



Enhanced State Validation Toolkit

December 2022



FEMA

This page intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

1. Purpose	1
2. Developing A Performance Plan.....	2
3. Guidance on the Annual Validation Meeting.....	4
Appendix 1: Frequently Asked Questions	7
Appendix 2: Example Measures for Elements E6-E9	9
Appendix 3: Model Enhanced Program Agreement.....	15
Appendix 4: Annual Performance Report Template.....	20

1. Purpose

An enhanced state mitigation plan documents a proven commitment to long-term risk reduction. Being enhanced recognizes a state's ongoing and coordinated work to reduce losses from natural hazards, protect life and property and create more resilient communities. Enhanced states' mitigation plans go beyond the minimum requirements. These states' plans represent holistic mitigation programs integrated across partners, staff and offices. The commitment to mitigation is demonstrated both in the plan and in day to day operations. Enhanced states have the capacity, resources and/or skills to build resilience for communities across the state. Enhanced states must also be able to adapt to changing circumstances. For example, enhanced states are able to support risk reduction through disasters, staff turnover, or changes to funding programs.

Enhanced states receive an additional 5% in Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) funds after a disaster. This means they receive 20% of estimated eligible Stafford Act assistance instead of 15%. Enhanced states share the responsibility for reducing risk across state agencies and departments. This "sharing the load" reduces risk more efficiently. It also connects the right resources with community needs.

A FEMA-approved enhanced state mitigation plan documents a sustained commitment to hazard mitigation. FEMA staff, including staff from Mitigation Planning and Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA), will validate the state's enhanced mitigation program annually over the 5-year approval period. This annual validation verifies that the enhanced mitigation program is on track. It also verifies that the state meets the enhanced planning and grants management performance requirements over the 5-year approval period. This process proactively identifies potential problems and allows for corrective action.

This toolkit is meant to provide resources that FEMA and state mitigation planning partners can use to co-develop performance measures and commitments for the annual validations. An annual enhanced state validation includes:

- Review of continued grants management performance.
- Documentation of continued integration of mitigation programs and other state planning efforts.
- Demonstration of a commitment to a comprehensive mitigation program.
- Demonstration of effective use of mitigation programs.
- Documentation of the state's implementation capability.

This toolkit is organized under these topic areas. It supplements the [2022 State Mitigation Planning Policy Guide](#) (the Guide).

2. Developing A Performance Plan

2.1. Overview

Each state is unique. Because of this, each enhanced mitigation program may have different goals and programs. For this reason, there are no standardized commitments or targets within each required element to track the performance of an enhanced program. For each enhanced requirement, FEMA and the state will develop commitments or performance measures within 6 months of plan approval. These measures will be based on the state's unique mitigation program and the documentation contained in the enhanced mitigation plan. Creating a performance plan helps everyone understand expectations and stay on track to reach agreed-upon goals.

This document includes a model agreement ([Appendix 3](#)) and the Enhanced Validation Summary Template ([Appendix 4](#)). These are options for the region and the state to use to document the agreed-upon commitments and/or performance measures for the 5-year plan approval period. FEMA regional staff may also provide a different tool or template, or the state may develop its own in coordination with FEMA. These commitments and metrics should be as specific and measurable as possible; they should serve as the basis of the annual enhanced validation.

Regardless of the format, the performance plan or agreement should identify specific and measurable outcomes for each year of the approval period. If these need to be changed, states should communicate those changes to FEMA staff. They should discuss any changes to the anticipated outcomes for the performance period with FEMA well before the annual validation meeting. This toolkit provides questions and suggestions to identify customized measures and commitments to include in the performance plan.

2.2. FEMA Grants Management Performance

Because enhanced states receive additional Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) funding, the state must show it can manage its HMA grants. To maintain enhanced status, each year during the approval period, the state must show that it meets all grants management performance requirements for all FEMA HMA programs for the last four quarters. The performance criteria for grants management are set in section 4.1.2 of the Guide.

Minor or one-time deficiencies or other extenuating circumstances may come up as part of the review. It is critical that these be documented. If this was the case during the plan review and approval, or a previous annual validation, states should work with FEMA to incorporate the summary of findings and corrective action plan through specific performance measures. This will be discussed at the following year's validation or mid-year check-in.

Before the annual validation meeting, the FEMA regional planner will reach out to HMA for an updated summary of findings for the performance period. Whenever possible, FEMA will send this summary to the state to review in advance of the validation meeting.

