

## LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

The *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool* demonstrates how the Local Mitigation Plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR §201.6 and offers States and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the community.

- The [Regulation Checklist](#) provides a summary of FEMA’s evaluation of whether the Plan has addressed all requirements.
- The [Plan Assessment](#) identifies the plan’s strengths as well as documents areas for future improvement.
- The [Multi-jurisdiction Summary Sheet](#) is an optional worksheet that can be used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of the each Element of the Plan (Planning Process; Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation; and Plan Adoption).

The FEMA Mitigation Planner must reference this *Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide* when completing the *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool*.

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Jurisdiction:</b><br>Ward County                | <b>Title of Plan:</b><br>Ward County, North Dakota Hazard Mitigation Plan       | <b>Date of Plan:</b>                          |
| <b>Local Point of Contact:</b><br>Amanda Schooling | <b>Address:</b><br>315 3 <sup>rd</sup> St. SE<br>PO Box 5055<br>Minot, ND 58701 | <b>E-Mail:</b><br>Amanda.Schooling@wardnd.com |
| <b>Title:</b><br>Emergency Management Director     |   |   |
| <b>Agency:</b><br>Ward County                      |   |   |
| <b>Phone Number:</b><br>701-857-6534               |   |   |

|   |                                  |   |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>State Reviewer:</b><br>Hilary Kendro<br>Kathleen Donahue | <b>Title:</b><br><b>Reviewer</b> | <b>Date Completed:</b><br>November 22, 2017<br>November 30, 2017<br>December 14, 2017 REVISED<br>January 19, 2018 REVISED |
|---|----------------------------------|---|

|  |               |              |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| <b>FEMA Reviewer:</b>                    | <b>Title:</b> | <b>Date:</b> |
| <b>Date Received in FEMA Region VIII</b> |               |              |
| <b>Plan Not Approved</b>                 |               |              |
| <b>Plan Approvable Pending Adoption</b>  |               |              |
| <b>Plan Approved</b>                     |               |              |

**SECTION 1:  
MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET**

| MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET |                   |                   |                      |                                 |                        |         |                        |                  |                        |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| #                                | Jurisdiction Name | Jurisdiction Type | Jurisdiction Contact | Email                           | Requirements Met (Y/N) |         |                        |                  |                        |
|                                  |                   |                   |                      |                                 | A. Planning Process    | B. HIRA | C. Mitigation Strategy | D. Update Rqmts. | E. Adoption Resolution |
| 1                                | Ward County       | County            | Amanda Schooling     | Amanda.Schooling@wardnd.com     | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 2                                | Berthold          | City              | Chris Burnside       | mcburnside@berthold-nd.gov      | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 3                                | Burlington        | City              | Jeanine Kabanuk      | kabanuk@min.midco.net           | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 4                                | Carpio            | City              | Chris Helseth        | Christopher.helseth@hotmail.com | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 5                                | Des Lacs          | City              | Darrell Francis      | jfrancis@minot.com              | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 6                                | Donnybrook        | City              | Nicole Michalenko    | Nicole58734@yahoo.com           | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 7                                | Douglas           | City              | Bill Gagnon          | 701.720.5348                    | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 8                                | Kenmare           | City              | Jamie Livingston     | jlivingston@sbt.com             | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 9                                | Makoti            | City              | Tyler Staflien       | 701.726.5000                    | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 10                               | Minot             | City              | Jason Olson          | Jason.olson@minotnd.org         | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 11                               | Ryder             | City              | Jody Reinisch        | reinisch@rtc.coop               | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 12                               | Sawyer            | City              | Susan Schmidt        | Sawyer81@srt.com                | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
| 13                               | Surrey            | City              | Jason Vaagen         | surreycityauditor@srt.com       | Y                      | Y       | Y                      | Y                |                        |
|                                  |                   |                   |                      |                                 |                        |         |                        |                  |                        |

**SECTION 2:  
REGULATION CHECKLIST**

| <b>1. REGULATION CHECKLIST</b>  |   | <b>Location in Plan</b> | <b>Met</b> | <b>Not Met</b> |
|---|---|-------------------------|------------|----------------|
| <b>Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)</b>   |   | <b>(section and/or</b>  |            |                |
| <b>ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS</b>  |   |                         |            |                |
| A1. Does the Plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(1))  | Sect. 3.2 pp. 3-1 to 3-8; Sect. 18.8 pp. 18-6 to 18-7; App. C   | X                       |            |                |
| A2. Does the Plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as other interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement §201.6(b)(2)) | Sect. 3.2 pp. 3-1 to 3-8; Sect. 3.3 pp. 3-8 to 3-9; App. C; App. D  | X                       |            |                |
| A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1))  | Sect. 3.3 pp. 3-8 to 3-9; App. D  | X                       |            |                |
| A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))  | Sect. 3.4 pp. 3-9 to 3-14; Sect. 18.9 pp. 18-7 to 18-8  | X                       |            |                |
| A5. Is there discussion of how the community(ies) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii))   | Sect. 18.7 p. 18-6  | X                       |            |                |
| A6. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a 5-year cycle)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i))   | Sect. 18.2 pp. 18-2 to 18-3; Sect. 18.3 p. 18-3; Sect. 18.4 pp. 18-3 to 18-4; Sect. 18.6 pp. 18-5 to 18-6   | X                       |            |                |
| <b>ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS</b>  |   |                         |            |                |
| <b>ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT</b>   |   |                         |            |                |
| B1. Does the Plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction(s)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))  | Sect. 4.3 pp. 4-5 to 4-49; Sect. 5.3 pp. 5-3 to 5-50; Sect. 6.3 pp. 6-3 to 6-49; Sect. 7.3 pp. 7-3 to 7-49; Sect. 8.3 pp. 8-3 to 8-49; Sect. 9.3 pp. 9-3 to 9-48; Sect. 10.3 pp. 10-3 to 10-49; Sect. 11.3 pp. 11-3 | X                       |            |                |

