

This section provides a description of the State of Nevada’s support in the development and maintenance of local mitigation plans. *Major accomplishments in this section since the last iteration of the NHMP include the following:*

- *Four counties have updated their hazard mitigation plans*
- *Five more counties have plans under development*
- *The State has developed and successfully implemented a “TableTop Exercise” (TTX) for updating of local plans*
- *Successfully developed and used the MyPlan website for the exchange of hazard mitigation data with local and tribal entities*
- *Integrated local HMP data into the current Enhanced State Plan*

## 5.1 LOCAL FUNDING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The requirements for local funding and technical assistance for the development of local mitigation plans, as stipulated in the DMA 2000 and its implementing regulations, are described below.

### DMA 2000 REQUIREMENTS: 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

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?

**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?**

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

### 5.1.1 Development of Local Mitigation Plans

The primary goal of the NHMPC is to ensure that every community in Nevada, develops a hazard mitigation plan and maintains it in a current, updated status. The NHMPC believes that the planning process is the first step in awareness of the risk and vulnerability posed by the hazards and provides the communities with a method to “do something about the risk.” This goal includes the updating of existing plans and enhancing the data available for locals to use in the update process. The State provides technical assistance in the development of local mitigation plans in all communities including those with severe repetitive loss properties. Through 2012, every plan needing an update has acquired funding through the application process, and, where needed, communities have joined together to develop regional plans. Since the previous state plan was approved in 2010, funding received for planning has allowed one county to develop a new plan, five counties to develop two

separate regional plans, and four to update their current plans. As a result, Nevada has reached its goal of all counties developing or updating hazard mitigation plans by 2013. Nevada has also developed plans to cover 4 more of the 26 tribal entities in the past 3 years whereas only two were covered in the previous period, for a total of six.

Planning funds have been “shared” by more than one community in several instances. For example, in 2012, Humboldt, Lander and Pershing counties are developing a regional plan under the approved PDM 2011 funding, and White Pine and Eureka counties are developing a joint regional plan under a PDM 2010 Grant. This leveraging of grant monies to develop regional plans is a very cost-effective way for rural communities to work together to become covered by a mitigation plan.

Eleven counties in the state have approved plans and the remaining six are currently developing hazard mitigation plans under approved HMA grant funding. Of the eleven with approved plans, three counties’ plans are being updated in a timely manner. The status of hazard mitigation plans and updates for all 17 counties is shown pictorially in Figure 5-1:



**Figure 5-1. Map of Counties and LHMP Status**

Since the last NHMP was approved:

- Lyon County is finalizing development of their plan.
- Churchill and Mineral County plans were approved in 2012 under a PDM 2010

planning grant. These planning efforts were helped by NHMPC traveling to rural counties to conduct the quarterly meeting.

- White Pine County and Eureka County are jointly developing a regional plan. The plan is funded by a PDM 2010 grant to White Pine County and Eureka County is matching the grant with cash.
- Pershing, Humboldt, and Lander Counties were awarded a PDM 2011 planning grant to develop a regional plan. These planning efforts were helped by NHMPC traveling to rural counties to conduct the quarterly meeting.
- FEMA approved updates for the following county plans: Carson, Clark, Lincoln, and Washoe.

The following counties are in the process of updating plans: Douglas, Elko, Nye, and Storey.

A TTX is scheduled with Esmeralda County in summer 2013.

Nevada's SHMO and NHMPC are currently working to assist the tribal nations in developing hazard mitigation programs. Since the last iteration of the NHMP, hazard plans have been developed that cover the Reno-Sparks tribe, the Pyramid Lake Paiute tribe, Elko Band, sometimes singly and sometimes in conjunction with other community plans. Plans for Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute tribe and Washoe tribe of Nevada and California were updated. With the assistance of the State Tribal Liaison, mitigation staff continues to meet with tribal emergency managers to discuss development and/or update of mitigation plans. As with any community, awareness and the readiness of the community is the first step in beginning the planning process. A TTX is scheduled with Elko Band Council in April 2013.

