

SUPPLEMENTAL CROSSWALK - FOR CA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PARTICIPATING IN MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL PLANS

The following Supplemental Plan Review Crosswalk should be completed by each jurisdiction participating in a Multi-Jurisdictional, LHMP, including the Lead Jurisdiction of the Multi-Jurisdictional Plan (MJP). This information **will most likely be found in each jurisdiction's annex or supplement** to the MJP, and not in the main body of the MJP. This supplement is designed to locate information, needed by the multi-jurisdictional planning effort, but specific to each participating jurisdiction. Each requirement and element of this supplemental crosswalk should be **completed from the perspective** of the MJP participating jurisdiction.

Participating Jurisdiction:	Title/Lead Jurisdiction of Multi-Jurisdictional Plan:	Date of Completion:
Local Point of Contact:		Address:
Title:		
Agency:		
Phone Number:		
		E-Mail:

State Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
------------------------	---------------	--------------

FEMA Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
-----------------------	---------------	--------------

Jurisdiction's NFIP Status*			
Y	N	N/A	CRS Class

* Notes: [Y] – Participating [N] - Not Participating [N/A] - Not Mapped

COLOR CODE: Submitting Jurisdiction input in Green. State requested information & OES comments in Blue. FEMA requirements in Black:

SCORING SYSTEM: All Requirements & Elements of the requirements must be rated “Satisfactory,” unless otherwise indicated, in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive an overall score of “Satisfactory.” All requirements must be satisfactory in order for the plan to receive final approval.

Elements displayed in shaded boxes, must be completed in order to meet FEMA's requirements or to [support the State's Hazard Mitigation Plan](#), however, a “Needs Improvement” score on these requirements or elements will not preclude the plan from being [recommended by OES](#) or approved by FEMA.

N – Needs Improvement: The jurisdiction's portion of the multi-jurisdiction's plan does not meet the minimum for a plan requirement. Reviewer’s comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The jurisdiction's portion of the multi-jurisdiction's plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer’s comments are encouraged, but not required.

SUPPLEMENTAL CROSSWALK - FOR CA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PARTICIPATING IN MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL PLANS

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY

A jurisdiction participating in a MJP must adopt the MJP and their own Supplement or Annex to the MJP, in order receive final approval from FEMA for their own LHMP.

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
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5) AND		
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation: §201.6(a)(3)		

Planning Process	N *	S
Local Capabilities Assessment §201.4(c)(ii) and §201.6(c)(1)**		

Risk Assessment: Jurisdictional Hazards	N *	S
Hazard Identification & Profiling:		

Risk Assessment: Jurisdictional Vulnerability	N *	S
Vulnerability: Overview & Impact:		
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)		
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)		
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)		
§201.6(c)(2)(i) & Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment: §201.6(c)(2)(iii) Unique Hazards		

Mitigation Strategy	N *	S
UNIQUE Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)		
Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(ii) (At least 1 Action per jurisdiction)		

Additional State Requirements**	N *	S
See Planning Process , Local Capabilities Assessment	—	—

STATE OES REVIEW STATUS OF THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE MJP:

STATE OES REVIEW COMPLETED on DATE: _____	
FORWARDED TO FEMA FOR REVIEW / APPROVAL DATE: _____	

*** See Reviewer's Comments**

** States that have additional requirements may 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.

SUPPLEMENTAL CROSSWALK - FOR CA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PARTICIPATING IN MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL PLANS

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE (MJP) MULTI JURISDICTIONAL PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> [M] MET [NM] NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) [N]--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT OR [S]--SATISFACTORY	
PREREQUISITE (S) - NOTE: The prerequisite, or prerequisites in the case of multi-jurisdictional plans, may be reviewed before, but must be met before the plan can receive final FEMA approved.		LOCATION	SCORE	COMMENTS
<p>Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption</p> <p>Requirement §201.6(c)(5):</p> <p>For multi-jurisdictional plans, each participating jurisdiction must provide supporting documentation, such as a letter of adoption, that the MJP, and the jurisdiction's "annex" has been formally adopted as their own LHMP.</p>			[M] [NM]	
		SUMMARY SCORE:	[M] [NM]	
<p>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.</p> <p>The MJP must document EACH jurisdiction's participation OR the participating jurisdiction must include this information in EACH jurisdiction's annex to the MJP.</p>			[M] [NM]	
		SUMMARY SCORE:	[N] [S]	

SUPPLEMENTAL CROSSWALK - FOR CA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PARTICIPATING IN MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL PLANS

