

SECTION 6 – PLAN MAINTENANCE AND MONITORING

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

§201.4(c)(5)(i) Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating **the Plan**

[The Standard State Plan Maintenance Process **must** include an] established method and schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the Plan.

Method and Schedule for Monitoring, Evaluating and Updating the Plan

Monitoring. Since mitigation actions are now tied to the goals in the Plan, Section 4 of the Plan will be monitored annually or after a Disaster Declaration as described in the next section on “Activities.” As previously noted, the County Directors meet monthly at the MEMA EOC and immediate concerns about the Plan can be addressed then. Since the public has occasionally also used those meetings as a way to address specific issues, there is another opportunity for input.

Evaluation. As before, the Plan will also be monitored relevant to any disasters (and new lessons learned) or new legislation. Reports are due on a quarterly basis as part of both MEMA and FEMA protocols. MEMA’s evaluation of the Plan will be based on State needs, budget, laws or new federal guidelines. It will be updated as needed to reflect hazard changes, additional mapping resources, regulatory changes or to generally improve mitigation program management.

Updating the Plan. The Plan will be revised within three years. To accomplish this, it will be reviewed on an annual basis by the State Hazard Mitigation Officer and the Hazard Mitigation Planner. This review will occur in June, which would allow enough time after the winter and usual spring flooding months to properly assess any storm damages and to review reports from the River Flow Advisory Committee. It will also be in conjunction with 2nd Quarter Work Reports, when the Mitigation Officer would normally report on any mitigation activities within the agency.

Evaluation of whether Previous Plan’s Methods and Schedules Worked

The previous Plan’s methods and schedules have not worked, and need to be adjusted. The major challenges are:

- The Hazard Mitigation Officer does not have sufficient time to Plan. The job requires multi-tasking: sponsoring workshops, participating in post-disaster assistance activities, reviewing applications, and attending to other emergency management duties. Additional staff is needed.
- A monthly review and evaluation is unrealistic and unnecessary. There are not that many changes taking place on a month-to-month basis. Quarterly or annual reviews and evaluations, and/or reviews after a Disaster Declaration, should be sufficient.
- The Hazard Mitigation Officer’s involvement in the preparation of county plans certainly helped the counties, but it also created a lot of extra work that took away time that could have been spent on the State Plan.
- The local (county) planning process raised awareness of hazard mitigation issues, but it also increased expectations that FEMA assistance would be available to fund locally identified projects. In reality, as previously noted, the planning process identified about 100 years worth of projects (assuming all would be funded through the HMGP program).

MONITORING PROGRESS OF MITIGATION ACTIVITIES

§201.4(c)(5)(ii) Monitoring Progress of Mitigation Activities	[The Standard State Plan Maintenance Process must include a] system for monitoring implementation of mitigation measures (actions) and project closeouts.
§201.4(c)(5)(iii) Monitoring Progress of Mitigation Activities	[The Standard State Plan Maintenance Process must include a] system for reviewing progress on achieving goals as well as activities and projects in the Mitigation Strategy.

How Mitigation Measures and Closeouts will be Monitored

For PDM, HMGP and FMA grant project activities, these will be monitored according to Section VIII - Project Management of the State's Hazard Mitigation Administrative Plan. This includes the administration, roles and responsibilities and financial administration of the projects. Again, according to standard business and accounting practices, it is a monthly process. MEMA has developed a spreadsheet for tracking the status of plans and projects.

Due to resource limitations, and the previously described distances across the state, site visits will usually be grant pre-application and final inspection events. Wherever possible, multiple site visits will be the norm to keep a "working inventory" and to reduce travel time and costs. Phone calls will substitute for travel or face-to-face meetings in many cases.

Specifically, the close out process includes the following steps:

- Monthly or quarterly reports (depending on size and scope of project)
- Matching of invoices to expenses
- Final site inspection (dual inspection by MEMA and FEMA whenever possible)
- Final documents signed by sub-grantee
- Written request to MEMA accountant to pay final amount
- Written notification to sub-grantee that payment has been processed
- Written notification to FEMA that the project has been closed

System for reviewing Progress on Achieving Goals in the Mitigation Strategy

Since mitigation activities will be occurring at the local and state levels there will be two processes for monitoring progress. For local activities, the County Directors will provide annual updates to the Mitigation Planner and/or as part of the agenda at one of the above referenced monthly meetings. Progress of state mitigation activities will be coordinated on an annual basis or after a Disaster Declaration by TELCOMs between the Mitigation Planner and the agencies identified in the State Capability Assessment table.

Modifications to Track Initiation, Status and Completion of Mitigation Activities

The current system used to track the initiation, status and completion of mitigation activities appears to be working well. No modifications are proposed, other than the timeframes noted above.

System for Reviewing Progress on Implementing Activities and Projects

Using the "Goals/Objectives and Strategic Measures (Actions)" table on pages 4-19 through 4-29 of the Mitigation Strategy, a spreadsheet has been created with an eighth column entitled

“Date of Completion.” As each action is completed, a percentage of goal accomplishment can then be quantified.

Implementation of Mitigation Actions from Previous Plan

See Status report contained in the table on the next page.