2.3. Integrated Planning

Long-term risk reduction is more effective when it is done collaboratively with partners. Integrated planning means aligning goals and strategies across sectors and agencies. This can help to use resources for greater resilience. To be enhanced, states must show a history of cooperation with a wide range of agencies and stakeholders that have mitigation capabilities or shared aims. They must work together to reduce risks from future natural hazards and increase resilience in the state. States should also consider the needs of underserved communities in this coordination process. Enhanced states must use the full range of FEMA programs to support their risk reduction programs. [Appendix 2](#) includes a table of prompts that FEMA and states can use to identify specific measures to include in a performance plan to meet the requirements of E6.

States should demonstrate integration by showing that mitigation is embedded in other state planning, decision making and development efforts. This means that other state priorities and planning initiatives must inform the state's overall mitigation strategy. Integrated planning should not be limited to state-level partners and programs. Integration should include state agencies and organizations with expertise in climate change and climate adaptation. It should also include agencies with programs, policies and assistance that support underserved communities. It should also bring in leaders and key stakeholders from nongovernmental organizations that serve those communities. FEMA defines underserved communities as "populations sharing a particular characteristic, as well as geographic communities, that have been systematically denied a full opportunity to participate in aspects of economic, social, and civic life." Who is considered underserved may differ from state to state. Historically, the following groups have been underserved and denied full and equal treatment:

- Black, Latino, Indigenous and Native American persons, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and other persons of color.
- Members of religious minorities.
- Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ+) persons.
- Persons with disabilities.
- Persons who live in rural areas.
- Persons otherwise adversely affected by persistent poverty or inequality.

The enhanced plan outlines the state's integrated activities. During the enhanced validation, states should demonstrate their continued effort to integrate programs and partners through current activities and outcomes. These activities should either have occurred within the performance period of review or be ongoing. See Appendix 2 for specific examples of measures to include in the Enhanced State Validation Summary Template or other format to show how the state is committed to integrated planning.

2.4. Commitment to a Comprehensive Mitigation Program

States with enhanced mitigation plans must demonstrate a robust and comprehensive commitment to mitigation. This commitment must go beyond that of a state with a standard mitigation plan. An enhanced state must give evidence that they are implementing programs, actions and/or projects. These should reduce exposure to hazards or use other mechanisms to show the state goes above and beyond the standard plan requirements. This includes policies focused on equitable and sustainable land use strategies as well as the adoption and enforcement of current hazard-resistant building codes. It also includes training, capability building and other state-led and coordinated efforts that help reduce risk and advance resilience. FEMA defines equity as “the consistent and systematic fair, just and impartial treatment of all individuals”. It also defines resilience as “the ability to adapt to changing conditions and rapidly recover from disruptions due to emergencies.”

To create a performance plan for this requirement, states and FEMA regional planners should list all components of the mitigation program. This review should consider potential gaps in the mitigation program which can be addressed in future plan updates. Appendix 2 includes a table of prompts that FEMA and states can use to identify specific measures to include in a performance plan to meet the requirements of E7.

2.5. Effective Use of Mitigation Funding

To show that it is using mitigation funding effectively, the state must prove that it is using a variety of ways to achieve its mitigation goals. This can include state and federal programs beyond FEMA funding. Full and effective use of existing mitigation programs means that an enhanced state is making the most of FEMA, as well as other federal, state or nongovernmental funding to advance mitigation. Refer to Appendix 2 for prompts to identify specific measures address the requirements of E7.

2.6. Documenting The State’s Implementation Capability

An enhanced state should be able to implement its mitigation plan and support local governments to carry out mitigation activities across the state. This should include underserved communities. This means the state must have criteria and processes to make decisions to allocate resources for mitigation actions, projects and initiatives. The state must also have a system to measure the effectiveness of its mitigation investments. Refer to Appendix 2 for ideas on how to incorporate the requirements of E8 into the performance plan.

3. Guidance on the Annual Validation Meeting

3.1. Overview

During the plan’s 5-year approval period, the region and the enhanced state must hold validation meetings. The Guide requires FEMA and the state to set the performance measures within 6 months of plan approval. It also requires FEMA to evaluate the state each year using these measures. The

annual meeting is a minimum requirement. States and regions are advised to meet more often to check on the progress of the performance plan.

The validation meetings are a chance to discuss challenges and opportunities to meeting the goals of the performance plan for the current approval period. The meetings also make the region and the state aware of progress and any potential challenges. These factors could affect the state's enhanced status as the state prepares to update and submit the next enhanced plan. These meetings also let states and FEMA update or change the performance measures. They may do this during the enhanced plan approval period if both FEMA and the state agree to the changes.

3.2. Before the Meeting

In the 6 months after the enhanced plan approval, FEMA and the state should agree on performance measures. These will be used during the enhanced validation meeting. Before the meeting, they should revisit these measures. If FEMA and the state signed a formal agreement documenting these expectations, this is the document that should be reviewed before the meeting.