### **Nevada's Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Process**

With the elimination of pre-disaster hazard mitigation funding, NDEM is limited to providing technical support for local planning efforts. These efforts are supported by Cooperating Technical Partners (CTP) and Management Cost funds. The SHMO does outreach through visits to the targeted communities and personal meetings with emergency managers, planners, public works directors and county commissioners of all Nevada communities to build awareness about the hazard mitigation plan requirements and process. Once the local jurisdiction has established resources and committed to the planning process, the SHMO assists in obtaining funds for the development and/or updating of the plan. Technical support from the state continues throughout the application process and plan development and/or update. Under the unified Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) program, NDEM works together with the help and guidance of NDWR staff in administering and processing all five hazard mitigation grant (HMA) programs to ensure that Nevada's subgrantees follow the same process when applying for funding under the HMA and both agencies provide outreach together.

Nevada's established methodology for technical support for the development and maintenance of local plans is as follows:

- SHMO and staff attend local planning meetings in rural venues to ascertain their needs and capabilities, and to develop local points of contact.
- SHMO and staff act as liaison with consultants and local entities to ensure information is provided promptly and accurately.
- NDEM provides risk assessment data and access to experts in the all hazard fields specific to the local jurisdictions. It also provides risk assessment data on flood, wildfire and earthquake hazards through the MyPlan website. (MyPlan is a FEMA-funded GIS-based website developed by NBMG to assist local planning professionals with hazard data necessary to address the risk and vulnerability assessment information required for hazard mitigation planning in their communities. For additional details see Section 8.6.2).

For plan maintenance, NDEM staff developed a Table Top Exercise (TTX) to facilitate annual evaluation of approved local hazard mitigation plans. NDEM staff demonstrates this exercise at established Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) meetings where there is already a broad cross-section of community leaders in attendance without requiring an additional meeting. State Emergency Response Commission requires that the LEPC meetings include representatives from local law enforcement, fire departments, hospitals, elected officials, and the private sector.

The primary benefit of the TTX has been to educate individuals not involved in the original planning process about hazard mitigation actions for the community. Where it has been implemented, this exercise has also proved its usefulness in generating requests from the participating local individuals about hazard mitigation activities. As one example, Lincoln County requested information on seismic retrofits of mobile homes as a result of the TTX. As another example, as a result of the TTX, Storey County decided to ground-truth URM data presented at the exercise.

The TTX is compliant with the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) and FEMA Region IX is considering it as a Best Management Practices example for other states to follow.

Tables 5-1 and 5-2 below show details of the current status of hazard plan development and updates in the local jurisdictions, tribal communities, and the state, as well as the dates FEMA approved their plans.

<b>Table 5-1. Current Status of Local Hazard Plan Development and Updates.</b>					
<b>State of Nevada - Division of Emergency Management</b>					
County Hazard Mitigation Plan Status as of: 2-Jan-2013					
	<b>County/City</b>	<b>Type of Plan</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>	<b>Update Due</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	Carson City	Multi	6-Apr-2011	6-Apr-2016	
2	Churchill	Multi	13-Jun-2012	13-Jun-2017	
3	Clark County	Multi	29-Nov-2012	29-Nov-2017	
4	Douglas County	Single	24-Mar-2008	24-Mar-2013	Plan update in process
5	Elko County	Multi	26-Oct-2008	26-Oct-2013	Plan update in process
6	Esmeralda County	Single	4-Apr-2011	4-Apr-2016	
7	Eureka County	Multi			Plan development in process PDM 2010 Grant
8	Humboldt County	Multi			Planning in Process PDM 2011 Grant
9	Lander County	Multi			Planning in Process PDM 2011 Grant
10	Lincoln County	Multi	1-May-2012	30-Apr-2017	
11	Lyon County	Multi			Plan development in process
12	Mineral County	Single	11-Apr-2012	10-Apr-2017	
13	Nye County	Multi	29-Apr-2006	29-Apr-2011	Plan update in process
14	Pershing County	Multi			Planning in Process PDM 2011 Grant
15	Storey County	Multi	29-Dec-2009	28-Dec-2014	
16	Washoe County	Multi	15-Dec-2010	14-Dec-2015	
	Reno, City of	Multi			
	Sparks, City of	Multi			
17	White Pine County	Multi			Plan in Process PDM 2010 Grant