PLANNING PROCESS: Local Capabilities Assessment <i>Requirement</i> – Section §201.4(c)(3) (ii) of the Federal Register Interim Final Rule 44 CFR Parts 201 and 206 states, “[The State mitigation strategy shall include] a general description and analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities.	LOCATION	SCORE	COMMENTS
Local Capabilities Assessment <i>Element A:</i> Does the plan provide a description of the human, technical and financial resources available within this jurisdiction to engage in a mitigation planning process and to develop a local hazard mitigation plan? (These resources are described in Section 2.2 of the OES LHMP Development Guide).		[N] [S]	<i>Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being recommended by OES or approved by FEMA.</i>
<i>Element B:</i> Does the plan list local mitigation funding sources (taxes, fees, assessments or fines) which affect or promote mitigation within the reporting jurisdiction?		[N] [S]	<i>Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being recommended by OES or approved by FEMA.</i>
<i>Element C:</i> Does the plan list local ordinances which promote disaster mitigation or emergency management within the reporting jurisdiction?		[N] [S]	<i>Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being recommended by OES or approved by FEMA.</i>
<i>Element D:</i> Does the plan describe the details of ongoing and completed mitigation projects and programs within the reporting jurisdiction? For completed actions, measures and projects, have the post disaster results been tabulated or documented?		[N] [S]	<i>Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being recommended by OES or approved by FEMA.</i>
	SUMMARY SCORE:	[N] [S]	

SUPPLEMENTAL CROSSWALK - FOR CA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PARTICIPATING IN MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL PLANS

RISK ASSESSMENT: HAZARDS: §201.6(c)(2)(i) & (ii): 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 - §201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction	LOCATION	SCORE	COMMENTS
For EACH Hazard identified by THIS Jurisdiction a <u>Narrative Summary</u> of the Overview of the Hazard (from the jurisdiction's perspective) and the Impact (to people, buildings, the environment etc.) if the Hazard occurred, shall be part of each jurisdiction's annex or supplement to the MJP.		[N] [S]	
SUMMARY SCORE:		[N] [S]	

RISK ASSESSMENT: Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)	LOCATION	SCORE	COMMENTS
Does the annex or supplement describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?		[N] [S]	<i>Note: This information must be included, however a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being recommended by OES or approved by FEMA.</i>
Does the annex or supplement describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?		[N] [S]	<i>Note: This information must be included, however a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being recommended by OES or approved by FEMA.</i>
SUMMARY SCORE:		[N] [S]	

RISK ASSESSMENT: Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)	LOCATION	SCORE	COMMENTS
Does the annex or supplement estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?		[N] [S]	<i>Note: This information must be included, however a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being recommended by OES or approved by FEMA.</i>
Does the annex or supplement describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?		[N] [S]	<i>Note: This information must be included, however a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being recommended by OES or approved by FEMA.</i>
SUMMARY SCORE:		[N] [S]	

SUPPLEMENTAL CROSSWALK - FOR CA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PARTICIPATING IN MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL PLANS

RISK ASSESSMENT: Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)	LOCATION	SCORE	COMMENTS
For EACH Hazard identified by THIS Jurisdiction, does the annex or supplement describe the impact of land use and development trends within the participating jurisdiction? <i>(With particular emphasis on future buildings and infrastructure). EXAMPLE: The annex or supplement should describe how a jurisdiction's land use and development trends would affect the flood hazard areas, the fire hazard areas, etc.</i>		[N] [S]	<i>Note: This information must be included, however a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from being recommended by OES or approved by FEMA.</i>
	SUMMARY SCORE:	[N] [S]	

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.	LOCATION	SCORE	COMMENTS
Identifying Unique Jurisdictional Hazards & Risks: Was a risk assessment (all sections) completed, by this participating jurisdiction, for each unique hazard or risk that was not covered in the main section of the MJP? [Only unique or additional hazards and risks, within a participating jurisdiction, should be included. These would be hazards and risks that are not already included as part of the MJP. For each unique hazard, a profile of the hazard along with vulnerabilities should be included in the jurisdiction's annex or supplement to the MJP. Example: A jurisdiction with a volcano, not covered in the MJP, would complete all Risk Assessment section for their volcano.]	[N/A] / [Yes]	[N] [S] [N/A]	
	SUMMARY SCORE:	[N] [S]	

SUPPLEMENTAL CROSSWALK - FOR CA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PARTICIPATING IN MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL PLANS

MITIGATION STRATEGY: §201.6(c)(3): The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction’s blueprint for reducing the potential losses <i>identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.</i>	LOCATION	SCORE	COMMENTS
Does the Annex or Supplement include a description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to each of this jurisdiction's identified hazards?		[N] [S]	NOTE: Do not repeat goals listed for the overall planning area in the MJP. List only goals that are different or unique , or have a different priority, for your participating jurisdiction.
	SUMMARY SCORE:	[N] [S]	

MITIGATION STRATEGY: 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.	LOCATION	SCORE	COMMENTS
<p>Does the plan include at least one identifiable action item for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?</p> <p>AND Does the Annex or Supplement for this jurisdiction identify and analyze, for at least one action item;</p> <p>1. How this action is prioritized in comparison to other proposed actions. (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used to determine its priority). 2. How was (or will) cost-benefit criteria be considered for this action, and will cost-benefit be used in the prioritization of this action (as compared to other proposed jurisdiction actions). 3. How will this mitigation strategy / action be implemented and administered? (For example, does it identify the responsible department, existing and potential resources, and timeframe?)</p>		[N] [S]	
	SUMMARY SCORE:	[N] [S]	

ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS	FEMA has included a provision for States that have additional requirements to add them in the appropriate sections of the <i>Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance</i> or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements. See <i>Local Capabilities Assessment</i> under the Documentation of the Planning Process Section.
--------------------------------------	--