tioga County**  | **Title of Plan:** **Tioga County 2022 HMP** | **Date of Plan:**  |
| **Local Point of Contact:**  | **Address:** |
| **Title:**  |
| **Agency:**  |
| **Phone Number:**  | **E-Mail:** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **State Reviewer:****Ernie Szabo** | **Title:****State Planner** | **Date:** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEMA Reviewer:****Matt McCullough****Joshua Norris** | **Title:**Community PlannerCommunity Planner | **Date:** |
| **Date Received in FEMA Region *(insert #)*** |  |
| **Plan Not Approved** |  |
| **Plan Approvable Pending Adoption** |  |
| **Plan Approved** |  |

**SECTION 1:**

**REGULATION CHECKLIST**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The Regulation Checklist must be completed by FEMA. The purpose of the Checklist is to identify the location of relevant or applicable content in the Plan by Element/sub-element and to determine if each requirement has been ‘Met’ or ‘Not Met.’ The ‘Required Revisions’ summary at the bottom of each Element must be completed by FEMA to provide a clear explanation of the revisions that are required for plan approval. Required revisions must be explained for each plan sub-element that is ‘Not Met.’ Sub-elements should be referenced in each summary by using the appropriate numbers (A1, B3, etc.), where applicable. Requirements for each Element and sub-element are described in detail in this *Plan Review Guide* in Section 4, Regulation Checklist.