Both FEMA and the state should consider if any changes are needed to the identified performance measures. They should also think about any concerns about whether the state can stay on target for each of the identified metrics.

FEMA should share a detailed agenda for the meeting at least 2 weeks before the validation meeting. The FEMA regional planner will work with HMA and other FEMA programs to identify any concerns about the performance or commitments in the plan before the meeting. The state hazard mitigation officer (SHMO) should also work with other state agencies and departments to document and share successes, gaps and concerns about the performance measures.

3.3. Who Should Attend the Meeting?

Validation meeting attendees should represent a variety of state programs and departments. The meeting participants should include representatives of the programs that can best speak to the success and/or challenges of meeting the measures of performance. Participants could include:

- The SHMO.
- The State Mitigation Planning Lead.
- The State NFIP Coordinator.
- The State Building Code Administrator.
- Lead coordinator(s) for HMA grants in the state.
- Non-HMA Grant Specialist(s).
- Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) Planners.

- Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation Specialists.

It is also a good idea to invite relevant experts in climate change and equity. These experts may come from different departments and organizations depending on the state. Consider which climate change and equity experts who were engaged throughout the planning cycle are most appropriate to invite to the validation meeting.

3.4. What Documentation Is Needed?

FEMA will provide the state the summary of findings on the grants management review. The state will provide all other documentation to validate that it is meeting the requirements to stay enhanced.

Documentation may include:

- An overview of how the state has used FEMA funding programs.
- The dollar amount or percentage of total mitigation spending from non-FEMA sources.
- NFIP statistics.
- A spreadsheet of actions to address comments from the previous Annual Validation Report.
- Statistics on training or capacity building activities.
- Other documentation or data to help show that the state is carrying out hazard mitigation commitments.

3.5. During the Meeting

A validation meeting is a chance for FEMA and the state to have a frank assessment of the state's enhanced status. FEMA can facilitate and take notes for the meeting, although the region and the state should decide how the meeting is organized.

The evaluation will lead to a determination of whether a state continues to meet the requirements to remain enhanced, or if corrective action is needed before the end of the approval period. If necessary, the state and FEMA should also agree on changes to the performance measures or agreement during the meeting.

3.6. After the Meeting

After the meeting, FEMA will give the state a written summary of its findings from the validation using [Appendix 4: The Enhanced State Validation Summary Template](#). It will also provide the state with all documentation or agreements from the validation process. The region will share a copy of the agreement with FEMA headquarters. It will also share the annual results, including notes and findings. FEMA will not require a state mitigation plan update following the annual validation. However, there may be corrective actions based on the validation's findings.

Appendix 1: Frequently Asked Questions

4.1. Why do we have an annual validation?

The annual validation makes sure that states with enhanced status are keeping their commitments to mitigation throughout the 5-year plan approval period.

4.2. How is the enhanced state validation different from the mitigation consultation?

The enhanced state validation is for states that already have enhanced status. The mitigation consultation is for all states, regardless of their enhanced status. The consultation is a chance for technical assistance and building capabilities. The validation is a focused conversation on whether the state is keeping its mitigation commitments.

4.3. What are the expectations of being enhanced? How can states make sure they don't lose their enhanced status?

For states to keep their enhanced status, they must show FEMA that they are maintaining a comprehensive mitigation program. They must also prove that they are using mitigation funding and able to manage increased HMGP funding. The best way for states to maintain their enhanced status is to consistently monitor performance using their performance plan. They should also proactively correct any deficiencies.

4.4. What are the benchmarks or metrics for success?

There is no one-size-fits-all measure for states to ensure that they maintain their enhanced status. The requirements for enhanced status necessitate that states demonstrate an effective mitigation program, which requires coordination and integration across state agencies and other stakeholders. Based on the recently approved enhanced hazard mitigation plan, states should work with FEMA staff to articulate the performance measures which demonstrate that the state is continuing to maintain an enhanced mitigation program. This approach makes sure that states have specific, realistic and measurable goals to work toward each year. States should work with FEMA staff to develop these performance measures within 6 months of plan approval.

4.5. What can states put in place to meet potential issues with capacity?

States should ask for help from FEMA if they are facing challenges with capacity. This could include training or technical assistance. If states do not ask for help, or do not respond to FEMA's offer of help, this may negatively affect FEMA's determination of enhanced status.

4.6. Does a state need to update its hazard mitigation plan after the annual validation?

No. FEMA does not require a plan update immediately after the annual validation. However, FEMA may require corrective actions based on the results of the validation.