<b>Table 5-2. Current Status of Nevada Tribal Hazard Plan Development and Updates.</b>					
	<b>TRIBAL</b>	<b>Type of Plan</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>	<b>Update Due</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute	Single	11-Jul-2011	11-Jul-16	Update approved by Region X
2	Duckwater Shoshone	Multi			Development in conjunction with Nye
3	Ely Shoshone Council				
4	Fallon Paiute-Shoshone				
5	Fort Mojave Indian				
6	Goshute Business Council				
7	Las Vegas Paiute				
8	Lovelock Paiute				
9	Moapa Business Council				

<b>Table 5-2. Current Status of Nevada Tribal Hazard Plan Development and Updates.</b>					
	<b>TRIBAL</b>	<b>Type of Plan</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>	<b>Update Due</b>	<b>Comments</b>
10	Pyramid Lake Paiute	Multi	7-Apr-2011	15-Dec-2015	Regional with Washoe Co.
11	Reno-Sparks Indian Colony	Multi	7-Apr-2011	15-Dec-2015	Regional with Washoe Co.
12	Summit Lake Paiute				
13	TeMoak Tribal Council				
14	Battle Mountain Band Council				
15	Elko Band Council	Single	18-Jan-2011	18-Jan-2016	
16	South Fork Bank Council				
17	Wells Band Council				
18	Timbisha Shoshone				
19	Yerington Paiute				
20	Yomba Shoshone				
21	Walker River Paiute				
22	Washoe Tribe of NV & CA	Multi	3-Jun-2009	3-Jun-2014	Update
23	Carson Colony Council				
24	Dresslerville Community Council				
25	Stewart Community Council				
26	Woodfords Community Council				

**5.1.1.1 Identification and Notification of Potential Subgrantees (206.437(b)(4)(i))**

Potential subgrantees for pre-disaster mitigation funding are identified and notified via the TTX sessions, workshops, social media, FM technical assistance sessions, NHMPC member networking, as well as widely distributed e-mail notices and hard-copy paper flyers.

First, there is a well-established email communication tree network that connects the main “trunk” SHMO with all subsidiary branches of the emergency management network throughout Nevada that reaches all levels of emergency management personnel in state, county, local, and tribal governments. This e-mail network is used to communicate with, identify, and notify potential subgrantees of pre-disaster mitigation funding opportunities. Through this network the initial notification is sent to the following main branches of the emergency management system and all subsidiary networks throughout the state:

- State Floodplain Manager
- Emergency Managers
- NHMPC
- NESAC

- Tribal Liaison
- Nevada Association of Counties
- Public Works Directors for local communities
- Homeland Security Distribution list
- Governor's office email list of State agencies
- Current and past subgrantee list
- Community Emergency Response Teams
- Local Emergency Planning Committees
- Nevada Grants Office

In addition to the mass e-mail notification, a paper flyer, found in Appendix Q, is updated annually that describes the Unified Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) programs, eligible activities, and a calendar with scheduled deadlines for the current grant cycle. This flyer is distributed to potential subgrantees through the DEM staff, the floodplain manager, and at the NHMPC meetings statewide. The flyer directs potential subgrantees to the NHMPC website for details on the application process.

In addition, the NHMPC website, the Floodplain Management Website, and the DEM website are updated with current application procedures and notices of intent and relevant forms.

Below is the State Administrative Plan's section pertaining to identification and notification of potential subgrantees for the post-disaster funding, HMGP. It includes the application process for PDM and HMGP as well as the application prioritization criteria used by NHMPC for all hazard mitigation requests under HMA. This process is also used to prioritize FMA and RFC proposals managed by NDWR.