| 1. REGULATION CHECKLIST   |  | Location in Plan | Met | Not Met |
|---|--|------------------|-----|---------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)  | (section and/or  |                  |     |         |
|   | to 11-48; Sect. 12.3 pp. 12-3 to 12-51; Sect. 13.3 pp. 13-3 to 13-48; Sect. 14.3 pp. 14-3 to 14-50; Sect. 15.3 pp. 15-3 to 15-49; Sect. 16.3 pp. 16-5 to 16-54   |                  |     |         |
| B2. Does the Plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))                  | Sect. 4.3 pp. 4-3 to 4-49; Sect. 5.3 pp. 5-3 to 5-50; Sect. 6.3 pp. 6-3 to 6-49; Sect. 7.3 pp. 7-3 to 7-49; Sect. 8.3 pp. 8-3 to 8-49; Sect. 9.3 pp. 9-3 to 9-48; Sect. 10.3 pp. 10-3 to 10-49; Sect. 11.3 pp. 11-3 to 11-48; Sect. 12.3 pp. 12-3 to 12-51; Sect. 13.3 pp. 13-3 to 13-48; Sect. 14.3 pp. 14-3 to 14-50; Sect. 15.3 pp. 15-3 to 15-49; Sect. 16.3 pp. 16-5 to 16-54 | X                |     |         |
| B3. Is there a description of each identified hazard's impact on the community as well as an overall summary of the community's vulnerability for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)) | Sect. 4.3 pp. 4-3 to 4-49; Sect. 4.4 pp. 4-49 to 4-65; Sect. 5.3 pp. 5-3 to 5-50; Sect. 5.4 pp. 5-50 to 5-67; Sect. 6.3 pp. 6-3 to 6-49; Sect. 6.4 pp. 6-49 to 6-65; Sect. 7.3 pp. 7-3 to 7-49; Sect. 7.4 pp. 7-49 to 7-65; Sect. 8.3 pp. 8-3 to 8-49; Sect. 8.4 pp. 8-49 to 8-65; Sect. 9.3 pp. 9-3 to 9-48; Sect. 9.4 pp. 9-48 to 9-63; Sect. 10.3 pp. 10-3 to 10-49; Sect. 10.4 | X                |     |         |

| 1. REGULATION CHECKLIST   |   | Location in Plan | Met | Not Met |
|---|---|------------------|-----|---------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)  | (section and/or   |                  |     |         |
|   | pp. 10-49 to 10-66; Sect. 11.3 pp. 11-3 to 11-48; Sect. 11.4 pp. 11-48 to 11-63; Sect. 12.3 pp. 12-3 to 12-51; Sect. 12.4 pp. 12-51 to 12-71; Sect. 13.3 pp. 13-3 to 13-48; Sect. 13.4 pp. 13-48 to 13-63; Sect. 14.3 pp. 14-3 to 14-50; Sect. 14.4 pp. 14-50 to 14-67; Sect. 15.3 pp. 15-3 to 15-49; Sect. 15.4 pp. 15-49 to 15-64; Sect. 16.3 pp. 16-5 to 16-54; Sect. 16.4 pp. 16-54 to 16-69; Sect. 17.1 pp. 17-1 to 17-2 |                  |     |         |
| B4. Does the Plan address NFIP insured structures within the jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)) | Sect. 4.3.2.4 p. 4-29; Sect. 5.3.2.4 p. 5-29; Sect. 6.3.2.4 p. 6-29; Sect. 7.3.2.4 p. 7-29; Sect. 8.3.2.4 p. 8-29; Sect. 9.3.2.4 p. 9-29; Sect. 10.3.2.4 p. 10-29; Sect. 11.3.2.4 p. 11-29; Sect. 12.3.2.4 p. 12-30; Sect. 13.3.2.4 p. 13-29; Sect. 14.3.2.4 p. 14-29; Sect. 15.3.2.4 p. 15-29; Sect. 16.3.2.4 p. 16-31   | X                |     |         |
| <b>ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY</b>   |   |                  |     |         |

