

This section provides the State of Nevada's schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the Nevada HMP; monitoring mitigation implementation measures and project closures; and reviewing progress on goals, activities, and projects in the mitigation strategy.

6.1 MONITORING, EVALUATING, AND UPDATING THE PLAN

The requirements for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the plan, as stipulated in the DMA 2000 and its implementing regulations, are described below.

DMA 2000 REQUIREMENTS: 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

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)

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)

Does the **new and updated** plan describe the method and schedule for **updating** the plan?

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?

Source: FEMA, Standard State Hazard Mitigation Plan Review Crosswalk 2008

6.1.1 Schedule for Monitoring, Evaluating and Updating the Plan

To ensure that the goals and objectives for Nevada are current and that local mitigation efforts are accomplished, the Subcommittee will do periodic monitoring of the Nevada HMP.

The Subcommittee monitors the Nevada HMP quarterly or as situations dictate, such as after a disaster declaration or when new information is obtained. The Subcommittee Chair in coordination with the SHMO or his/her designee is responsible for updating the Nevada HMP in the second quarter of the year. A record of updates is maintained in the minutes of the Subcommittee meetings. The earlier form was not used during the 2010 update as the on-going nature of the update process did not demonstrate a need to use it. When an evaluation of the plan determines it is necessary, the update process will begin immediately.

6.1.2 Method for Monitoring the Plan

The process to complete the review of the Nevada HMP has four basic steps listed below.

1. The Chair of the NHMPC receives a quarterly report on the status of the Nevada HMP's mitigation goals and objectives.
2. The report will evaluate whether the Nevada HMP's current mitigation goals, objectives, and action items are appropriate and/or effective.
3. The report will recommend any changes and/or amendments to the Nevada HMP.

4. If the NHMPC determines to modify the Nevada HMP, the NHMPC can initiate a plan amendment following the administrative requirements of the state's open meeting law.
5. SHMO or his/her designee will record any reviews and updates in formal meeting minutes.

6.1.3 Method for Evaluating the Plan

This methodology did not change during the 2010 update process. The evaluation was accomplished by reviewing each and every section of the 2007 plan and each question listed below was asked as the appropriate section was reviewed by the Subcommittee. For example, the 2007 risk assessment did not include terrorism as a hazard, but after evaluating Section 3 during the 2010 revision, the Subcommittee ranked terrorism as a Very High Risk hazard.

The Subcommittee Chair will incorporate the following process into the quarterly meetings:

1. Risk Assessment Evaluation
 - a. Incorporate new and/or updated local mitigation plan risk assessment information.
 - b. Have the risks changed at a state level?
2. Has the Strategy changed?
3. Goals Evaluation
 - a. Are the goals appropriate for what the State wants to accomplish?
 - b. Do the goals reflect what the local jurisdictions want to accomplish?
 - c. Do the State's and local jurisdictions' goals and actions complement each other?
 - d. Do the goals satisfy the Federal criteria (i.e., the crosswalk)?
 - e. Do the goals reflect the local jurisdictions' plans and concerns?
 - f. Are the goals feasible given the funding sources available to state, and local jurisdictions?
4. Modify goals in accordance with the results of the evaluation
5. Action/Project Evaluation
 - a. What action items have been accomplished?
 - b. Are the action items appropriate to accomplish the plan's goals and objectives?
 - c. Do any of the action items need to be changed?
 - d. Do new action items need to be added?
6. Does the Nevada HMP meet federal criteria?

- a. Using current FEMA crosswalk, review the plan for appropriate content.

6.1.4 Method for Updating the Plan

Once the Nevada HMP is monitored and evaluated, it must be updated to stay current with mitigation goals, objectives, and activities. The process for updating the plan is in the following list of actions:

1. The Subcommittee Chair, SHMO, or his/her designee submits changes to the Subcommittee. (A NHMPC member can also submit changes to the Nevada HMP.)
2. The Subcommittee reviews and recommends (or rejects) the changes, then sends the changes to the NHMPC.
3. The NHMPC approves/rejects the Nevada HMP's changes.
4. SHMO or his/her designee updates the Nevada HMP with approved changes.
5. The changes are recorded in the meeting minutes which become part of the plan in the form of Appendix D.
6. The process is completed within 90 days.
7. Update the record of adoption if necessary.

As mentioned before, the update of the SHMP is continuous in Nevada. After FEMA approval in October, the next Subcommittee meeting in January begins the evaluation, data compilation, and updating of the plan document.