| **1.** **REGULATION CHECKLIST** | **Location in Plan****(section and/or** **page number)** | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Regulation** (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans) |
| **ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS**  |
| A1. Does the Plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(1)) | Pg. 23-34Appendix C | X |  |
| A2. Does the Plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as other interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement §201.6(b)(2)) | Pg. 23-34Appendix C | X |  |
| A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1)) | Pg. 29-31Appendix C | X |  |
| A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3)) | Pg. 16-17Appendix A | X |  |
| A5. Is there discussion of how the community(ies) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii)) | Pg. 312 | X |  |
| A6. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a 5-year cycle)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i)) | Pg. 311-312 | X |  |
| **ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS**A2.) **Discussion**: Pg. 31- “Municipalities were also encouraged to review hazard mitigation related items with other constituents located in the municipality like businesses, academia, private and nonprofit interests.” Did the communities find success in engaging these entities on their own? I see this as a really interesting opportunity, going forward, for the communities themselves to play a bigger role in building an engagement strategy for the plan update prior to kick-off.Follow-ups not specifically tracked but engaged as full as possible suggested\*50 external stakeholders/agencies for feedback\*Cross-state contact\*A5.) **Note**: HMP maintained on County website.A6.) **Note**:The County may want to add an item to inquire about new or updated community or county structure-level data. This sort of data could improve the risk assessment for the next plan update.  |
| **ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT**  |
| B1. Does the Plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction(s)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)) | Section 4.2 & 4.3 | X |  |
| B2. Does the Plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)) | Section 4.3 | X |  |
| B3. Is there a description of each identified hazard’s impact on the community as well as an overall summary of the community’s vulnerability for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)) | Section 4.3 | X |  |
| B4. Does the Plan address NFIP insured structures within the jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)) | Pg. 87-88 | X |  |
| **ELEMENT B: REQUIRED REVISIONS** **Discussion**: Vulnerability Assessment approach. B3.) **Revision:** Earthquake- Pg. 69- the Vulnerability Assessment needs to provide information on the potential assets that would be affected throughout the planning area. “Ground shaking is the biggest risk to building damage in Tioga County”. What structure types are more likely to be affected by this hazard? Information included.B3.) **Revision:**Extreme Temperatures: Pg. 77 – the Vulnerability Assessment could breakdown, by community, where the “very old” and “very young” are most concentrated. This would provide a more accurate description of where risk is greatest for this hazard. Will place matrix within this section\*Matrix placed in plan. B3.) **Revision**:Flooding: Loss estimates are noted on pg. 81. Pg. 90- At a minimum, which critical facilities are located in the Special Flood Hazard Area? (Appendix D) Will include\*Information included. Has there been a conversation seeking to further understand the makeup (function, building use, etc…) of the at-risk structures in the SFHA noted through the maps in Appendix D?. How are the community representatives providing local context to the plan in identifying the value of the assets in SFHA? It is highly possible that through exploring this engagement activity, it may be found that some of these structures/assets are critical to the participating communities day-to-day operations. This could provide some highly specific risks and pose an opportunity in the mitigation strategy section to develop highly specific solutions. B3.) **Revision**:Solar Flares: Pg. 124- the Vulnerability Assessment could provide the number and locations of transformers that service the communities in the planning area. Data limitation\*Limitation noted. B3.) **Revision**:Land Subsidence: Pg. 127- the Vulnerability Assessment should state that there isn’t enough data, within Tioga County, to more accurately reflect where risk can be assigned to this hazard. If the analysis states that subsidence occurs more closely to abandoned mines, then the focus of any data collection could be on structures/assets in close proximity to abandoned mines. B3.) **Revision**:Tornado/Windstorm: Pg. 141- “Critical facilities are highly vulnerable to high windstorms and tornadoes……..Critical facilities are particularly vulnerable to power outages which can leave facilities functionless.”Using the existing list of critical facilities in Appendix H, the Vulnerability Assessment could begin developing criteria to rank those facilities that are most at-risk to this hazard, These criteria could include elements such as location within the planning area, construction type of the building, etc. It is also suggested to further document each facility’s function or service and develop criteria to rank how that function is valued within the community. This process can assist the communities to begin carving out where mitigation action strategy creation should be prioritized. This same process can be applied to the economic assets of the communities, as is also noted as a risk on pg. 141. B3.) **Revision**:Wildfire: Pg. 148-149- the Vulnerability Assessment does not provide any representation or affiliation of at-risk assets to the hazard. At a minimum, provide the association to existing critical facilities. Will include\*Information included.  |
| **ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY** |
| C1. Does the plan document each jurisdiction’s existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)) | Pg. 234- 250 | X |  |
| C2. Does the Plan address each jurisdiction’s participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii)) | Pg. 238-241 & Appendix C | X |  |
| C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i)) | Pg. 270-273 | X |  |
| C4. Does the Plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii)) | Pg. 278-310 & Appendix H | X |  |
| C5. Does the Plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including cost benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii)) | Pg. 278-310 & Appendix H | X |  |
| C6. Does the Plan describe a process by which local governments will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii)) | Pg. 248-249 | X |  |
| **ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS** C4.) **Note: Please reference discussion under B3.) Flooding Revision**:Pg. 287 Action 3.1.4- Which pipes, sluices, culverts and bridge culverts?- Take a look at Appendix G\*Pg. 288- Action 3.1.6- What other, more in-depth, risk solutions can be discussed? Why is the power to the facilities going out in the first place? C6.) **Recommended Revision**:In the next plan update, it is suggested to perform an expanded discussion/workshop on opportunities to pull more specific items from either the Risk Assessment, Mitigation Strategy or Capability Assessment into other local planning mechanisms.  |
| **ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION** (applicable to plan updates only) |
| D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Pg. 13-16, 23-233 | X |  |
| D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Pg. 256-270 | X |  |
| D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Pg. 27-273 & Appendix H | X |  |
| **ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS****D1.) Recommended Revision:**In the next plan update, for those communities who saw an increase in population, perhaps reaching out to those communities to ask specifically if new residential or commercial construction has occurred to account for those increases. Also, is that new construction occurring in our out of the assessed hazard areas.  |
| **ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION** |
| E1. Does the Plan include documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5)) | N/A |  |  |
| E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5)) | N/A |  |  |
| **ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS** |
| **OPTIONAL: HIGH HAZARD POTENTIAL DAM RISKS** |
| HHPD1. Did Element A4 (planning process) describe the incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information for high hazard potential dams? | Section 5.2.5: Pp 248-250  | X |  |
| HHPD2. Did Element B3 (risk assessment) address HHPDs? | Section 4.3.14: pp 166-173  | X |  |
| HHPD3. Did Element C3 (mitigation goals) include mitigation goals to reduce long-term vulnerabilities from high hazard potential dams that pose an unacceptable risk to the public? | Goal 6, Objective 6.2 (Page 273)  | X |  |
| HHPD4. Did Element C4-C5 (mitigation actions) address HHPDs prioritize mitigation actions to reduce vulnerabilities from high hazard potential dams that pose an unacceptable risk to the public? | Action 2.4.1 (Page 284)  | X |  |
| **REQUIRED REVISIONS****HHPD2:** The plan does not provide a summary description of all dam risk, which consists of incremental, non-breach, and residual risk. Though Sections 4.3.14.2, 4.3.14.3, 4.3.14.4, and 4.3.14.5 describe incremental risk, non-breach and residual risk are not addressed. To meet this requirement, please add narrative describing non-breach, and residual risk with respect to at least Tioga County eligible high hazard potential dams. If insufficient information is available to describe non-breach and residual risk in Tioga County, please add language explaining this limitation and include the definition of the three all dam risk component concepts. Pertinent definitions and example language that would address this revision are included below.Definitions:*Incremental Risk:* The risk (likelihood and consequences) to the pool area and downstream floodplain occupants that can be attributed to the presence of the dam should the dam breach prior or subsequent to overtopping, or undergo component malfunction or misoperation, where the consequences considered are over and above those that would occur without dam breach. The consequences typically are due to downstream inundation, but loss of the pool can result in significant consequences in the pool area upstream of the dam.*Non-Breach Risk:* The risk in the reservoir pool area and affected downstream floodplain due to ‘normal’ dam operation of the dam (e.g., large spillway flows within the design capacity that exceed channel capacity) or ‘overtopping of the dam without breaching’ scenarios.*Residual Risk:* The risk that remains after all mitigation actions and risk reduction actions have been completed. With respect to dams, FEMA defines residual risk as “risk remaining at any time” (FEMA, 2015, p A-2). It is the risk that remains after decisions related to a specific dam safety issue are made and prudent actions have been taken to address the risk. It is the remote risk associated with a condition that was judged to not be a credible dam safety issue.Source: “Rehabilitation of High Hazard Potential Dams Grant Program Guidance,” June 2020Example Language:Note: Though the requested text edits are in blue for easy identification, please maintain the plan’s established formatting (do not make the text blue in the plan itself).At this time, insufficient information is available to conduct a substantive analysis of incremental, non-breach and residual risk relative to Tioga County’s high hazard potential dams. However, it is acknowledged that incremental risk is “the risk (likelihood and consequences) to the pool area and downstream floodplain occupants that can be attributed to the presence of the dam should the dam breach prior or subsequent to overtopping, or undergo component malfunction or misoperation, where the consequences considered are over and above those that would occur without dam breach;” non-breach risk is “the risk in the reservoir pool area and affected downstream floodplain due to ‘normal’ dam operation of the dam (e.g.,large spillway flows within the design capacity that exceed channel capacity) or ‘overtopping of the dam without breaching’ scenarios;” and residual risk) is “the risk that remains after decisions related to a specific dam safety issue are made and prudent actions have been taken to address the risk. It is the remote risk associated with a condition that was judged to not be a credible dam safety issue” (FEMA, 2020 Rehabilitation of High Hazard Potential Dams Grant Program Guidance**HHPD2:** The plan does not adequately address All Dam Risk. To meet this requirement, add information to the HMP describing the risks and vulnerabilities to and from eligible HHPDs including:* Potential multijurisdictional impacts from a dam incident.
* Location and size of populations at risk from eligible HHPDs as well as potential impacts to institutions and critical infrastructure/facilities/lifelines.
* Documentation of limitations and the approach to address deficiencies.