| 1. REGULATION CHECKLIST  |   | Location in Plan | Met | Not Met |
|--|---|------------------|-----|---------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)   |   | (section and/or  |     |         |
| <p>C1. Does the plan document each jurisdiction's existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3))</p> | <p>Sect. 4.5 pp. 4-65 to 4-66; Sect. 5.5 pp. 5-67 to 5-68; Sect. 6.5 pp. 6-65 to 6-66; Sect. 7.5 pp. 7-65 to 7-66; Sect. 8.5 pp. 8-65 to 8-66; Sect. 9.5 pp. 9-63 to 9-64; Sect. 10.5 pp. 10-66 to 10-67; Sect. 11.5 pp. 11-63 to 11-64; Sect. 12.5 pp. 12-71 to 12-72; Sect. 13.5 pp. 13-63 to 13-64; Sect. 14.5 pp. 14-67 to 14-68; Sect. 15.5 pp. 15-64 to 15-65; Sect. 16.5 pp. 16-70 to 16-73</p>  | <p>X</p>         |     |         |
| <p>C2. Does the Plan address each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))</p>   | <p>Sect. 4.3.2.4 p. 4-29; Sect. 5.3.2.4 p. 5-29; Sect. 5.6.2 p. 5-73; Sect. 6.3.2.4 p. 6-29; Sect. 6.6.2 p. 6-71; Sect. 7.3.2.4 pp. 7-29; Sect. 7.6 p. 7-71; Sect. 8.3.2.4 pp. 8-29; Sect. 8.6.2 p. 8-71; Sect. 9.3.2.4 p. 9-29; Sect. 9.6.2 p. 9-69; Sect. 10.3.2.4 p. 10-29; Sect. 10.6.2 p. 10-72; Sect. 11.3.2.4 p. 11-29; Sect. 11.6.2 p. 11-69; Sect. 12.3.2.4 p. 12-30; Sect. 12.6.2 p. 12-77; Sect. 13.3.2.4 p. 13-29; Sect. 13.6.2 p. 13-69; Sect. 14.3.2.4 p. 14-29; Sect. 14.6.2 p. 14-73; Sect. 15.3.2.4 p. 15-29; Sect. 15.6.2</p> | <p>X</p>         |     |         |

| 1. REGULATION CHECKLIST  |   | Location in Plan | Met | Not Met |
|--|---|------------------|-----|---------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)   | (section and/or   |                  |     |         |
|  | p. 15-70; Sect. 16.3.2.4 p. 16-31; Sect. 16.6.2 p. 16-78  |                  |     |         |
| C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))   | Sect. 4.6.1 pp. 4-66 to 4-67; Sect. 5.6.1 pp. 5-68 to 5-67; Sect. 6.6.1 pp. 6-66 to 6-67; Sect. 7.6.1 pp. 7-66 to 7-67; Sect. 8.6.1 pp. 8-66 to 8-67; Sect. 9.6.1 pp. 9-64 to 9-65; Sect. 10.6.1 pp. 10-67 to 10-68; Sect. 11.6.1 pp. 11-64 to 11-65; Sect. 12.6.1 p. 12-73; Sect. 13.6.1 pp. 13-64 to 13-65; Sect. 14.6.1 pp. 14-68 to 14-69; Sect. 15.6.1 pp. 15-65 to 15-66; Sect. 16.6.1 p. 16-74 | X                |     |         |
| C4. Does the Plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii)) | Sect. 4.6.2 pp. 4-67 to 4-74; Sect. 5.6.2 pp. 5-69 to 5-76; Sect. 6.6.2 pp. 6-67 to 6-74; Sect. 7.6.2 pp. 7-67 to 7-74; Sect. 8.6.2 pp. 8-67 to 8-73; Sect. 9.6.2 pp. 9-65 to 9-72; Sect. 10.6.2 pp. 10-68 to 10-75; Sect. 11.6.2 pp. 11-65 to 11-71; Sect. 12.6.2 pp. 12-73 to 12-80; Sect. 13.6.2 pp. 13-65 to 13-71; Sect. 14.6.2 pp. 14-69 to 14-76; Sect. 15.6.2 pp. 15-66 to 15-72;             | X                |     |         |

| 1. REGULATION CHECKLIST   |   | Location in Plan | Met | Not Met |
|---|---|------------------|-----|---------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)  | (section and/or   |                  |     |         |
|   | Sect. 16.6.2 pp. 16-74 to 16-87   |                  |     |         |
| C5. Does the Plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including cost benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii)) | Sect. 4.6.2 pp. 4-67 to 4-74; Sect. 5.6.2 pp. 5-69 to 5-76; Sect. 6.6.2 pp. 6-67 to 6-74; Sect. 7.6.2 pp. 7-67 to 7-74; Sect. 8.6.2 pp. 8-67 to 8-73; Sect. 9.6.2 pp. 9-65 to 9-72; Sect. 10.6.2 pp. 10-68 to 10-75; Sect. 11.6.2 pp. 11-65 to 11-71; Sect. 12.6.2 pp. 12-73 to 12-80; Sect. 13.6.2 pp. 13-65 to 13-71; Sect. 14.6.2 pp. 14-69 to 14-76; Sect. 15.6.2 pp. 15-66 to 15-72; Sect. 16.6.2 pp. 16-74 to 16-87 | X                |     |         |
| C6. Does the Plan describe a process by which local governments will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii)) | Sect. 18.5 pp. 18-4 to 18-6   | X                |     |         |
| <b>ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION</b> (applicable to plan updates only)   |   |                  |     |         |
| D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))  | Sect. 17.1 pp. 17-1 to 17-2   | X                |     |         |
| D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))  | Sect. 4.6.2 pp. 4-71 to 4-74; Sect. 5.6.2 pp. 5-73 to 5-76; Sect. 6.6.2 pp. 6-71 to 6-74; Sect. 7.6.2 pp. 7-71 to 7-74; Sect. 8.6.2 pp. 8-71 to 8-73; Sect. 9.6.2   | X                |     |         |



