

State Mitigation Team Meeting Report

February 22, 2006

FEMA-DR-1556 Full Application Scoring and PDMC06 Project Review

The State Mitigation Team met Wednesday, February 22, 2006, to score 1556 full applications and PDMC06 applications. The following team members and mitigation staff were in attendance: Chad Berginnis– OEMA, Cindy Crecelius – ODNR, Steve Ferryman – ODNR, Karen Fabiano – ODOD, Kay Phillips – OEMA, Buck Adams – Medina County EMA Director (EMAO Representative), Rick Warren – OEMA, Drew Whitehair – OEMA, Linda Haller – OEMA, Rachael Evans – OEMA, Sharon Rolf – OEMA, Ramona Hauenstein – OEMA, Sima Merick – OEMA.

After introductions, ground rules and parking lot issues were addressed the following handouts were passed out:

- Planning status of PDMC06 applicants
- 2006 PDMC OEMA Eligibility and National Ranking Review Sheet
- Updated Alternative Determination of Cost-Effectiveness, Region 5 Ohio, Eligible Insured Repetitive Loss Properties.

Chad Berginnis discussed the direction and future of state mitigation team meetings. The administrative plan, which creates the state mitigation team and must be approved by FEMA, is a requirement of the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program and although the team is not chartered in statute, it is through the Administrative Plan. However, the state mitigation team can be effective for all mitigation programs, including the Pre Disaster Mitigation program, and help develop/direct good mitigation policy in the state. Due to repeat disasters, the team has been convened mainly to rank and score projects. Chad would like to meet quarterly to discuss broader mitigation, policies, etc. Additional agencies need to be added to the team. Feedback is welcomed by all members.

Chad advised the team that benefit cost has become an issue at FEMA and has stalled project approval starting with the 1519 projects.

Also noted was the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District initiative to levee an assessment on all properties in the district and utilize the funds in an innovative, comprehensive manner. In addition to using the funds to repair/rehabilitate high hazard dams (which are identified in the State of Ohio Mitigation Plan) as a moderate to high hazard, an innovation in MWCDs approach is that a small portion of the projected \$270 million that will be collected from the assessment will be utilized to fund mitigation projects - or more specifically either fund the projects or be used as local match for FEMA mitigation projects. Since local matching funds are always difficult to find this would be a welcome development, especially since, in future disasters, there could be significant mitia

Buck Adams advised the team on the status of MAPS (Mitigation, Assistance, Preparedness and Support) program. The County EMA directors have been working on MAPS since 1985. It is now through legislative services and they are hiring a lobbyist for the next 5 years. The intent is to create a \$12 million fund of which 55% will go to local communities and 20% for local match to mitigation projects. They are looking for a sponsor. Cindy recommended Buck contact the [Ohio Fair Plan](#).

Cindy Crecelius briefed on the FEMA Map moderation Program. FEMA rolled out a multi year update plan. Funds will not cover the cost. Ohio is in the 3rd year of funding with 10 counties with new maps, 16 counties in the mapping process and 12 getting started. Information can be found on ODNR website.

The status of Ohio planning was reviewed by Chad. Approximately one half of the counties have an approved or approved and adopted plan. 87 out of 88 counties are working on a plan or have an approved plan. The Ohio enhanced plan will provide 20% funding for the next disaster.

Chad reviewed the minutes from the June 29, 2005 State Mitigation Team meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Team members are to receive copy of State Mitigation Team meeting minutes.

There was discussion on substantial damage determinations. Substantially damaged structures that have been determined and signed off on by the local official do not have to have a benefit cost completed for mitigation projects. Buck expressed concern over the inconsistency of the FEMA teams and substantial damage determinations. Kay stated this is why there is always a state person assigned to the FEMA teams. Kay advised the FEMA teams are looking for enough substantially damaged structures to declare a federal disaster. This is different than the local official completing a substantial damage determination.

Buck advised the Substantial Damage workshops are helpful to the counties/locals.