Talk w/ Joshua on data availability. Conferred with Joshua. Limitation noted on data availability. **HHPD3:** Link proposed actions for reducing long-term vulnerabilities from HHPDs to (at least 2) HMP goals. To address this revision, one may add information to Table 73, *2022 Goals and Objectives*,stating which goals align with at least the mitigation actions that reduce the long-term vulnerabilities from HHPDs (i.e. the 4 mitigation actions in Table 77 that address the Dam Failure hazard). Alternatively, add narrative explaining how the HMP’s (dam failure hazard) mitigation actions that reduce long term vulnerabilities from HHPDs advance multiple mitigation goals or long-term strategies.Links made within Goals & Objectives. **RECOMMENDED REVISIONS (Not Required to Meet HHPD/All Dam Risk Requirements)****HHPD1:** Consider incorporating additional dam-related data into the plan, such as the potential impacts to institutions and critical infrastructure/facilities/community lifelines, EAPs, HEC-RAS, DSS-WISEHCOM, DSS-WISE Lite, FLO-2D, or more detailed studies. The resource detailed below can be leveraged to help address this recommendation.*The US Army Corps of Engineers National Inventory of Dams (NID) has updated its database (of 90,000 dams nationwide) and associated website to include dam-specific risk information and inundation maps for USACE dams. The dam-related data is publicly available and went live in November 2021. Consider reviewing the USACE dam analyses that have been added to the NID, to inform the refinement of your Hazard Mitigation Plan’s dam risk analyses. The new NID includes an advanced map viewer that allows local dam data layers (in GeoJSON or Zip Shapefile formats) to be imported and overlayed against USACE data (and additional layers included in the new NID map viewer tool such as FEMA’s National Flood Hazard Layer). For more information, please refer to the recorded 10/26/2021 “National Inventory of Dams Update and Public Release of USACE Inundation Maps” Silver Jackets webinar which is available here: https://usace.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p16021coll2/id/7418.***HHPD4:** To help inform the development and refinement of HHPD mitigation actions, eligible activities from the FEMA FY21 HHPD grant funding opportunity are included below. Consider incorporating mitigation actions with language from the eligible activities below for specific HHPDs within Tioga County, and include at least one structural or infrastructure project that addresses a specific HHPD. Eligible FY21 Rehabilitation of HHPD Grant Program Activities * Repair, removal, or any other structural or nonstructural measures to rehabilitate an eligible high hazard potential dam.
* Planning Activities such as:
	+ Alternatives analysis to identify a preferred plan for dam rehabilitation and the estimated cost for design and construction
	+ Investigations and risk assessments that further define the dam risk using a risk prioritization methodology defined in section H.14 of the FY21 HHPD NOFO.
* Design Activities such as:
	+ Work to develop conceptual, preliminary, or final design plans and specifications for dam rehabilitation projects that have been planned using an alternative evaluation process that complies with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements.