6.1.5 Previous Process and Recommended Changes

In reviewing the previous plan's process, the Planning Subcommittee and the SHMO found some modifications were necessary. Earlier forms that tracked mitigation actions in state, local, tribal and private sectors other than DEM were not distributed for completion as a new format was being developed for use. The new format should encourage participation by a greater number of entities, implement more activities, and create a heightened awareness of mitigation in the state. The results of this distribution will be available for tabulation in the next iteration of the plan.

A recommendation to smooth the transition from raw data to the Nevada HMP is to assign members of the NHMPC and the Subcommittee to track disaster incidents and events, and to recommend mitigation goals and actions in their respective areas of expertise. For instance, an NHMPC member from NDF could present wild-land fire incident data and appropriate goals for inclusion into the Nevada HMP during the review process, and the Nevada Earthquake Safety Council could recommend changes in light of new research results and information.

as well as GIS personnel in The NHMPC and Subcommittee members did provide the

information during the meetings held resulting in the update of the data for the risk assessment

The flexibility and ongoing nature of Nevada's hazard mitigation plan update process proved functional shortly after the 2010 update planning process began, when there was a Nevada disaster occurrence: the Fernley Canal Breach Disaster of 2008.

The level of flooding due to this type of breach had not before been experienced in Nevada and it was discussed at length at subsequent meetings of the Subcommittee. We immediately contacted experts in floodplain management and repetitive loss in helping us rewrite pertinent sections of the HMP to address this risk and future events. We also contacted GIS experts for help in identifying and mapping other potential sites in the state where this hazard might exist. These new materials were incorporated into the latest iteration of the plan. This serves as an example of how the process can be readily adapted to address individual hazard events as they occur.

A similar "teachable moment" disaster event also occurred when a magnitude 6 earthquake hit in February 2008 near rural Wells, in northeast Nevada. No one was killed or severely injured although there was intense damage to the largely unreinforced masonry buildings of the Wells historic downtown district. The Subcommittee learned from this event that there was little that could be done from a State Mitigation Planning perspective to help a community of this size in the event of an earthquake of this magnitude. Most of the recovery occurred as a result of the resiliency of the neighborhood and citizenry. The most important lesson learned by the Subcommittee from this event was the importance of education and awareness efforts in rural communities with regard to earthquake mitigation and preparedness.

As other disaster events occur in the State, the Subcommittee will continue to learn from them and adjust both the process and the plan to address any deficiencies highlighted by these occurrences.

The periodic monitoring of the plan and process takes place through quarterly meetings of the Subcommittee. Below is a possible list of the meetings' general agenda items for discussion and/or action at the established quarterly meetings. The Subcommittee is scheduled to meet the last Monday of the first month of the quarter at 1:30 pm.

1. Risk assessment review involving both the state and local level:
 - a. Local level
 - i. New plans
 - ii. Updated plan
2. Ongoing studies
3. Addition of action items to address risk
4. Modification of action items
5. Deletion of action items completed or no longer applicable
6. Grant application, funding sources

7. Training and workshops

This information will be reported to the NHMPC by the Subcommittee Chair at its quarterly meetings.

Figure 6-1. Annual Review Questionnaire

PLAN SECTION	QUESTIONS	YES	NO	COMMENTS
PLANNING PROCESS	Are there internal or external organizations and agencies that have been invaluable to the planning process or to mitigation action?			
	Are there procedures (e.g., meeting announcement, plan updates) that can be done more efficiently?			
	Has the Steering committee undertaken any public outreach activities regarding the HMP or implementation of mitigation actions?			
HAZARD PROFILES	Has a natural and/or human-caused disaster occurred in this reporting period?			
	Are there natural and/or human-caused hazards that have not been addressed in this HMP that should be?			
	Are additional maps or new hazards studies available? If so, what have they revealed?			
VULNERABILITY ANALYSIS	Do any new critical facilities or infrastructure need to be added to the asset lists?			
	Have there been changes in development patterns that could influence the effects of hazards or create additional risks?			
MITIGATION STRATEGY	Are there different or additional resources (financial, technical, and human) that are now available for mitigation planning?			
	Are the goals still applicable?			
	Should new mitigation actions be added to a community's Mitigation Action Plan?			
	Do existing mitigation actions listed in a community's Mitigation Action Plan need to be reprioritized?			
	Are the mitigation actions listed in a community's Mitigation Action Plan appropriate for available resources?			

6.2 MONITORING PROGRESS OF MITIGATION ACTIVITIES

The requirements for monitoring the progress of mitigation activities, as stipulated in the DMA 2000 and its implementing regulations, are described below.