Pri. #	Action	Cost	Funding Source	Time Frame	Agency	Status
1A	Create and maintain a State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan	\$50,000	EMPG/MEMA	Nov 07	MEMA	Not feasible – lack of staff capacity
1B	Advertise Hazard Mitigation concepts in media	\$100,000	PDM	Jun 06	MEMA	Ongoing (e.g. newspaper inserts)
2	Establish & staff a Hazard Mitigation Technical Assistance Office	\$100,000/yr	EMPG/MEMA	Jun 06	MEMA	Not feasible. Lack of staff capacity
3	Review the remaining county hazard mitigation plans to determine communities that are the most vulnerable to damage losses associated with hazard events.	Completed by existing staff	EMPG/MEMA	Jul 05	MEMA	To be done 2008-10
4	Modify the Floodplain Management program to use storm surge/SLOSH maps and requirements	\$50,000	PDM	Jun 06	SPO	No modification, but MEMA distributed copies to towns
5A	Staff MEMA with a GIS Technician	\$50,000/yr	EMPG/MEMA	Jun 06	MEMA	Not feasible. Lack of staff capacity. MEMA uses Maine Office of GIS Services as needed
5B	Create a Hazard Mitigation Best Management Practices (BMP) Manual	\$75,000	PDM	Dec 06	MEMA	To be done 2008-10
6	Budget a “Winter Day” Road Assistance Program	\$1,000,000/yr	US & Maine Highway Funds	Jun 07	MDOT	Not feasible – lack of sufficient State highway budget
7A	Create a Hazard Mitigation Awareness Outreach Program	\$50,000/yr	EMPG/MEMA	Jun 06	MEMA	Ongoing
7B	Encourage all communities to enact a basic Urban-Wildland Interface building code	\$100,000	Land Use Impact Fees	Nov 07	SPO	Not feasible. MFS is taking a voluntary approach to mitigation through its community assessment program
7C	Budget for Flood Area Road Capital Improvements Program	\$1,000,000/yr	US & Maine Highway Funds	Jun 07	MDOT	Not feasible. No budget for this outside disaster assistance and mitigation programs
7D	Use Website to advertise mitigation concepts	\$4,000/yr	PDM	Jun 05	MEMA	Ongoing. 100% implementation
8	Provide Hurricane Storm Surge Inundation maps to every community participating in the NFIP and encourage inclusion in their floodplain ordinances.	\$200,000	Land Use Impact Fees	Jun 07	SPO	MEMA distributed copies to towns. No guidance on how to implement
9	Improve the State’s disaster early warning capabilities, such as river gauges and NOAA alerting systems	\$25,000	Bonding	Jun 07	MEMA	MEMA partnered with National Weather Service
10A	Require that every municipality have a Floodplain ordinance and be a member of the NFIP	\$5,000	SPO Budget	Jun 06	SPO	Not done. Non-participation is not an issue. Some towns do not have FIRMS.
10B	Establish a state hazard mitigation database that is secure web-based and tied to GIS in order to keep the state mitigation plan up to date.	\$50,000	EMPG/MEMA	Jun 06	MEMA	Action modified in current Plan. To be done 2008-10.
10C	Complete Q3 Flood Maps for those counties which do not have Q3 data and estimate probability for coastal erosion.	\$200,000	PDM	Nov 07	SPO	FEMA is updating maps through its map modernization program. Not a State activity
11A	Establish the Annual Mitigation Review Committee	\$20,000/yr	EMPG/MEMA	Jun 06	MEMA	Done – 2004

Pri. #	Action	Cost	Funding Source	Time Frame	Agency	Status
11B	Revise Hazard Mitigation Prioritization Criteria in Admin Plan to include communities at highest risk, with consideration for repetitive loss and most intense development pressures.	Completed by existing staff	EMPG/MEMA	Jul 06	MEMA	In Plan being reviewed by FEMA
12	Support farmers with Irrigation projects and technical assistance	\$500,000/yr	US DOA Grants/Loans	Jun 07	DOA	Not feasible
13A	Increase DEP Land & Water Quality Stormwater and Shoreland Zoning Enforcement Staffing.	\$200,000/yr	DEP Permit Fees	Jun 07	DEP	Not feasible. Lack of funds for additional staff.
13B	Collect vulnerability and potential loss data to estimate losses for State owned and operated buildings, infrastructure and critical facilities associated with the most likely hazards events.	\$50,000	PDM	Sep 07	MEMA	No information on losses to State facilities other than those currently in the Plan
13C	Complete GIS mapping of all dam locations.	Completed by Item #5 GIS Tech	EMPG/MEMA	Sep 07	MEMA	Not feasible. Lack of adequate staff capacity. Some GIS being done on a case by case basis as dams are inspected by MEMA staff
14	Establish and fund a Public Facility Generator Grant	\$50,000/yr	Maine Budget	Jun 07	MEMA	Establishment of State program not feasible, but some funds available through Homeland Security
15	Convert MGS dune maps to a GIS coverage so the spatial extent in each municipality or county could be known and integrated.	\$25,000	PDM	Jun 06	DOC	Not done
15A	Determine dune cross-section areas for 100 year storms.	\$25,000	PDM	Jun 06	DOC	There has been a dune profiling program
16B	Complete mapping of bluff and landslide hazards along the entire GIS coverage.	\$25,000	PDM	Jun 06	DOC	75% complete