4.7. What happens if a state is not able to maintain the requirements for enhanced status?

Developing a formal agreement between the enhanced state mitigation program and the region allows both parties to have a clear understanding of expectations during the performance period. Enhanced status is an earned benefit for programs that exceed minimum requirements in mitigation. However, if a state is unable to maintain those commitments, FEMA may take corrective action. The following are examples of what may prompt corrective action. This is not an exhaustive list. If there is a specific question or concern, it is best to speak directly with the FEMA region:

- States do not comply with relevant federal statutes and regulations on hazard mitigation.
- States are unable to complete the mitigation commitments they have made during the plan approval period.
- States do not comply with HMA award administration requirements.
- More than 25% of local jurisdictions do not have a currently approved plan and are not actively updating their plans.

However, FEMA may make exceptions if it finds that:

- The infraction is minor or is a one-time challenge that the state has already corrected.
- The deficiency resulted from an emergency or another extenuating circumstance.

Appendix 2: Example Measures for Elements E6-E9

In developing an agreement between the state and the region, the specific commitments and measures should come from the most recently approved plan. The following tables include examples of how measures can be identified based on the mitigation strategy and other elements of the state’s mitigation program. These are just illustrative examples; they may not be appropriate for every state and are not intended as requirements. The questions included in previous sections of this toolkit may help identify appropriate measures. All these suggestions are in addition to, and are not meant to replace, the specific requirements identified in the Guide. This appendix was created to align with the Enhanced State Validation Summary Template (ESV Template), which is included as [Appendix 4](#).

INTEGRATED PLANNING

Element Requirements	Example Commitments/Performance Measures
<p>E6. The state continues to demonstrate integration, to the extent practicable, with other state and/or regional planning initiatives and FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives.</p> <p>The enhanced mitigation program continues to demonstrate ongoing integration with other state and/or regional planning initiatives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If there are state plans or regulations that do not incorporate hazard mitigation or natural hazard risk reduction into their policies, planning goals or objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify opportunities to integrate hazard mitigation into these policies and plans. ▪ For states that identify plans and policies which will be updated to integrate climate change or risk from natural hazards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Describe what successful integration looks like. What are the barriers? ▪ If the state is trying to partner with new sectors, agencies or other non-state organizations to reduce risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discuss how exactly those mitigation actions have supported or will advance community lifelines. ▪ If the state’s plan said it would convene a planning team meeting every quarter to address resilience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have those conversations happened? What were the outcomes?
<p>The enhanced mitigation program continues to demonstrate integration of FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When the state identifies participation in FEMA programs and initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are there programs that have not been integrated into the state program? If so, what will the state do about addressing these barriers?

COMMITMENT TO A COMPREHENSIVE MITIGATION PROGRAM

Element Requirements	Example Commitments/Performance Measures
<p>E7. The state continues to demonstrate a commitment to a comprehensive mitigation program.</p>	
<p>The state continues to demonstrate commitment to statewide programs, initiatives and plans that advance mitigation and resilience.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the statewide programs, initiatives and plans that advance mitigation and resilience? How does the state measure the impacts of these programs and plans? Consider the following types of activities when identifying these metrics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Statewide planning laws, legislative initiatives or frameworks (where permitted by state and local law) that require or promote land use planning, or other integrated strategies that advance mitigation. ○ Partnerships among councils, teams (beyond the state mitigation planning team) or public-private partnerships focused on mitigation investment at the state, regional and local levels. ○ Integrating mitigation and community resilience ideas into the state’s post-disaster recovery operations, including ideas that can leverage comprehensive forms of mutual aid that support, essential community services such as post-disaster building codes and floodplain management administration and enforcement. ○ Developing an in-depth, multi-year plan to mitigate the risks to buildings identified as necessary for post-disaster response and recovery actions. ○ Use of a model floodplain ordinance that includes and goes beyond the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) requirements. This floodplain ordinance should be coordinated with the state building code(s). ○ Adoption of a state building code with hazard-resistant provisions that goes beyond those in the model codes. The state building code should be coordinated with the model floodplain ordinance.¹

¹ Some potential resources for these requirements include:

1. Higher standards and code-coordinated ordinances can be found in the [Reducing Flood Losses Through the International Codes: Coordinating Building Codes and Floodplain Management Regulations](#) document.
2. Communities and states can learn more about where they stand regarding building codes by consulting the [Building Code Adoption Tracking tool](#).
3. Planners and partners can look at the [Building Codes Adoption Playbook](#) for more guidance about how to adopt and enforce building codes.