Source: Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 Rehabilitation of High Hazard Potential Dams (HHPD) Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) |
| **ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)** |
| F1.  |  |  |  |
| F2.  |  |  |  |
| **ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS** |

**SECTION 2:**

**PLAN ASSESSMENT**

**INSTRUCTIONS**: The purpose of the Plan Assessment is to offer the local community more comprehensive feedback to the community on the quality and utility of the plan in a narrative format. The audience for the Plan Assessment is not only the plan developer/local community planner, but also elected officials, local departments and agencies, and others involved in implementing the Local Mitigation Plan. The Plan Assessment must be completed by FEMA. The Assessment is an opportunity for FEMA to provide feedback and information to the community on: 1) suggested improvements to the Plan; 2) specific sections in the Plan where the community has gone above and beyond minimum requirements; 3) recommendations for plan implementation; and 4) ongoing partnership(s) and information on other FEMA programs, specifically RiskMAP and Hazard Mitigation Assistance programs. The Plan Assessment is divided into two sections:

1. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement
2. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

***Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement*** is organized according to the plan Elements listed in the Regulation Checklist. Each Element includes a series of italicized bulleted items that are suggested topics for consideration while evaluating plans, but it is not intended to be a comprehensive list. FEMA Mitigation Planners are not required to answer each bullet item and should use them as a guide to paraphrase their own written assessment (2-3 sentences) of each Element.

The Plan Assessment must not reiterate the required revisions from the Regulation Checklist or be regulatory in nature and should be open-ended and to provide the community with suggestions for improvements or recommended revisions. The recommended revisions are suggestions for improvement and are not required to be made for the Plan to meet Federal regulatory requirements. The italicized text should be deleted once FEMA has added comments regarding strengths of the plan and potential improvements for future plan revisions. It is recommended that the Plan Assessment be a short synopsis of the overall strengths and weaknesses of the Plan (no longer than two pages), rather than a complete recap section by section.

***Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan*** provides a place for FEMA to offer information, data sources and general suggestions on the plan implementation and maintenance process. Information on other possible sources of assistance including, but not limited to, existing publications, grant funding or training opportunities, can be provided. States may add state and local resources, if available.

**A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement**

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas where these could be improved beyond minimum requirements.