1. IDENTIFICATION:

- a. Upon receipt of a presidential disaster declaration, the SHMO consults with the Federal Hazard Mitigation Officer (FHMO) to identify potential projects. The FHMO, and the FEMA Public Assistance Officer provide the SHMO with early indications of potential projects. The SHMO coordinates with the State Public Assistance and Individual Assistance Officers to determine a preliminary list of Subgrantees. Using the most current disaster assessment information available, the SHMO develops a list of potential Subgrantees. The SHMO considers the use of pre-identified mitigation strategies and potential HMGP projects found in the State and/or Local Multi Hazard Mitigation Plan. Potential projects may also be

identified during the preliminary damage assessment or post-disaster hazard mitigation team process. The SHMO uses these initial consultations to obtain a general estimate of available program funds.

- b. The SHMO reviews the existing State Multi Hazard Mitigation Plan (Section 322 of the Stafford Act) for potential applications of Section 404 funding. The SHMO forwards all applications to NHMPC's Proposal Review Subcommittee for review of eligibility and prioritization recommendations. The SHMO obtains additional information necessary to assist the NHMPC in making their determination and notifying Subgrantees of ineligible projects.
  - c. The NHMPC reviews all pre-disaster and post-disaster projects, and other projects/programs for potential Section 404 and 322 funding.
  - d. The list of potential Subgrantees will continue to expand as recovery efforts get underway.
2. NOTIFICATION:
- a. The SHMO will:
    - (1) Work with the FHMO to coordinate an announcement of the availability of the Section 404 Program funding during the Public Assistance Applicant Briefing. The FHMO and SHMO will present a detailed overview of the program to potential Subgrantees for assistance under this program. See Annex B for a sample copy of a "Notification Letter" for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.
    - (2) Notify potential applicants of information via public notices, news releases, direct contact and media coverage.
  - b. The NHMPC's Proposal Review Subcommittee will recommend, to the NHMPC, a selection and prioritization of projects to be submitted to FEMA for approval. The NHMPC approves the final selection and prioritization of projects for submission to FEMA. The SHMO will notify each Subgrantee of the NHMPC's decision. The SHMO submits projects approved by NHMPC to FEMA.
  - c. The SHMO will notify Subgrantees of projects not selected for submission to FEMA and advise them of the following **State** appeal process (206.437 (b)4(ix)):
    - 1) The Subgrantee may appeal a decision made by the NHMPC.
    - 2) The written appeal must be submitted to the NHMPC within 60 days after the receipt of a notice of denial/rejection.
    - 3) The appeal must contain documented justification supporting the Subgrantee's position to warrant reconsideration by the NHMPC.
  - d. The SHMO will establish a Point of Contact (POC) with all Subgrantees and coordinate technical assistance, project management and overview with the Subgrantee's POC for the duration of the project. The NHMPC, the SHMO, State staff, and the FHMO can generate expertise.

**5.1.1.2 Application Procedures (206.437(b)(4)(ii))**

1. The SHMO will coordinate with the State Public Assistance and Individual Assistance Officers as well as the FHMO to determine deadlines for the HMGP.
2. The SHMO will have responsibility to ensure the proper completion of all applications prior to submission to the FEMA Regional Director. The State requires submission of an electronic copy and a hard copy of all applications.
3. An interested potential subgrantee must submit a Notice of Interest (NOI) to the SHMO within 60 days of the disaster declaration. The SHMO and/or the PA officer will announce the 60-day deadline at the Public Assistance and/or Mitigation Applicants' Briefings.
4. The SHMO will forward all applications to the NHMPC for review of eligibility in accordance with Section H, Part 1. The SHMO will obtain additional information necessary to assist NHMPC in making their determination and notifying Subgrantees of ineligible projects.
5. In the event that several eligible projects are competing for limited funding, the NHMPC will prioritize the applications. Applications will be submitted to FEMA according to NHMPC's prioritization.
6. The SHMO will prepare the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program application package for submission to FEMA. The Governor's Authorized Representative (GAR) for the HMGP or the Chief of DEM for PDM will forward state application to FEMA based on the NHMPC's recommendation.
7. The SHMO will notify Subgrantees of the NHMPC's decision regarding application approval or disapproval. Requests and project information will be coordinated with the Federal Hazard Mitigation Officer (FHMO).