DMA 2000 REQUIREMENTS: PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

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

Does the **new or updated** plan describe how mitigation measures and project closeouts will be monitored?

Does the **new or updated** plan identify a system for reviewing progress on achieving goals in the Mitigation Strategy?

Does the updated plan describe any modification, if any, to the system identified in the previously approved plan to track the initiation, status, and completion of mitigations activities?

Does the **new and updated** plan identify a system for reviewing progress on implementing activities and projects of the Mitigation Strategy?

Does the updated plan discuss if mitigation actions were implemented as planned?

Source: FEMA, Standard State Hazard Mitigation Plan Review Crosswalk 2008

6.2.1 Monitor Progress of Mitigation Activities

The SHMO or his/her designee will track, monitor and provide oversight for approved projects under FEMA's HMGP and PDM programs. The tracking of projects includes a comparison against the mitigation goals, objectives, and actions from Nevada HMP Section Four. The comparison allows the SHMO to verify that Nevada is meeting the goals and objectives set in the updated Nevada HMP as well as the effectiveness of the mitigation program.

For PDM and HMGP funding, the tracking of projects begins when the SHMO reviews initial project applications for completeness and eligibility. At this time, the SHMO also compares the project with the Nevada HMP Section Four to determine whether the project is in agreement with the actions, goals and objectives established in the mitigation strategy. The SHMO maintains records of the applicable action, goal and objective by funding source, year, and hazard. The resulting information is shown in figures and tables found in Section 4.2.4 Hazard Management Capability changes. This report is presented to the Nevada HMPC at its quarterly meetings. The form presented as Table 6-3 in the previous iteration was not used. The form shown here in Figure 6-3 is now used by DEM to assist in tracking mitigation actions in Nevada. Data collected from these forms will be collected, tabulated, and evaluated in the next iteration of the plan, given adequate staffing.

After the project closeout, the SHMO will work with the Committee to re-evaluate two items: one; the mitigation strategy to determine the progress made and, two; if modifications are necessary. The SHMO maintains a record of any modifications to the mitigation strategy in the minutes of the NHMPC and Subcommittee meetings. This record is used to create the report for the Subcommittee's review at their subsequent meeting.

It is our intent to compile data about the State's accomplishments in the mitigation field. This data is provided by the representatives of the lead agencies participating in the Subcommittee, the NHMPC and/or the annual survey described in section 6.2.3.

6.2.2 Project Closeouts

The previous closeout form was modified by DEM to standardize its internal grant process. The new Quarterly Report Form is used to close out mitigation projects. The process described in 2007 remains the same; the only change was the form presented. When the applicant reports that the mitigation project is complete and all eligible reimbursements have been paid, the SHMO will prepare the Fiscal/Program Quarterly Report Form. The Quarterly Report Form will be mailed with a formal letter explaining the procedures for project closeout to the applicant. The letter will request that the applicant review and verify that the project closeout information is correct. The applicant will sign and return the Quarterly Report Form to the Mitigation Section for final processing. Upon receipt of the verified and signed Final Quarterly Report Form, the SHMO will send the Final Quarterly Report to the appropriate authority for review and signature.

When the SHMO determines that all project management procedures have been satisfied, the original signed Final Quarterly Report Form will be filed with the project file. A copy of the form will be forwarded to FEMA with a formal letter, officially requesting closure of the project. Nevada successfully closed HMGP and PDM projects during the update of this plan following the procedure above.

6.2.3 Review Progress on Mitigation Strategy

The SHMO or his/her designee tracks mitigation objectives, goals, or action items implemented with the Unified Hazard Mitigation Assistance programs. These include activities managed by the DWR. To obtain data about activities implemented by local, tribal, other state and private entities with different sources of funding, the form shown in Figure 6-3: Activity/Project Implementation Report will be distributed in January each year to the current tree/network of contacts described in Section 5.1.1.1. The information will serve to measure progress and capability of the state in the implementation of the mitigation strategy.

6.2.4 Modifications in Tracking Mitigation Actions

No modification was made to this process during the 2010 plan update. Figure 6-3 is a valid and useful form that will provide the SHMO a standardized format to track state agencies


and local jurisdictions' objectives, goals, and actions as well as track their progress and accomplishments. The SHMO will compile the data and compare the activities to the goals and objectives. This data is presented to the Subcommittee and NHMPC at their regularly scheduled meetings.