The following applications submitted under FEMA-DR-1556 were reviewed and ranked:

- Village of Powhatan Point
- Monroe County (Includes Cameron)
- Trumbull (City of Niles)
- Tuscarawas. City of Uhrichsville
- Washington Village of Lower Salem
- Belmont (Neffs area)
- Columbiana (Countywide)
- Columbiana (Lisbon area)
- Washington (Aurelius Twp. Elba & Macksburg)

The project submittal deadline to FEMA is March 16, 2006. NFIP compliance issues can be addressed in the State/Local Grant Agreement followed up by quarterly reporting through OEMA required quarterly reports (where NFIP coordination is required, it would be completed and OEMA would forward report to ODNR). Also, each of these communities should have an initial meeting with ODNR/EMA (Cindy and Chad). This still allows the projects to proceed and address outstanding NFIP issues.

Chad discussed the option of submitting \$0.00 funded projects into NEMIS. If projects are not determined to be cost beneficial or withdraw, this would allow projects submitted as \$0.00 to be funded. However, this has to be take place before the 24 month time period of when the disaster was declared. All FEMA funds have to be obligated by the 24 month.

Karen stressed she needs to know as soon as possible, what communities will be using the HUD disaster funds for the local match. She has other communities needing funding.

**HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM
APPLICATION MATRIX**

FEMA-DR-1556-OH, Declared 09.19.2004

SHMT Meeting Date: February 22, 2006

Applicant	Local Match	*NFIP Compliance	Comments
Village of Powhatan Point Belmont County - Acquisition	+	+	EMA: The new mayor indicated village didn't want the project to proceed. Will be discussing with Village Council next week. <i>Following the meeting, Powhatan Point did drop out of the program.</i>
Monroe County Acquisition	X	X	ODNR: Rick Sherman, County EMA Director is new Flood Plain Coordinator. If approved, grant agreement should include NFIP issues and solutions. ODOD: Karen is still working on local match issue for additional HUD Disaster Funds, should have an answer next week.
City of Niles	+	+	ODNR: Went from a minus status to score of 85.
City of Uhrichsville Tuscarawas County	X	X	ODNR: City has not returned repeated calls to schedule CAV. ODOD: Karen to follow up on local match funds. Application lists \$200,000.00 in HUD disaster funds.
Aurelius Township Washington County	+	+	ODNR: New score of 80, up from 20. Adoptions were done without following procedures. They may be suspended for short period until adoption is done correctly.
Village of Lower Salem Washington County	+	X	ODNR: Score of 65. If approved, grant agreement should include NFIP issues and solutions.
Belmont County – Neffs	+	X	ODNR: Improved score of 60. If approved, grant agreement should include NFIP issues and solutions. EMA: Application may have post firm violations, will address. Substantial damage worksheets were submitted for most structures. ODOD: Local match of \$682,000.00 is needed – county has over \$1,000,000.00.
Columbiana County	+	X	ODNR: No improvement. If approved, grant agreement should include NFIP issues and solutions.
Columbiana County	+	X	ODNR: No improvement. If approved, grant agreement should include NFIP issues and solutions.

+ = Recommended

X = ODNR Coordination Required

- = Not Recommended

*NFIP scores based on: Compliance with Regs, Administrative Process and Steps taken on Violations

Pre Disaster Mitigation Competitive Program 2006:

- The criteria being used by the State Mitigation Team is the same as the National Ranking Review Team.
- The 2006 Pre Disaster Mitigation Competitive funding amount is \$50,000,000.00.
- The 2007 Pre Disaster Mitigation Competitive proposed amount is \$150,000,000.00.
- Each state is allowed to submit a maximum of 5 projects for the PDMC06 funding.
- Chad stated good PDMC projects not are not selected for submission for PDMC06 may be considered for HMGP funding if funds are available.
- Buck asked why the top 5 are submitted for PDMC, with a “chance” of being funded; when HMGP is a “sure thing.” If they are good projects, shouldn’t they have the best chance of being funded? Chad advised we could submit for both funding sources, HMGP would be submitted as 0 funding. However, it would have to be compliant with the administrative plan, such as, was the community in the declared area for the possible HMGP funding it is being submitted for, etc.
- Karen asked if PDMC was going to be an annual funding source, could the team only review eligible projects, as not to waste the team’s time. Chad advised, this is not the way the mitigation branch prefers to present the projects to the team, but due to time restraints and staffing, the branch is behind. The goal for next year is to be better organized.
- Buck asked for clarification on the intent of the scoring process, ie: good, viable projects on paper but may not be a good solution, etc.
- Buck was told he has to have building codes to enforce NFIP regulations. Cindy stated this is not true and referred him to 307.85 and 307.37.