**5.1.2 Funding and Technical Assistance for the Past Three Years**

Nevada's SHMO continues to work with local entities to provide funding and technical assistance for local hazard mitigation plans. Technical assistance for local mitigation planning projects has consisted of the following:

- a) Providing guidance for organization of resources
- b) Mitigation planning presentations for elected officials
- c) Putting local entities in contact with appropriate sources of expertise such as the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology for earthquake information, and the Division of Water Resources for flood issues
- d) Regularly attending local mitigation planning meetings.

Funding for mitigation plans and projects is provided under FEMA mitigation programs through NDEM in close coordination with the Division of Water Resources. All plans developed at the local and State levels are presented to the SHMO for a preliminary review. Jurisdictions are strongly encouraged to present partial sections to the SHMO allowing for

“course corrections” before their final draft submissions. As mentioned before, the SHMO also participates as a State Liaison in key plan development meetings with the jurisdiction whose plan is under development. State funding for development and/or updating of hazard mitigation plans is not available. Local, tribal, and state plans are developed only with funding received through the HMA process. Table 5-3 presents a summary of HMA funding received by counties, regional communities, and the State for plan development and updates during the period since the last state update, 2010-2013.

Table 5-3. HMA Funding for Plans 2010-2013				
Year	County/City	Description	Source	Amount (\$)
2010	Churchill and Mineral	Development of separate HM plans	PDM	39,375.00
2010	Lincoln County	Update of HM plan	PDM	23,099.00
2010	Nye County	Update of HM plan	PDM	39,001.00
2010	White Pine and Eureka County	Development of Regional HM plan	PDM	39,500.00
2010	State of Nevada	MyPlan Website Development	CTP	100,000.00
2011	Pershing, Lander, and Humboldt	Development of Regional HM plan	PDM	60,006.00
2012	State of Nevada	Community Resilience	CTP	75,000.00
2012	Douglas County	Update of HM plan	PDM	102,258.00
2012	Enhanced SHMP	Update of SHM plan	PDM	399,728.00
<b>Total received during three-year state planning cycle</b>				<b>877,967.00</b>

## 5.2 LOCAL PLAN INTEGRATION

The requirements for local plan integration, as stipulated in the DMA 2000 and its implementing regulations, are described below.

### DMA 2000 REQUIREMENTS: COORDINATION OF LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING

#### Local Funding and Technical Assistance

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

Does the **new or updated** plan provide a description of the **process and timeframe** the State established to **review** local plans?

Does the **new or updated** plan provide a description of the **process and timeframe** the State established to **coordinate and link** local plans the State Mitigation Plan?

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

**5.2.1 Process and Timeframe to Review Local Plans**

The SHMO or his/her designee requests review of drafts from the communities as the planning process progresses in an effort to provide feedback and guide the plan to meet the federal requirements. While attending local HM planning meetings locally, State HM staff recommends appropriate action to ensure compliance with federal planning requirements. Once a completed draft of the plan is received, mitigation staff reviews the crosswalk and content of the plan document and together with the lead local planner make revisions. In addition to attending local planning meetings when possible, mitigation staff is available to provide planning technical assistance when requested by the community.

Rapid review of local mitigation plans was hindered in early years by understaffing within the DEM mitigation section. A consultant hired in 2009 to assist the SHMO with planning, grant, application and technical assistance tasks greatly increased efficiency and timeliness of the SHMO's ability to fully review all local hazard mitigation plans within 45 days of receipt. From 2009 to 2011, PDM management costs funded this contractor and during 2012, funding from CTP sources was received to continue contractor funding and to provide technical assistance and support to local communities for their annual evaluation through the Table Top Exercise, or to assist in the update process of an expiring HM plan. This assistance is essential to provide the technical support for local hazard mitigation updates and maintenance in the future. However, with the state's budgetary constraints, no additional staffing is foreseen in the future.

**5.2.2 Coordinate and Link Local Plans to the State Mitigation Plan**

The NHMP Subcommittee is charged with coordinating and linking the local plans to the Nevada HMP. Once a local plan is completed and approved by FEMA Region IX, the plan must wait for review until the next quarterly Subcommittee meeting. The integration process is expected to take 6 months to a year. The following process will be used for linking the local plan to the Nevada HMP.