6.2.5 Reviewing Progress on Implementing Activities and Projects

The document shown in Figure 6-2 is an example of a quarterly financial and progress report used in the system for reviewing the progress of activities and projects of the Nevada HMP programs managed by NDEM. This form is updated on a quarterly basis by the subgrantees and sent to the SHMO for review. The SHMO reports this information to the NHMPC at its quarterly meeting. The NHMPC discusses the information and formulates recommendations to modify the Nevada HMP accordingly. The NHMPC has the opportunity to discuss the information presented in these reports and formulate recommendations or modifications to the NHMP based on it at its meeting scheduled for the last quarter of the year.

The State Floodplain Manager has implemented a similar form to track activities funded by the HMA programs managed by the DWR. A very close working relationship is established between the DEM and DWR in implementing mitigation activities. All activities requesting funds from HMA programs require NHMPC's input in the prioritization process before submission to FEMA.

Figure 6-2. Sample Quarterly Financial & Progress Report



QUARTERLY FINANCIAL AND PROGRESS REPORT

Reporting Period: Quarter STARTING
month, day & year
January 1, 2010 Quarter ENDING
month, day & year
March 31, 2010

DESCRIPTION			
Subgrantee Agency:	Esmeralda, Emergency Management	Report No.:	Nine (9)
Address:	Box 57, Goldfield, NV 89013	Funding Year:	2007
Project Name:	2007 PDMC-002, HM Plan	Grant Fund Stream:	PDM
Project Manager:	Harriet Ealey	Funding Job #:	97017E7
E-mail: harrietealey@frontiernet.net	Fiscal Agent:	Fed Funds Share %:	75%
Phone: 775-485-9974	Phone:	Match Funds Share %:	25%

TO-DATE CUMULATIVE TOTALS		DEM Use Only	
A. Total Expenses Previously Claimed	\$ 24,086.19	Budget Account:	
B. Total Expenses Claimed This Period	\$ -	Category:	
C. Total Expenses Claimed To Date (Lines A+B)	\$ 24,086.19	General Ledger:	
D. Total Match provided by Sub-grantee To-date (If applicable)	\$ 6,021.55	Amount Reimbursed:	
F. Total Expenses Reimbursed To Date (Total Fed Funds Requested this QTR+Prev)	\$ 18,064.64	Voucher #:	
G. Encumbered	\$ -	Initials:	
H. Total Federal Grant Funds Awarded	\$ 24,949.50	Date:	
I. Unobligated Balance of Federal Funds (Lines H - (G+F))	\$ 6,884.86		

BUDGET, EXPENDITURES & COMMITMENTS BY CATEGORY					
Category	Grant Funds Awarded (H)	Previously Claimed To Date (A)	Claimed This Period (B)	Total Claimed To Date (C)	Encumbered (G)
Personnel				\$ -	\$ -
Consultants/Contracts	\$ 33,266.00	\$ 24,086.19	\$ -	\$ 24,086.19	\$ -
Travel		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Supplies/Operating		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Equipment		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Training		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Planning		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
M&A		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
COLUMN TOTALS	\$ 33,266.00	\$ 24,086.19	\$ -	\$ 24,086.19	\$ -

Total Federal Funds Requested this Claim: (Current Period Total Less Match):	\$ -
--	------

PROJECT REPORTING	
Do you anticipate completion of work within the performance period. <small>If not, please describe any problems, delays or adverse conditions that will impair the ability to meet the stated objectives in the application.</small>	Yes
Do you anticipate: Cost underrun/overrun?	No
Do you anticipate: Request for extension of performance period?	No



QUARTERLY FINANCIAL AND PROGRESS REPORT

Reporting	Quarter STARTING month, day & year	Quarter ENDING month, day & year
Period:	January 1, 2010	March 31, 2010

DESCRIPTION

Subgrantee Agency:	Esmeralda, Emergency Management	Report No.:	Nine (9)
Address:	Box 57, Goldfield, NV 89013	Funding Year:	2007
Project Name:	2007 PDMC-002, HM Plan	Grant Fund Stream:	PDM
Project Manager:	Harriet Ealey	Funding Job #:	97017E7
E-mail: harrietealey@frontiernet.net	Fiscal Agent:	Fed Funds Share %:	75%
Phone: 775-485-9974	E-mail:	Match Funds Share %:	25%
	Phone:		

PROJECT COMPLETION (Note: The Tasks as identified and tracked here come from the Project Plan)

Task #	Task Description	% Completion of Task	% Total Completion
1		100%	
2		100%	
3		100%	
4		90%	
5			
6			
7			
8			98%
9			
10			
11			
12			
Total Actual Project Completion To Date:		98%	

Please describe significant activities and developments that have occurred that show performance during this quarter, including a comparison of actual accomplishments to the tasks listed above.