| 1. REGULATION CHECKLIST  |  | Location in Plan | Met | Not Met |
|--|--|------------------|-----|---------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)   | (section and/or  |                  |     |         |
|  | pp. 9-69 to 9-72;<br>Sect. 10.6.2 pp.<br>10-72 to 10-75;<br>Sect. 11.6.2 pp.<br>11-69 to 11-71;<br>Sect. 12.6.2 pp.<br>12-77 to 12-80;<br>Sect. 13.6.2 pp.<br>13-69 to 13-71;<br>Sect. 14.6.2 pp.<br>14-73 to 14-76;<br>Sect. 15.6.2 pp.<br>15-70 to 15-72;<br>Sect. 16.6.2 pp.<br>16-78 to 16-87  |                  |     |         |
| D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities?<br>(Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Sect. 4.4 pp. 4-49<br>to 4-65; Sect. 4.6<br>pp. 4-66 to 4-74;<br>Sect. 5.4 pp. 5-50<br>to 5-67; Sect. 5.6<br>pp. 5-68 to 5-76;<br>Sect. 6.4 pp. 6-49<br>to 6-65; Sect. 6.6<br>pp. 6-66 to 6-74;<br>Sect. 7.4 pp. 7-49<br>to 7-65; Sect. 7.6<br>pp. 7-66 to 7-74;<br>Sect. 8.4 pp. 8-49<br>to 8-65; Sect. 8.6<br>pp. 8-66 to 8-73;<br>Sect. 9.4 pp. 9-48<br>to 9-63; Sect. 9.6<br>pp. 9-64 to 9-72;<br>Sect. 10.4 pp. 10-<br>49 to 10-66; Sect.<br>10.6 pp. 10-67 to<br>10-75; Sect. 11.4<br>pp. 11-48 to 11-<br>63; Sect. 11.6 pp.<br>11-64 to 11-71;<br>Sect. 12.4 pp. 12-<br>51 to 12-71; Sect.<br>12.6 pp. 12-72 to<br>12-80; Sect. 13.4<br>pp. 13-48 to 13-<br>63; Sect. 13.6 pp.<br>13-64 to 13-71;<br>Sect. 14.4 pp. 14-<br>50 to 14-67; Sect. | X                |     |         |

| 1. REGULATION CHECKLIST   |  | Location in Plan  | Met | Not Met |
|---|--|---|-----|---------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)  |  | (section and/or   |     |         |
|   |  | 14.6 pp. 14-68 to 14-76; Sect. 15.4 pp. 15-49 to 15-64; Sect. 15.6 pp. 15-65 to 15-72; Sect. 16.4 pp. 16-54 to 16-69; Sect. 16.6 pp. 16-73 to 16-87 |     |         |
| <b><u>ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u></b>   |  |   |     |         |
| <b>ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION</b>   |  |   |     |         |
| E1. Does the Plan include documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5)) |  | Appendix B  |     |         |
| E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))                     |  | Appendix B  |     |         |
| <b><u>ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u></b>   |  |   |     |         |
| <b>ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)</b>  |  |   |     |         |
| F1.   |  |   |     |         |
| F2.   |  |   |     |         |
| <b><u>ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u></b>   |  |   |     |         |

**SECTION 3:**

**PLAN ASSESSMENT**

**A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement**

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas where these could be improved beyond minimum requirements.

**Element A: Planning Process**

Requirement A1 – The plan provides a detailed summary of the planning process as well as meeting documentation including sign in sheets, minutes, presentations, agendas, and notes in Appendix C. In addition to the advisory committee meetings, individual jurisdictional meetings were held for each participating jurisdiction and meeting summaries are included to describe how each jurisdiction participated in the planning process.

Consider providing a list of the participating jurisdictions in the Executive Summary to clearly identify all participating jurisdictions, rather than only referencing the point of contact list available in Section 18 **Completed 2-2**

Requirement A2 – Although diverse agencies and outside organizations were involved in the planning process, for plan updates consider including additional regulatory agencies, specifically the local Water Board and/or USACE, due to flooding concerns. Also, consider listing the neighboring communities that were specifically asked to review and comment on the draft plan and elaborate on the responses received. If no response were received, state that in the plan. As noted in the plan on page 3-4, the floodplain administrator for jurisdictions also serve as the planning directors and permitting officers. The Ward county Emergency Management enforces floodplain management, updating flood ordinances, training and public outreach.

Requirement A3 – Although there was an opportunity for public involvement during the planning process, no comments from the public or other stakeholders were received during the comment and review period. Encourage more public participation and awareness of the plan by holding open meetings, distributing questionnaires or surveys, or setting up booths at community events. Since low public participation occurred, identify/describe how public participation can be encourage as the plan progresses. Include these public outreach actions in the mitigation actions section with specifics as to what will occur, how it will occur, and when it will occur.

The public notices included in Appendix D advertise a public meeting held on September 6, 2017 as an opportunity for the public to comment on the draft plan; however, this meeting is not documented anywhere else in the plan. Include a description of this meeting in the meeting schedule and summary table in Section 3.2 and include any additional documentation such as a sign in sheet and agenda(s) in Appendix D.

Requirement A4 – A list of the federal, state, county, and municipal program, policy, and technical documents and data that were reviewed and incorporated into the plan is provided as well as description of the method of incorporation into the plan for each. Information from those sources was incorporated throughout the plan; however, consider including citations to further identify how the documents and data were incorporated into the plan.

