

Enhanced State Hazard Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

State Point of Contact: Elizabeth Ashby	Address: 2478 Fairview Dr. Carson City, NV 89701
Title: SHMO	
Agency: Division of Emergency Management	
Phone Number: 775-687-0314	E-Mail: eashby@dps.state.nv.us

FEMA Reviewers: National Review Panel	Title:	Date:
Date Received in FEMA Region [insert #]		
Plan Not Approved		
Date Plan Approved		

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

State: NEVADA

Date of Plan: October 2013

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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

☐

PLAN APPROVED

☐

See Reviewer's Comments

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

State: NEVADA

Date of Plan: October 2013

-

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 #)	National Enhanced Panel Reviewers' Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan meet all the Standard State Mitigation Plan requirements?	Section 1.2, page 1-1 Appendix A			
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 #)	National Enhanced Panel Reviewers' 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 8.1.1, pages 8-1 and 8-2 Section 2.3.1, page 2-20 Pages 4-2, 5-9, 5-10			
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 8.1.2, page 8-2 and 8-3 Section 2.3.3, page 2-23, Table 2-7 Section 4.2, pages 4-14 to 4-38			

SUMMARY SCORE

--	--

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:*

- *Established eligibility criteria for multi-hazard mitigation measures.*
- *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*
- *[A system] to rank the measures according to the State's eligibility criteria.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	National Enhanced Panel Reviewers' 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 8.2.1, pages 8-4 to 8-8-9 and Figures 8-1 and 8-2. Sections 4.2, 5.3			
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 8.2.2, pages 8-9, Figures 8-1 and 8-2. Section 4.4, Table 4-10. Section 5.3, pages 5-14			

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

-

State: NEVADA

Date of Plan: October 2013

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 8.2.3, pages 8-9 to 8-11 Section 4.4			
		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:

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

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	National Enhanced Panel Reviewers' 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?	Sec. 8.3.1, page 8-11. Fig. 8-3, pages 8-12	Correspondence from the Region will be provided to the State on a regular basis regarding grant management performance regarding all elements in this section.		
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?	Sec. 8.3.1, pages 8-11 to 8-16; Fig. 8-4, pages 8-14.	See above		
C. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan provide a record for preparing and submitting accurate environmental reviews and benefit-cost analyses?	Sec. 8.3.2, pages 8-14.	See above		
D. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan provide a record for submitting complete and accurate quarterly progress and financial reports on time?	Sec. 8.3.3, pages 8-15; Fig. 6-2, pages 6-9 and 6-10.	See above		
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?	Sec. 8.3.4, pages 8-15-6; Fig. 6-2, pages 6-9 and 6-10.	See above		
		SUMMARY SCORE		

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

State: NEVADA

Date of Plan: October 2013

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 #)	National Enhanced Panel Reviewers' 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 8.4.1, page 8-17.			
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 8.4.1, page 8-17. Section 8.4.2, pages 8-17 to 8-21, Table 8-1			
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 #)	National Enhanced Panel Reviewers' 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 8.5.1, page 8-21 Section 8.5.2, page 8-23 to 8-26, Table 8-3 Section 4.2.4, pages 4-31 Section 5.1 Section 8.3.1, page 8-12 Section 8.5.1, pages 8-21 to 8-23			

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

State: NEVADA

Date of Plan: October 2013

B. Does the new or updated Enhanced Plan document how the State is effectively using existing programs to achieve its mitigation goals?	Section 8.5.2, pages 8-23 to 8-26, Table 8-2 Section 4.2.1, page 4-14; Table 4-3, page 4-15 to 4-30 Section 4.5, Tables 4-11 and 4-12, pages 4-65 and 4-66			
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:*

- *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.*
- *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.*
- *The State provides a portion of the non-Federal match for HMGP and/or other mitigation projects.*
- *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.*
- *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.*
- *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 #)	National Enhanced Panel Reviewers' 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 8.6, pages 8-27 to 8-36 Section 5.1.2			

ENHANCED STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

-

State: NEVADA

Date of Plan: October 2013

<p>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?</p>	<p>Section 8.6, pages 8-27 to 8-36</p> <p>Section 2.3, page 2-20</p> <p>Section 4.2.1, page 4-14, Table 4-3</p> <p>Section 4.2.4, pages 4-31 to 4-32</p> <p>Section 4.5, pages 4-65 and 4-66, Tables 4- 11 and 4-12</p>			
SUMMARY SCORE				