Task #1	Project Initiation - Complete
Task #2	Risk Assessment - Completed
Task #3	Mitigation Strategy - Completed
Task #4	Prepare Plan-Submitted draft plan to County and Elizabeth Ashby for review. The draft will be amended to reflect the comments or changes received and submitted to FEMA.
Task #5	
Task #6	
Task #7	
Task #8	
Task #9	
Task #10	
Task #11	
Task #12	

Attached are copies of all expenses to substantiate the expenses requested on this claim. I certify that submitted invoices have been paid prior to the request for reimbursement from the SAA and to the best of my knowledge and belief, this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unpaid obligations are for the purposes set forth under the terms of federal and state assurances, program regulations and the approved grant budget. I further certify that a copy of this Financial Report has been provided to the above named Project Manager.

Signature - Fiscal Agent	Date
Harriet Ealey	4/13/2010
I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief, this report is correct and complete and that all pertinent facts regarding the status of this Project are included. I further certify that I have provided a copy of this report to the above named Fiscal Agent.	
Signature - Project Manager	Date
Harriet Ealey	4/13/2010

NOTE: Back-up for this claim can be found in the grant program file located at the Division of Emergency Management.

As mentioned previously in Section 6.1.4, other programs will be monitored by Subcommittee members. The SHMO will place an action item in the Subcommittee's agenda requesting information about accomplished mitigation projects supported, facilitated and/or funded through/by other state agencies.

Each member is tasked with reporting the current status of and progress made on mitigation-related activities or projects within the agency he or she represents, linked to. Figure 6-3 is the form provided to the members for reporting purposes.

Figure 6-3. Activity/Project Implementation Report

QUARTER :Jan, Feb Mar 201	Agency and Amount (\$)		Effect on Loss Reduction	Goal, Action # achieved from State Plan (See Table 4-2 for Mitigation Goals and Strategic Actions)
Date Submitted: _____	State – Manage, support, Fund (\$)	Federal (\$)		
Activity/Project				
Sample: Silver Spring drainage pipe enhancement at Highways 50 and 95	DEM Manage	FEMA \$53,340	Flood	Action 6.E.2

Complete applicable areas. If unknown, write N/A. Any questions call SHMO Elizabeth Ashby at 775-687-0314

This form was not presented to the Subcommittee or NHMPC during the current plan update. This oversight was due to lack of staffing within the mitigation program to track all data and forms. However, activities funded through DEM or the DWR are included in the report found in Section 4.2.4 Hazard Management Capabilities Changes. The oversight will be corrected in the next iteration the assistance of the NBMG and temporary staff who are already identified. The staff will review each section of the plan before the next Subcommittee meeting in January and develop a list of future strategic mitigation actions stated in the State or local plans or discussed at meetings to track their progress for the new

iteration. The tracking form will be distributed at the same time as the Annual Review Questionnaire to both NHMPC and Subcommittee members and any completed forms will be requested at each quarterly meeting.

Mitigation actions were implemented as planned during the 3-year update cycle; see Section 4.1.3, Goal Assessment and 4.2.4 Hazard Management Capabilities Changes for details. These sections show that Nevada received one relatively small Presidential Declaration in 2008 with HMGP funding totaling \$489,792. PDM competitive funding increased for both 2009 and 2010 as shown in Table 4-5, p. 4-28. Both sources of funding enhanced local planning and partially fulfilled actions set forth in the 2007 strategy. We had great success in coordinating hazard mitigation planning efforts with local communities; this was the first goal in 2007 although it is on-going as expirations occur. Of the remaining eight counties without approved plans, 2 applied successfully and the remaining six are coordinating countywide or regional (two or more neighboring counties) applications for the current PDM cycle to develop multi-jurisdictional plans. If all proposals are funded, every community in Nevada will be covered by a hazard mitigation plan by the completion of the next update. Project activities also increased during this update period as shown in Table 4-4: seven project applications were submitted to FEMA in 2010, and three were selected for further review. Many issues and concerns remain for the communities and their selected mitigation projects as the lagging economy causes a scarcity of available matching funds. Layoffs and agency department closures have been common in most urban areas and will continue to negatively affect the number of mitigation activities implemented during the next state planning update. Budgetary shortfalls have had a profound “trickle-down” effect and as we all know, mitigation takes place at the local level.