Requirement A5 – Consider using presentations on plan progress and/or annual questionnaires or surveys to gain feedback from the public during the plan maintenance process. Holding public meetings or developing news articles are additional methods for encouraging continued public participation. Include how social media can be used to promote and encourage public participation. How will social media be used to encourage comments – could be a mitigation action item as well.

Requirement A6 – Consider including a sample annual report or template to further explain how the plan will be monitored and evaluated each year. What are the metrics that will be used to evaluate progress towards the goals, objectives, and actions identified in the plan?

### **Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment**

Requirement B1 – The plan includes hazard identification and detailed hazard profiles that are specific to each of the participating jurisdictions. The hazard profiles describe the characteristics, location, extent and severity, potential impact, past occurrences, and probability of a future occurrence for each of the identified hazards. Maps are used to further delineate the areas at risk to those hazards with a geographically-specific location, such as wildfire, flood, and hazardous materials incident.

Consider adjusting the probability of future occurrence for severe summer storms. Currently, the probability is identified as moderate or low (occurring at least once every five years or less than every five years), but this is likely based on an incomplete historical record and summer storms will occur every year. Kenmare, Minot, and the county are the only jurisdictions that have a high probability of future severe summer storms. If adjustment is not-applicable, define the severity of the summer storm, although summer storms occurring annually, it is less likely to have a severe summer storm that would knock out power to the whole community or damage a senior living facility with some special needs for electricity units. Define more as to what constitutes a summer storm and, if not occurring annually which is most common for this hazard, define why.

Although all of the hazards commonly recognized to affect the planning area are included in the plan, consider developing separate profiles for the dam failure and windstorms hazards which are currently included under flood and severe summer storm, respectively.

Requirement B3 – In addition to describing the potential impact of each hazard, the plan also describes the vulnerability of each jurisdiction to the identified hazards and uses an impact/vulnerability scale to summarize the overall vulnerability through a qualitative risk assessment. This scale assigned a low, moderate, or high ranking to the potential vulnerability/impact to people or life safety, to assets or infrastructure, and to service delivery. Define these categories more specific on the STAPLEE or other methodology score, use numbers to quantitatively define the categories (if possible).

A quantitative risk assessment was also conducted for fire, flood, severe summer storm, severe winter storm, and hazardous material incident. This assessment determined the total value of critical assets as well as the number of structures in each jurisdiction and estimated the potential losses to the residential housing stock based on the average listing price of residential structures. Although this is a good starting point, consider using a scenario-based analysis to estimate future potential losses of total exposure during various hazard events/scenarios rather than providing the total loss potential or assuming 1 or 10 percent damage. Hazus and other FEMA based risk software could be used.

The plan identifies the data limitations for assessing the impacts and vulnerabilities related to each hazard. Identify how these data limitations can be corrected. For the next update, also discuss in more detail problems associated with overland flooding.

The plan takes into account how the Mouse River Enhanced Flood Protection Project (MREFPP) is reducing vulnerability to flood in at-risk communities. We hope to see this project realize its full range of initiatives for the safety of Ward County residents.

Kudos to the communities that are beginning to utilize the products developed through the Risk Mapping, Assessment, and Planning (RiskMAP), a FEMA program that provides communities with flood information and tools to enhance mitigation plans and take action to better protect citizens. For the next update, ensure Ward County and all its communities leverage the RiskMAP products.

### **Element C: Mitigation Strategy**

Requirement C1 – A questionnaire was completed by each participating jurisdiction to survey the existing capabilities. The findings of the survey assess the knowledge of mitigation programs and practices; current/ongoing mitigation efforts; intra- and inter-governmental coordination; planning; and staff, personnel, and technical capability. Identify what municipal staff was interviewed for this.

Requirement C4 – The plan identifies the range of mitigation actions that were discussed and considered by the Advisory Committee. A table provides the identified and prioritized mitigation actions for each participating municipality and identifies the goal(s) and hazard(s) addressed, if it is new or previous action, if it addresses new or existing development, the responsible department(s), funding resource(s), estimated cost, and any notes or updates. These tables clearly show each jurisdiction's mitigation actions and the goal(s) and hazard(s) they address, linking the hazard assessment with the mitigation strategy.

The mitigation actions need to be more specific. For example, City of Berthold: establish public information and outreach program... > how? How will a public information program be developed – this is more of a goal rather than a specific action such as: City will set up a booth at Ward County's annual community event to pass out FEMA flyers on hazards (all available online), attend one home owners association meeting per month to talk about how residents can stay safe during a hazard events, or partner with various business throughout the community and have hazard information available at the location or on the website (such as landscape businesses, woodworkers (sheds), roofers, etc). Minot states it will enforce floodplain management ordinances – but how? Check ordinances every 6 months to ensure they are aligned with NFIP goals/regulations, communicate with Ward County every month to give an update on ordinance adjustments or identify issues that need to be amended...that of tangible things that staff can do to make these mitigation actions a reality.

Requirement C5 – STAPLEE was used to prioritize the mitigation actions. The jurisdictions also considered the cost-effectiveness during prioritization by analyzing the costs and benefits of each mitigation action at a general level.

### **Element D: Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation (Plan Updates Only)**

Requirement D1 – Section 17: HIRA Summary contains a good discussion on changes in hazards and potential impacts as well as how increases in populations are elevating vulnerability.