1. NHMP Subcommittee Meeting (6 months to a year)
2. Local plans are presented to the Subcommittee as new business by SHMO as follows:
  - a. Written detailed items found in new local plan, including required analyses, proposed for incorporation into the State Plan (examples of information presented for incorporation are listed below)
    - i. Recommended additions to State plan under each identified hazard, noting hazards not identified in the State plan.
    - ii. Add capability assessment information
    - iii. Add goals, objectives and action (GOAS) items, noting current mitigation activities, funding sources, and link to the State's GOAS.
    - iv. Record the completed plan in appropriate State plan locations.
3. The additions are approved, disapproved, or modified by the Subcommittee.

4. Incorporation of new plan data made to the Nevada HMP by the SHMO or designee

Local plans use the state plan to compile information about the communities' hazards, their nature, location, and estimated potential losses. The information for earthquake and flood hazards currently found in the state plan has been used by communities such as Washoe County and Carson City to update their plans. The state in turn uses the local plans to update the data about the communities' capabilities, hazard ratings, and the mitigation strategy.

Since 2007, the integration of local plans with the state plan has really been upside down, with the planning communities using the state plan's information to assist in their risk assessment. This is the primary reason for the NHMPC to work on enhancing the data found in the state plan and making it available in electronic format to Nevada's communities. Much work remains to be done and although priorities exist, these are not always the same for the state as for the communities. As the state is not a source for mitigation funding, support for communities who go above and beyond the norm in mitigation planning and strategy consists basically of written letters of recognition from NHMPC, and the state tracks the activity when notified.

In an effort to better support the integration of local plans with the state plan, the NHMPC has initiated a special project funded by the Regional Office called "MyPlan", implemented by NBMG's GIS staff. This project uses the same format as that created by California's "MyPlan" project, which consists of a website directed to community planners to access hazard risks for each and all communities but populates it with Nevada-specific data. The use of the website as a resource for developing and/or updating hazard mitigation plans with better, more accessible data will make the planning process much easier for locals and for state integration purposes. During the 2010-2013 plan update period, Gary Johnson with NBMG has been accompanying the SHMO on visits to LHMP meetings and giving presentations to those groups in order to familiarize planners with MyPlan and its capabilities in the planning process and to solicit input of additional local hazard data sets into the system.

### 5.3 PRIORITIZING LOCAL ASSISTANCE

The requirements for prioritizing local assistance, as stipulated in the DMA 2000 and its implementing regulations, are described below.

#### DMA 2000 REQUIREMENTS: COORDINATION OF LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING

##### Local Funding and Technical Assistance

Requirement §201.4(c)(4)(ii): 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

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?

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?

For the **new or updated plan, do** the criteria include considerations for communities with the highest risk?

For the **new or updated plan, do** the criteria include considerations for repetitive loss properties?

For the **new or updated plan, do** the criteria include considerations for communities with the most intense development pressures?

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

#### 5.3.1 Local Funding and Technical Assistance

##### 5.3.1.1 Planning, Review, Ranking, and Selection

The guidelines used by the NHMPC to review, rank, and select projects for HMA are set forth in Section 8. Please refer to Section 8.2.3 and Figure 8-2 for these guidelines on the review, ranking and selection of projects for HMA.

##### 5.3.1.2 Prioritization Evaluation

Application Prioritization criteria used by the NHMPC prioritize projects for HMA funding are set forth in Section 8. Please refer to Section 8.2.3 and Figure 8-2 for these Prioritization criteria

##### 5.3.1.3 Prioritization Form

The Mitigation Grant Prioritization Form used by the NHMPC is shown in Section 8, Figure 8-2 and below.

NHMPC Prioritization Form	
Subgrantee: _____ Activity Name: _____	
<b>Ranking and Selection of Applications:</b>	
<b>Application Prioritization Criteria (I-3)</b>	<b>Assigned Value (0 - 10)</b>
a. Population Affected	_____
b. Public Perception of Need	_____
c. Emergency Access and Public Inconvenience	_____
<i>For planning applications: Performance of current plan maintenance activities &amp; Implementation of mitigation activities.</i>	
d. Cost Effectiveness of the Project (BCA=1) (10 pts)	_____
<i>For planning applications: (15 pts) Understanding of the planning process and a methodology for completing the proposed mitigation plan.</i>	
e. Availability of Other Funding Sources	_____
f. Timing and Implementation	_____
g. Environmental Enhancement (10 pts)	_____
<i>For planning applications: (0 pts)</i>	
h. Resilience, Maintenance & Sustainability of Project (10 pts)	_____
<i>For planning applications: (15 pts) The description of unique or innovative outreach activities</i>	
<b>Subtotal Prioritization Criteria (I-3, a thru h)</b>	_____
<b>Subtotal Criteria - (80-Point Maximum)/2 =</b>	_____
(Max. 40 points)	
<b>Additional Prioritization Considerations (I-4)</b>	
a. Consistent with State & Local Mitigation Plan	_____
b. Detrimental Impact if Not Taken	_____
c. Greatest Impact to Reduce Future Disaster Losses	_____
d. Mitigate Multiple Hazards and/or Accomplish Multiple Objectives	_____
e. Optimize Total Funds Available	_____
f. Local Level of Interest & Degree of Commitment to Project	_____
<b>Additional Considerations Combined (I-4, a thru f)</b>	_____
(Max. 60 points)	
<b>Total Criteria + Considerations</b>	_____
(Max. 100 points)	

**Figure 5-2.** NHMPC Application Prioritization Form

**5.3.2 Cost Benefit Review of Proposed Projects**

Section 8.2.1, Figure 8-2 subsection 3.d, Application Prioritization, letter d. states the consideration of the cost benefit review criteria.

**5.3.3 Highest Risk Communities**

Section 8, Figure 8-2 subsection 4 lists a series of considerations taken by the committee regarding highest risk communities.

**5.3.4 Repetitive Loss Properties**

Section 8, Figure 8-2 subsection 4, letter i lists a series of considerations taken by the committee regarding repetitive loss properties.

**5.3.5 Intense Development Communities**

Population affected is the first criterion used for prioritization of mitigation funding proposals. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, between April 2010 and July 2012, four Nevada counties saw population growth of 2.5% or more: Clark-2.5%, Lander-2.9%, Humboldt - 3.1%, and Elko-4.9%. Four counties had very low to no growth and 8 actually lost population during the same time period. However, Clark and Washoe Counties still contain the greatest percentage of Nevada's population and thus the greatest number of people at risk from flood, wildfire, and earthquake.

During the last three-year period, funded proposals for planning included one from Churchill County; a regional plan from Pershing, Lander, and Humboldt; and a second regional from White Pine and Eureka. Clark, Nye, Douglas counties received grants to update their currently approved plans. Storey, and Elko counties are updating their plans with funding from Cooperating Technical Partners grant program.

Washoe, Douglas, Clark, and Storey counties and the cities of Reno and Henderson continue to take advantage of available funding sources. All have projects eligible for future HMA funding that include embankment protection, fuels reduction, demolition of flood-prone buildings, culvert enhancement and infrastructure protection. NHMPC members discuss and evaluate the criteria for the prioritization process every time applications are submitted to the state. To date, the primary challenge has been to submit applications that are competitive nationally.

As for successes in coordination of Local Mitigation Plans, data in Table 5-1 reveal that Nevada now has 11 counties with approved local county hazard mitigation plans in 2013, as compared to only 5 counties with approved local county hazard mitigation plans in 2007 and 8 in 2010. All remaining 6 counties are in the process of developing county hazard mitigation plans – either in preparation or pending approval by FEMA.

Development of Local Mitigation Plans among Nevada's 26 independent tribal entities has presented a challenge to coordination. In 2007, Nevada had only one tribal entity with an approved hazard mitigation plan, 3 in 2010, and in 2013 we have 5 approved tribal hazard mitigation plans. The State, through its tribal liaison member on the NHM Planning

Subcommittee and the Intertribal Emergency Response Committee provides an avenue for tribal participation in mitigation planning. The SHMO makes regular visits throughout the year to various tribal communities with mitigation outreach flyers, funding information, planning tools, and technical expertise.