PDMC 2006 State Mitigation Team Scoring Results:

Community Name	Ap #	Scores	Avg.	Comments
City of Fairfield Pleasant Run Mit Proj.	005	85,84,71,90,93	84.6	Good application
Brown Twp/Malwayne Fld Proj #1	015	81,83,71,95,88	83.6	Need to rephrase local match source, BC and damage backup is an issue, comment in ap states building codes are not enforced..?
Brown Twp/Malwayne Fld Proj #2	016	80,83,71,95,88	83.4	Same issues as project #1
Stark County/Sandy Twp Acq Project	022	80,83,71,70,95	79.8	No Comments
Uhrichsville Newport Stormwater Drainage	017	77,72,48,95,95	77.4	Is this part of a phased project or can it be a stand alone project? Alternatives were not okay, project protects to 10 year event?
Belle Valley/Washington Soil & Water	013	81,75,71,82,77	77.2	Need to review reference to previous uncompleted storm water work
Licking Cty Tornado Severe Weather Proj.	006	75,82,59,75,63	70.8	6 safe rooms
City of Willard WPCP Generator/Pump	008	61,82,70,95,40	69.6	Comments in application are inappropriate and needs addressed if selected to forward to FEMA.
City of Defiance Acquisition Flood Proj.	018	55,53,50,82,91	66.2	Ap appeared confusing to some team members. Mentioned 22 properties but project is for 3 only. (Rick explained that 22 rep loss properties are addressed in their plan.) Need to review application and BC – was total damages for the flood area used instead of damages of 3 properties?

City of Urbana Weather Shelter	021	70,64,32,57,95	63.6	Could not find a lot of info in the application, no maintenance cost listed.
Village of Bradner/Safe Room Mitigation	003	47,47,71,95,53	62.6	Comment back to Village regarding stand alone or dual use safe room.
Village of Mt. Gilead Service Dept	004	41,36,67,80,88	62.4	Is this an eligible project? New Build?
Boardman Twp/Weir Retention Upgrade	009	65,67,40,64,70	61.2	Ap is confusing; are they protecting 100 or 500 homes? BC run does not match ap, no damages listed in application, do they plan to bid the work?
Byesville Drainage Improvement Project	012	50,61,29,85,65	58.0	Serious technical problems, solution may prevent local flooding but create pressure on railroad embankment, damage info does not match benefits and no engineering documentation to support claims was attached.
City of Lorain Retention Basin	007	45,63,41,55,85	57.8	Damage of history on page 28 does not match BC. Unclear if this was a retention or acquisition project. It is an acquisition project. The title of retention basin does not match project. Ap states the project area is in the floodplain but conflicts with information they provided in FIRM panel section.
City of Mentor Marsh Creek Watershed Improvement & Stormwater	001	41,37,53,92,56	55.8	BC is not good, ap states proj improves from 5 to 25 yr vent – is this ok?
Huron County Generators for Shelter	002	35,47,21,77,84	52.8	Generators are for 8 schools, are they considered critical facilities?
City of Kenton Generator Project	020	45,57,17,70,64	50.6	YMCA used as an emergency shelter – is this a critical facility?
Boardman Twp/Ewing Brookfield Retention	011	47,52,3,50,71	44.6	Methodology was questioned, not right solution for the problem, did not acknowledge future maintenance in application.
Village of Rarden Mitigation Ditches	019	35,37,26,56,55	41.8	Ap is not clear; put culverts in ditches? Team discussed the issue of low income communities having the staff or not able to hire contractors to complete applications for them.....The Haves vs the Have Nots.
Boardman Twp/Market St School/Storm Water Detention	010	41,47,3,45,56	38.4	Not well documented, protect to 10 yr versus 100 yr? Underground vault in floodplain?
Village of Moscow Post Office	014	31,57,2,55,43	37.6	Is this an eligible project? New Build? List 1 damage event of \$37,000.00 with \$600,000.00 plus in project costs. Is this cost effective?

Parking Lot Items:

- Chad to follow up on FEMA's definition of Substantial Damage Determination
- How long do we give community to address NFIP issues.
- For counties that have zoning, an inspector training would be helpful.
- Follow up on Privacy Act issue on damage payments by Insurance/FEMA.
- Follow up on guidance for generator projects (ie: successful applications)
- Have's versus the Have Not's – How do we get past this?