Requirement D3 – Although the plan prioritized all of the new and deferred mitigation actions and ranked the vulnerability/impact for each hazard, consider including a narrative description of if and how any priorities have changed since the plan was previously approved in order to reflect current financial, legal, political, and post-disaster conditions. Also, include the previous prioritization of mitigation actions that were carried over from the previous plan as well as the previous rankings of hazard vulnerability/impact to further demonstrate how priorities have changed.

## **B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan**

The N.D. Department of Emergency Services has a Hazard Mitigation Toolbox on its webpage: <http://www.nd.gov/des/disaster/>. The goal is to provide guidance to emergency managers and their contractors regarding available resources. Additionally, NDDDES hosts biannual G318 Planning Courses. The next course will be scheduled in 2019.

### **FEMA FUNDING SOURCES**

**Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP).** The HMGP is a post-disaster mitigation program. It is made available to states by FEMA after each Federal disaster declaration. The HMGP can provide up to 75 percent funding for hazard mitigation measures. The HMGP can be used to fund cost-effective projects that will protect public or private property in an area covered by a federal disaster declaration or that will reduce the likely damage from future disasters. Examples of projects include acquisition and demolition of structures in hazard prone areas, flood-proofing or elevation to reduce future damage, minor structural improvements and development of state or local standards. Projects must fit into an overall mitigation strategy for the area identified as part of a local planning effort. All applicants must have a FEMA-approved Hazard Mitigation Plan (this plan).

Applicants who are eligible for the HMGP are state and local governments, certain nonprofit organizations or institutions that perform essential government services, and Indian tribes and authorized tribal organizations. Individuals or homeowners cannot apply directly for the HMGP; a local government must apply on their behalf.

**Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) Program.** The FMA combines the previous Repetitive Flood Claims and Severe Repetitive Loss Grants into one grant program. FMA provides funding to assist states and communities in implementing measures to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk of flood damage to buildings, manufactured homes, and other structures insurable under the NFIP. The FMA is funded annually; no federal disaster declaration is required. Only NFIP insured homes and businesses are eligible for mitigation in this program. Funding for FMA is very limited and, as with the HMGP, individuals cannot apply directly for the program. Applications must come from local governments or other eligible organizations. The federal cost share for an FMA project is 75 percent. At least 25 percent of the total eligible costs must be provided by a non-federal source. Of this 25 percent, no more than half can be provided as in-kind contributions from third parties. At minimum, a FEMA-approved local flood mitigation plan is required before a project can be approved. FMA funds are distributed from FEMA to the state.

**FEMA, Pre-Disaster Mitigation Competitive (PDMC) Grant Program.** The PDM program is an annually funded, nationwide, competitive grant program. No disaster declaration is required. Federal funds will cover 75 percent of a project's cost up to \$3 million. As with the HMGP and FMA, a FEMA-approved local Hazard Mitigation Plan is required to be approved for funding under the PDM program.

**FEMA, Readiness, Response and Recovery Directorate, Fire Management Assistance Grant Program.** This program provides grants to states, tribal governments and local governments for the mitigation, management and control of any fire burning on publicly (non-federal) or privately owned forest or grassland that threatens such destruction as would constitute a major disaster. The grants are made in the form of cost sharing with the federal share being 75 percent of total eligible costs. Grant approvals are made within 1 to 72 hours from time of request.

**Fire Prevention and Safety Grants.** The Fire Prevention and Safety Grants (FP&S) are part of the Assistance to Firefighters Grants, and are administered by the FEMA. FP&S Grants support projects that enhance the safety of the public and firefighters from fire and related hazards. The primary goal is to target high-risk populations and reduce injury and prevent death. Eligibility includes fire departments, national, regional, state, and local organizations, Native American tribal organizations, and/or community organizations recognized for their experience and expertise in fire prevention and safety programs and activities. Private non-profit and public organizations are also eligible. Interested applicants are advised to check the website periodically for announcements of grant availability. More information: <https://www.fema.gov/welcome-assistance-firefighters-grant-program>

#### **OTHER MITIGATION FUNDING SOURCES**

Grant funding is available from a variety of federal and state agencies for training, equipment, and hazard mitigation activities. Several of these programs are described below.

**Program 15.228: Wildland Urban Interface Community and Rural Fire Assistance.** [This program](#) is designed to implement the National Fire Plan and assist communities at risk from catastrophic wildland fires. The program provides grants, technical assistance, and training for community programs that develop local capability, including: Assessment and planning, mitigation activities, and community and homeowner education and action; hazardous fuels reduction activities, including the training, monitoring or maintenance associated with such hazardous fuels reduction activities, on federal land, or on adjacent nonfederal land for activities that mitigate the threat of catastrophic fire to communities and natural resources in high risk areas; and, enhancement of knowledge and fire protection capability of rural fire districts through assistance in education and training, protective clothing and equipment purchase, and mitigation methods on a cost share basis.

**Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act - Title III- County Funds.** The Self-Determination Act has recently been reauthorized and now includes specific language regarding the Firewise Communities program. Counties seeking funding under Title III must use the funds to perform work under the Firewise Communities program. Counties applying for Title III funds to implement Firewise activities can assist in all aspects of a community's recognition process, including conducting or assisting with community assessments, helping the community create an



action plan, assisting with an annual Firewise Day, assisting with local wildfire mitigation projects, and communicating with the state liaison and the national program to ensure a smooth application process. Counties that previously used Title III funds for other wildfire preparation activities such as the Fire Safe Councils or similar would be able to carry out many of the same activities as they had before. However, with the new language, counties would be required to show that funds used for these activities were carried out under the Firewise Communities program. More information: [http://www.fs.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsinternet!/ut/p/c4/04\\_SB8K8xLLM9MSSzPy8xBz9CP0os3gjAwhwtDDw9\\_AI8zPwhQoY6BdkOyoCAPkATIA!/?ss=119985&navtype=BROWSEBYSUBJECT&cid=FSE\\_003853&navid=091000000000000&pnavid=null&position=BROWSEBYSUBJECT&ttype=main&pname=Secure%20Rural%20Schools-%20Home](http://www.fs.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsinternet!/ut/p/c4/04_SB8K8xLLM9MSSzPy8xBz9CP0os3gjAwhwtDDw9_AI8zPwhQoY6BdkOyoCAPkATIA!/?ss=119985&navtype=BROWSEBYSUBJECT&cid=FSE_003853&navid=091000000000000&pnavid=null&position=BROWSEBYSUBJECT&ttype=main&pname=Secure%20Rural%20Schools-%20Home)

**Community Planning Assistance for Wildfire.** Established in 2015 by Headwaters Economics and Wildfire Planning International, Community Planning Assistance for Wildfire (CPAW) works with communities to reduce wildfire risks through improved land use planning. CPAW is a grant-funded program providing communities with professional assistance from foresters, planners, economists and wildfire risk modelers to integrate wildfire mitigation into the development planning process. All services and recommendations are site-specific and come at no cost to the community. More information: <http://planningforwildfire.org/what-we-do/>

**Urban and Community Forestry (UCF) Program.** A cooperative program of the U.S. Forest Service that focuses on the stewardship of urban natural resources. With 80 percent of the nation's population in urban areas, there are strong environmental, social, and economic cases to be made for the conservation of green spaces to guide growth and revitalize city centers and older suburbs. UCF responds to the needs of urban areas by maintaining, restoring, and improving urban forest ecosystems on more than 70 million acres. Through these efforts the program encourages and promotes the creation of healthier, more livable urban environments across the nation. These grant programs are focused on issues and landscapes of national importance and prioritized through state and regional assessments. Information: <http://www.fs.fed.us/managing-land/urban-forests/ucf>

**Western Wildland Urban Interface Grants.** The National Fire Plan (NFP) is a long-term strategy for reducing the effects of catastrophic wildfires throughout the nation. The Division of Forestry's NFP Program is implemented within the Division's Fire and Aviation Program through the existing USDA Forest Service, State & Private Forestry, State Fire Assistance Program.

Congress has provided increased funding assistance to states through the U.S. Forest Service State and Private Forestry programs since 2001. The focus of much of this additional funding was mitigating risk in WUI areas. In the West, the State Fire Assistance funding is available and awarded through a competitive process with emphasis on hazard fuel reduction, information and education, and community and homeowner action. This portion of the National Fire Plan was developed to assist interface communities manage the unique hazards they find around them. Long-term solutions to interface challenges require informing and educating people who live in these areas about what they and their local organizations can do to mitigate these hazards.

The 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy focuses on assisting people and communities in the WUI to moderate the threat of catastrophic fire through the four broad goals of improving prevention and



suppression, reducing hazardous fuels, restoring fire-adapted ecosystems, and promoting community assistance. The Western States Wildland Urban Interface Grant may be used to apply for financial assistance towards hazardous fuels and educational projects within the four goals of: improved prevention, reduction of hazardous fuels, restoration of fire-adapted ecosystems and promotion of community assistance. Information: <https://www.westernforesters.org/wui-grants>

**U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Rural Fire Assistance Grants.** Each year, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) provides Rural Fire Assistance (RFA) grants to neighboring community fire departments to enhance local wildfire protection, purchase equipment, and train volunteer firefighters. Service fire staff also assist directly with community projects. These efforts reduce the risk to human life and better permit FWS firefighters to interact and work with community fire organizations when fighting wildfires. The Department of the Interior (DOI) receives an appropriated budget each year for an RFA grant program. The maximum award per grant is \$20,000. The DOI assistance program targets rural and volunteer fire departments that routinely help fight fire on or near DOI lands. More information: [http://www.fws.gov/fire/living\\_with\\_fire/rural\\_fire\\_assistance.shtml](http://www.fws.gov/fire/living_with_fire/rural_fire_assistance.shtml)

**Fire Management Assistance Program.** This program is authorized under Section 420 of the Stafford Act. It allows for the mitigation, management, and control of fires burning on publicly or privately owned forest or grasslands that threaten destruction that would constitute a major disaster. More information: <http://www.fema.gov/fire-management-assistance-grant-program>

**NOAA Office of Education Grants.** The Office of Education supports formal, informal and non-formal education projects and programs through competitively awarded grants and cooperative agreements to a variety of educational institutions and organizations in the United States. More information: <http://www.noaa.gov/office-education/grants>