**Element A: Planning Process**

*How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the planning process with respect to:*

* *Involvement of stakeholders (elected officials/decision makers, plan implementers, business owners, academic institutions, utility companies, water/sanitation districts, etc.);*
* *Involvement of Planning, Emergency Management, Public Works Departments or other planning agencies (i.e., regional planning councils);*
* *Diverse methods of participation (meetings, surveys, online, etc.); and*
* *Reflective of an open and inclusive public involvement process.*

**Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment**

*In addition to the requirements listed in the Regulation Checklist, 44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans identifies additional elements that should be included as part of a plan’s risk assessment. The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of:*

1. *A general description of land uses and future development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions;*
2. *The types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas; and*
3. *A description of potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures, and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate.*

*How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment with respect to:*

* *Use of best available data (flood maps, HAZUS, flood studies) to describe significant hazards;*
* *Communication of risk on people, property, and infrastructure to the public (through tables, charts, maps, photos, etc.);*
* *Incorporation of techniques and methodologies to estimate dollar losses to vulnerable structures;*
* *Incorporation of Risk MAP products (i.e., depth grids, Flood Risk Report, Changes Since Last FIRM, Areas of Mitigation Interest, etc.); and*
* *Identification of any data gaps that can be filled as new data became available.*

**Element C: Mitigation Strategy**

*How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the Mitigation Strategy with respect to:*

* *Key problems identified in, and linkages to, the vulnerability assessment;*
* *Serving as a blueprint for reducing potential losses identified in the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment;*
* *Plan content flow from the risk assessment (problem identification) to goal setting to mitigation action development;*
* *An understanding of mitigation principles (diversity of actions that include structural projects, preventative measures, outreach activities, property protection measures, post-disaster actions, etc);*
* *Specific mitigation actions for each participating jurisdiction that reflects their unique risks and capabilities;*
* *Integration of mitigation actions with existing local authorities, policies, programs, and resources; and*
* *Discussion of existing programs (including the NFIP), plans, and policies that could be used to implement mitigation, as well as document past projects.*

**Element D: Plan Update, Evaluation, and Implementation (*Plan Updates Only*)**

*How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the 5-year Evaluation and Implementation measures with respect to:*

* *Status of previously recommended mitigation actions;*
* *Identification of barriers or obstacles to successful implementation or completion of mitigation actions, along with possible solutions for overcoming risk;*
* *Documentation of annual reviews and committee involvement;*
* *Identification of a lead person to take ownership of, and champion the Plan;*
* *Reducing risks from natural hazards and serving as a guide for decisions makers as they commit resources to reducing the effects of natural hazards;*
* *An approach to evaluating future conditions (i.e. socio-economic, environmental, demographic, change in built environment etc.);*
* *Discussion of how changing conditions and opportunities could impact community resilience in the long term; and*
* *Discussion of how the mitigation goals and actions support the long-term community vision for increased resilience.*

**B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan**

*Ideas may be offered on moving the mitigation plan forward and continuing the relationship with key mitigation stakeholders such as the following:*

* *What FEMA assistance (funding) programs are available (for example, Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA)) to the jurisdiction(s) to assist with implementing the mitigation actions?*
* *What other Federal programs (National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), Community Rating System (CRS), Risk MAP, etc.) may provide assistance for mitigation activities?*
* *What publications, technical guidance or other resources are available to the jurisdiction(s) relevant to the identified mitigation actions?*
* *Are there upcoming trainings/workshops (Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA), HMA, etc.) to assist the jurisdictions(s)?*
* *What mitigation actions can be funded by other Federal agencies (for example, U.S. Forest Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Smart Growth, Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Sustainable Communities, etc.) and/or state and local agencies?*

**SECTION 3:**

**MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET (OPTIONAL)**

**INSTRUCTIONS**: For multi-jurisdictional plans, a Multi-jurisdiction Summary Spreadsheet may be completed by listing each participating jurisdiction, which required Elements for each jurisdiction were ‘Met’ or ‘Not Met,’ and when the adoption resolutions were received. This Summary Sheet does not imply that a mini-plan be developed for each jurisdiction; it should be used as an optional worksheet to ensure that each jurisdiction participating in the Plan has been documented and has met the requirements for those Elements (A through E).

|  | **MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET** |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **Jurisdiction Name** | **Jurisdiction Type (city/borough/****township/****village, etc.)** | **Plan POC** | **Mailing Address** | **Email** | **Phone** | **Requirements Met (Y/N)** |
| **A.****Planning Process** | **B.****Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment** | **C. Mitigation Strategy** | **D.****Plan Review, Evaluation & Implementation** | **E.****Plan Adoption** | **F.****State Require-ments** |
| **1** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **7** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **8** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **10** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **11** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **12** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **13** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **14** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **15** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **16** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **17** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **18** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **19** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **20** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |