

Instructions for Using the Plan Review Crosswalk for Review of Local Mitigation Plans

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000*, published by FEMA, dated March 2004. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and *44 CFR Part 201 – Mitigation Planning, Interim Final Rule* (the Rule), published February 26, 2002.

SCORING SYSTEM

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

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

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated “Satisfactory” in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of “Satisfactory.” A “Needs Improvement” score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing.

When reviewing single jurisdiction plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the boxes for multi-jurisdictional plan requirements. When reviewing multi-jurisdictional plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the prerequisite box for single jurisdiction plans.

States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards, assessing vulnerability, and identifying and analyzing mitigation actions are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

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

Example

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the jurisdiction’s vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description shall include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction’s vulnerability to each hazard?	Section II, pp. 4-10	The plan describes the types of assets that are located within geographically defined hazard areas as well as those that would be affected by winter storms.		✓
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section II, pp. 10-20	The plan does not address the impact of two of the five hazards addressed in the plan. Required Revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include a description of the impact of floods and earthquakes on the assets. A brief description of the impacts of recurring flooding on Robinson and Plainfield Twps is included on Page 94. Recommended Revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This information can be presented in terms of dollar value or percentages of damage. A listing of the SEV’s of Property subject to recurring flooding in Robinson and Plainfield Twps is shown on Page 95. 	✓	
SUMMARY SCORE			✓	

Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

Jurisdiction: Kent County, Ottawa County, City of Grand Rapids, MI	Title of Plan: Pre-Hazard Mitigation Plan	Date of Plan: March 22, 2005
Local Point of Contact: Joseph R. Partridge	Address: Executive Office 300 Monroe Ave NW Rm 489 Grand Rapids, MI 49503	
Title: Emergency Management Director		
Agency: City of Grand Rapids		
Phone Number: 616-456-4139	E-Mail: jpartrid@ci.grand-rapids.mi.us	

State Reviewer:	Title:	Date:		
FEMA Reviewer: Heidi Nachman	Title: Mitigation Specialist	Date: October 25, 2005		
Date Received in FEMA Region [V]				
Plan Not Approved	X			
Plan Approved				
Date Approved				
Jurisdiction:	NFIP Status*			
	Y	N	N/A	CRS Class
Kent County:				
1. Ada Twp	X			
2. Algoma Twp	X			
3. Alpine Twp	X			
4. Cannon Twp	X			
5. Charter Twp of Cascade	X			
6. City of Grand Rapids	X			

Jurisdiction:	NFIP Status*			
	Y	N	N/A	CRS Class
7. City of Grandville	X			
8. Village of Kent City			X	
9. City of Lowell	X			
10. Plainfield Twp	X			
11. Sparta Twp	X			
12. Village of Sparta	X			
13. City of Walker	X			
14. City of Wyoming	X			
15. City of Cedar Springs			X	
16. City of East Grand Rapids	X			
17. City of Rockford			X	
18. Bowne Twp			X	
19. Byron Twp			X	
20. Caledonia Twp	X			
21. Courtland Twp			X	
22. Gaines Twp			X	
23. Grand Rapids Twp			X	
24. Grattan Twp			X	
25. Lowell Twp			X	

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW CROSSWALK

FEMA REGION [V]

Jurisdiction: Kent County, Ottawa County, City of Grand Rapids, MI

Jurisdiction:	NFIP Status*			CRS Class
	Y	N	N/A	
26. Nelson Twp			X	
27. Oakfield Twp			X	
28. Solon Twp			X	
29. Spencer Twp			X	
30. Spring Lake Twp			X	
31. Tyrone Twp			X	
32. Vergennes Twp			X	
33. Village of Caledonia			X	
34. Village of Casnovia			X	
35. Village of Sand Lake			X	
36. Village of Sparta			X	
Ottawa County:				
37. City of Grand Haven	X			
38. Grand Haven Twp	X			
39. City of Holland	X			
40. City of Ferrysburg	X			
41. Charter Twp of Allendale	X			
42. Blendon Twp	X			
43. Chester Twp	X			
44. Village of Coopersville	X			
45. Crockery Twp	X			

Jurisdiction:	NFIP Status*			
	Y	N	N/A	CRS Class
46. City of Hudsonville	X			
47. Jamestown Twp	X			
48. Olive Twp	X			
49. Park Twp	X			
50. Charter Twp of Polkton	X			
51. Port Sheldon Twp	X			
52. Spring Lake Twp	X			
53. Village of Spring Lake	X			
54. Wright Twp	X			
55. City of Zeeland	X			
56. Charter Twp of Zeeland	X			
57. Georgetown Twp	X			
58. Robinson Twp	X			
59. Tallmadge Twp	X			
60. Holland Twp.	X			

* Notes: Y = Participating N = Not Participating N/A = Not Mapped

CHANGES TO INITIAL CROSSWALK DOCUMENT ARE INDICATED IN BOLD TYPE.

Local Mitigation Plan review SUMMARY

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. A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. 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(s) (Check Applicable Box)	NOT MET	MET
Adoption by the Local Governing Body: §201.6(c)(5) OR	N/A	N/A
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5) AND	X	
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation: §201.6(a)(3)		X
Planning Process	N	S
Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b) and §201.6(c)(1)		X
Risk Assessment	N	S
Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)		X
Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)	X	
Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)	X	
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)	X	
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)	X	
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)	X	
Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment: §201.6(c)(2)(iii)		X

Mitigation Strategy

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)
 Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(ii) **Table now Included**
 Implementation of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iii)
 Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iv)

N	S
	X
X	
	X
	X

Plan Maintenance Process

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan: §201.6(c)(4)(i)
 Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms: §201.6(c)(4)(ii)
 Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)

N	S
	X
	X
	X

Additional State Requirements*

Does the plan include descriptions and/or maps of the jurisdiction's public warning system coverage, and any known gaps in that coverage?
Siren Coverage maps are now provided after Page 103

N	S
X	

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

PLAN APPROVED

*States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

See Reviewer's Comments

PREREQUISITE(S)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan **shall** include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council).

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted the plan?			N/A	
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?			N/A	
SUMMARY SCORE			N/A	

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan **must** document that it has been formally adopted.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?	Pgs. 17, 20, 29	A table listing the participating cities, townships and villages in Kent and Ottawa Counties is provided.		X
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the plan?	Pg. 20	Required Revisions: When the mitigation planning process is completed, all participating jurisdictions must formally adopt the plan.	X	
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?	Pg. 20	Required Revisions: For each participating jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan, include a copy of the signed plan adoption resolution. The plan must be formally adopted by each jurisdiction's governing body.	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation

Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process ... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the plan describe how each jurisdiction participated in the plan's development?	Pgs. 24-26, Appendix B	Excellent documentation of each jurisdiction's participation.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

PLANNING PROCESS: §201.6(b): An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan.

Documentation of the Planning Process

Requirement §201.6(b): In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process **shall** include:

- (1) An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;
- (2) An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and
- (3) Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.

Requirement §201.6(c)(1): [The plan **shall** document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the plan?	Pgs. 24-29			X
B. Does the plan indicate who was involved in the planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, etc.?)	Intro, Pg. 24, Appendix A	Contractor let overall development. Representatives from the City of Grand Rapids, Kent County and Ottawa County worked with the Contracting team and involved the individual jurisdictions.		X
C. Does the plan indicate how the public was involved? (Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval?)	Pg. 24	The Public had an opportunity to be involved in the process through public meetings, announcements and website.		X
D. Was there an opportunity for neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, and other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?	Pg. 24			X

E. Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	Pgs. 24			X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

RISK ASSESSMENT: §201.6(c)(2): *The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.*

Identifying Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include a description of the types of all natural hazards that affect the jurisdiction? If the hazard identification omits (without explanation) any hazards commonly recognized as threats to the jurisdiction, this part of the plan cannot receive a Satisfactory score. Consult with the State Hazard Mitigation Officer to identify applicable hazards that may occur in the planning area.	Pgs. 9-12, 27, 39-130	Natural Hazard identified include: Extreme Temperatures, Thunderstorm Hazards, Tornado, Drought, Severe Winter Weather, Shoreline flooding/erosion, Landslides, Earthquakes, Wildfire, and Flooding. Infrastructure Failure, Public Health Emergency and Human-Induced Event Hazards are also described.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Profiling Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan shall include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?	Pgs. 39-130	Required Revision: Need to provide more information on the location of Riverine Flooding. Grand Rapids is the primary focus in the flooding section. The responses from the individual jurisdictions in Appendix B indicate that other areas are vulnerable to flooding. Should provide a floodmap for Ottawa, and Kent (including Grand Rapids) to depict which areas are vulnerable to floods. Flood Map is Provided for both Kent and Ottawa Counties following Page 95.	X	

B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pgs. 39-130			X
C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pgs. 39-130	Recommended Revision: The description of the previous occurrences should primarily discuss Ottawa, Kent, Grand Rapids and the participating jurisdictions. A large portion of some hazards descriptions included information on MI as a whole and events in surrounding states.		X
D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	Pgs. 39-130	Probability identified under Risk Likelihood heading.		X
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction’s vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction’s vulnerability to each hazard?	Pgs. 39-130	Required Revision: Need to include more information about flooding vulnerability. Grand Rapids is the primary focus in the flooding section. The responses from the individual jurisdictions in Appendix B indicate that other areas are vulnerable to flooding. Should provide a floodmap for Ottawa, and Kent (including Grand Rapids) to depict which areas are vulnerable to floods. Flood Map is Provided for both Kent and Ottawa Counties. Description on Page 94 has been modified to include description of recurring flood prone areas in Robinson Twp and Plainfield Twp.	X	
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Pg 23-24, Appendix D			X
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area

Location in the

SCORE

Element	Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Pg. 166	Recommended Revision: Describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas. Numbers of structures for flooding are provided, but the type is not included. The types of structures (residential and wood frame) has been included.	X	
B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	Not included in Plan	Recommended Revisions: For hazards, identify the type and number of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities within each hazard area. The number of properties has been identified on Page 95 of the Plan.	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): *[The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?	Pg 166-167	Recommended Revision: Provide an estimate of potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures. The Dollar Value of Losses to flood prone structures is included on Page 95.	X	
B. Does the plan describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?	Pg 166-167	Recommended Revision: Describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate of potential dollar losses. Loss Estimates Based on Average SEV for the vulnerable properties.	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe land uses and development trends?	Pgs. 33-37	Recommended Revision Please include a discussion of current land uses and development trends. If available, could provide a land use map. Land Use Maps for Both Kent and Ottawa Counties is Included beyond Page 36. A General Description of Land Use trends is included on Page 34.	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment **must** assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?	Pgs. 39-130, Appendix B			X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

MITIGATION STRATEGY: §201.6(c)(3): The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy **shall** include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the plan include a description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (GOALS are long-term; represent what the community wants to achieve,	Pg. 163			X

such as “eliminate flood damage”; and are based on the risk assessment findings.)				
			SUMMARY SCORE	X

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): *[The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?	Pgs. 164, 166-167	Required Revision Need to provide mitigation actions and projects for each hazard. The Plan covers 2 Counties and 61 local jurisdictions and only 8 actions are listed. Severe winter weather is identified as the top hazard, but there aren't any corresponding action items. Appendix B contains a list of mitigation actions identified from each jurisdiction by hazard. A matrix could be developed that compiles the information from Appendix B and lists by hazard, the action, jurisdiction, responsible party to implement, timeframe (is it an ongoing project, something that needs to be completed within 2 yrs, 5 yrs, 10 yrs?), and if possible estimated cost. This should be The requested Matrix is included on Pages 166-197.	X	
B. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on new buildings and infrastructure?	Pg 164	Building code enforcement for new construction		X
C. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on existing buildings and infrastructure?	Pg 164	Purchase property vulnerable to flooding as funds become available.		X
			SUMMARY SCORE	X

Implementation of Mitigation Actions

Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(iii): *[The mitigation strategy section shall include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S

A. Does the mitigation strategy include how the actions are prioritized ? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)	Pg. 163-167	Action Plan priorities were set by grouping common hazard scores. Recommended Revision: Include a description of the prioritization process when mitigation projects are identified for the other hazards that were not covered.		X
B. Does the mitigation strategy address how the actions will be implemented and administered ? (For example, does it identify the responsible department, existing and potential resources, and timeframe?)	Pg 163-167	Recommended Revision: Need to include information for each new mitigation action item (for the hazards not covered in initial draft, such as severe winter weather) as to who/whom will be responsible for the implementation, and a general timeframe for their process.		X
C. Does the prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a cost-benefit review (see page 3-36 of <i>Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance</i>) to maximize benefits?	pg 163	Projects were identified that would address more than one hazard to maximize mitigation funding. Formal cost-benefit analysis will be conducted upon funding.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): For multi-jurisdictional plans, there **must** be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the plan include at least one identifiable action item for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?	Pg 165			X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): [The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for	Pg 168	Emergency Management Directors for Ottawa, Kent and the		X

monitoring the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for monitoring and include a schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and meetings?)		City of Grand Rapids will monitor the Plan.		
B. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for evaluating the plan and include the criteria used to evaluate the plan?)	Pg 168	Review annually, list of questions to ask if effective.		X
C. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan within the five-year cycle?	Pg 168	Formal revision every five years		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan identify other local planning mechanisms available for incorporating the requirements of the mitigation plan?	Pg 168			X
B. Does the plan include a process by which the local government will incorporate the requirements in other plans, when appropriate?	Pg. 10, 26-27, 33			X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Continued Public Involvement

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): [The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan explain how continued public participation will be obtained? (For example, will there be public notices, an on-going mitigation plan committee, or annual review meetings with stakeholders?)	Pg. 168			X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Additional State Requirement

Requirement Does the plan include descriptions and/or maps of the jurisdiction’s public warning system coverage, and any known gaps in that coverage?

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer’s Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include descriptions and/or maps of the jurisdiction’s public warning system coverage, and any known gaps in that coverage?	Pg 18	Projects include the number of sirens that are needed, but the Plan doesn’t discuss the current warning system coverage. Siren Maps Are Now Included following Page 104.	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	