**NRCS Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP).** The Environmental Quality Incentives Program, administered through the NRCS, is a cost-share program that provides financial and technical assistance to agricultural producers to plan and implement conservation practices that improve soil, water, plant, animal, air and related natural resources on agricultural land and non-industrial private forestland. Owners of land in agricultural or forest production or persons who are engaged in livestock, agricultural or forest production on eligible land and that have a natural resource concern on that land may apply to participate in EQIP. Eligible land includes cropland, rangeland, pastureland, non-industrial private forestland and other farm or ranch lands. EQIP is another funding mechanism for landowner fuel reduction projects. More information: <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/financial/eqip/>

**U.S. Department of Agriculture, Community Facilities Loans and Grants.** Provides grants (and loans) to cities, counties, states and other public entities to improve community facilities for essential services to rural residents. Projects can include fire and rescue services; funds have been provided to purchase fire-fighting equipment for rural areas. No match is required. More information: [http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?navid=GRANTS\\_LOANS](http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?navid=GRANTS_LOANS)

**General Services Administration, Sale of Federal Surplus Personal Property.** This program sells property no longer needed by the federal government. The program provides individuals, businesses and organizations the opportunity to enter competitive bids for purchase of a wide

variety of personal property and equipment. Normally, there are no restrictions on the property purchased. More information: <http://www.gsa.gov/portal/category/21045>

**Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Grants.** Grant funds are passed through to local emergency management offices and HazMat teams having functional and active LEPC groups. More information: <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/hazmat/grants>

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security.** Enhances the ability of states, local and tribal jurisdictions, and other regional authorities in the preparation, prevention, and response to terrorist attacks and other disasters, by distributing grant funds. Localities can use grants for planning, equipment, training and exercise needs. These grants include, but are not limited to areas of Critical Infrastructure Protection Equipment and Training for First Responders, and Homeland Security Grants. More information: <http://www.dhs.gov/>

**Community Development Block Grants (CDBG).** The U.S. Department of Commerce administers the CDBG program which are intended to provide low and moderate-income households with viable communities, including decent housing, as suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities. Eligible activities include community facilities and improvements, roads and infrastructure, housing rehabilitation and preservation, development activities, public services, economic development, planning, and administration. Public improvements may include flood and drainage improvements. In limited instances, and during the times of “urgent need” (e.g. post disaster) as defined by the CDBG National Objectives, CDBG funding may be used to acquire a property located in a floodplain that was severely damaged by a recent flood, demolish a structure severely damaged by an earthquake, or repair a public facility severely damaged by a hazard event. CDBG funds can be used to match FEMA grants. More Information:

<http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/communitydevelopment/programs/>

**Building Blocks for Sustainable Communities.** The EPA Office of Sustainable Communities sometimes offers grants to support activities that improve the quality of development and protect human health and the environment. When these grants are offered, they will always be announced on [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov).

## **OTHER RESOURCES**

**FEMA: Grant Application Training.** Each year, FEMA partners with the State on training courses designed to help communities be more successful in their applications for grants. Contact your State Hazard Mitigation Officer for course offering schedules. Example Courses:

- Unified Hazard Mitigation Grant Assistance Application Development Course
- [Benefit Cost Analysis \(BCA\)](#) Course

**FEMA: Community Assistance Visit.** It may be appropriate to set up a Community Assistance Visit with FEMA to provide technical assistance to communities in the review and/or updating of their floodplain ordinances to meet the new model ordinance. Consider contacting your State NFIP Coordinator for more information.

**FEMA: Building Science.** The Building Science branch develops and produces multi-hazard mitigation publications, guidance materials, tools, technical bulletins, and recovery advisories that incorporate the most up-to-date building codes, floodproofing requirements, seismic design standards, and wind design requirements for new construction and the repair of existing buildings. To learn more, visit: <https://www.fema.gov/building-science>

**EPA: Smart Growth in Small Towns and Rural Communities.** EPA has consolidated resources just for small towns and rural communities to help them achieve their goals for growth and development while maintaining their distinctive rural character. To learn more, visit: <https://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/smart-growth-small-towns-and-rural-communities>

**EPA: Hazard Mitigation for Natural Disasters: A Starter Guide for Water and Wastewater Utilities.** The EPA released guidance on how to mitigate natural disasters specifically for water and wastewater utilities. For more information, visit: <https://www.epa.gov/waterutilityresponse/hazard-mitigation-natural-disasters>

**National Integrated Drought Information System.** The National Drought Resilience Partnership may provide some additional resources and ideas to mitigate drought hazards and increase awareness of droughts. Visit: <https://www.drought.gov/drought/what-nidis/national-drought-resilience-partnership>.

**STAR Community Rating System.** Consider measuring your mitigation success by participating in the STAR Community Rating System. Local leaders can use the STAR Community Rating System to assess how sustainable they are, set goals for moving ahead and measure progress along the way. To get started, go to <http://www.starcommunities.org/get-started>

**Beyond the Basics: Best Practices in Local Mitigation Planning.** The product of a 5-year research study where the Coastal Hazards Center and the Center for Sustainable Community Design analyzed local mitigation plans to assess their content and quality. The website features numerous examples and best practices that were drawn from the analyzed plans. Visit: <http://mitigationguide.org/>

**Flood Economics.** The Economist Intelligence Unit analyzed case studies and state-level mitigation data in order to gain a better understanding of the economic imperatives for investment in flood mitigation. To learn more, visit: <http://floodeconomics.com/>

**Headwaters Economics.** Headwaters Economics is an independent, nonprofit research group that works to improve community development and land management decisions in the West. To learn more, visit: <https://headwaterseconomics.org/>