Element Requirements	Example Commitments/Performance Measures
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For states that have a mandatory statewide building code: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What edition of the model codes is the statewide building code based on? ○ How many local governments have adopted higher standards for hazard resistance in their building codes? Has there been a change in this number during this performance period? ○ How many state-owned and operated facilities have been built in compliance with the most recent hazard-resistant building code(s)? ○ How are states helping communities improve their building code administration and Building Code Effectiveness Grading Scores (BCEGS)? ▪ For states that do not have a mandatory statewide building code: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What action(s) does the states have in the current mitigation strategy to reduce the long-term hazard risk of buildings? What does success look like for this/these action(s)? ○ How does the state work with local jurisdictions through building codes to enhance resilience and meet regulatory requirements? ○ How are states helping communities improve their building code administration and Building Code Effectiveness Grading Scores (BCEGS)?
<p>The state continues to demonstrate a commitment to mitigation training and capability building.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What commitments for mitigation training and capability building did the state include in the hazard mitigation plan update? How is the state tracking those commitments? ▪ Has the state identified localities which may need further assistance to carry out mitigation actions? If so, how is the state supporting those under-resourced areas through trainings and capacity-building initiatives? ▪ Detail which training sessions were held during this performance period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explain how those training sessions help to build capacity at the state and local level. ▪ Describe how the state plans to address inequities in capabilities and demonstrate how those actions have been advanced during this performance period.
<p>The state continues to demonstrate a commitment to its mitigation planning responsibilities by helping local</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In cases where the 75% threshold was met at the time the enhanced status was approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Describe any change in the percentage of jurisdictions which either have approved plans or are currently

Element Requirements	Example Commitments/Performance Measures
<p>governments update and adopt their plans before they expire.</p> <p><i>Note: FEMA’s calculation for Element E7c will be produced through a report from the FEMA Mitigation Planning Portal that contains all local jurisdictions with plans that are Approved, Approved Pending Adoption, In Review, Awaiting Revisions or Plan in Progress status. Special districts are excluded from this calculation.</i></p>	<p>conducting updates. Detail the state’s efforts to support local mitigation plan updates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In cases where the 75% threshold was not met at the time the enhanced status was approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Describe any change in the percentage of jurisdictions which either have approved plans or are currently conducting updates. How has the state advanced its identified process to improve the status of local mitigation planning since the state HMP was approved? ▪ Assuming the state met the 75% local jurisdiction approval threshold at the time of plan submittal, does state have planned activities to maintain or increase that number during the next 5 years? ▪ If the state did not meet the 75% threshold at plan submittal, what was the identified process for improvement that was approved at the time of enhanced designation?

EFFECTIVE USE OF EXISTING MITIGATION PROGRAMS TO ACHIEVE MITIGATION GOALS

Element Requirements	Example Commitments/Performance Measures
<p>E8. The state is effectively using existing mitigation programs to achieve mitigation goals.</p>	
<p>The state continues to demonstrate the full and effective use of existing FEMA programs for which funding is available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe how the state supports eligible local governments in accessing FEMA funding opportunities. ▪ What percentage of local governments, including special districts, are eligible subrecipients for FEMA funding? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How many of these have successfully applied for and used these funds during this performance period? ○ Does the state have actions or commitments to expand this number for the next performance period? ▪ Which FEMA programs does the state plan to use during this plan approval period? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ During the most recent performance period, how many of those programs did the state apply for? ○ Which FEMA programs did the state <i>not</i> utilize throughout the planning cycle?
<p>The state continues to demonstrate the full and effective use of non-FEMA programs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there non-FEMA programs the state does not utilize that align with goals and priorities? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Detail how the state intends to pursue additional non-FEMA programs for risk reduction.

Element Requirements	Example Commitments/Performance Measures
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify the total dollars spent on mitigation and risk reduction activities that comes from non-FEMA sources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Show how those monies were used in concert with FEMA funds to advance mitigation across the state.

DOCUMENTATION OF THE STATE'S IMPLEMENTATION CAPABILITY

Element Requirements	Example Commitments/Performance Measures
<p>E9. The enhanced plan documents capability to implement mitigation actions.</p>	
<p>The state continues to use the system described in the enhanced mitigation plan to rank mitigation measures established in the enhanced plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If there was a change in prioritization approach since the previous plan update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How does this change in prioritization more accurately reflect the mitigation program? How has the state used the change in prioritization to advance different actions within this performance period? ▪ Identify if any mitigation projects from the most recent plan have shifted down in priority. If so, detail why this change has occurred. Do other high-priority actions meet the same planning goal?
<p>The state continues to assess the effectiveness of mitigation actions and uses the results to inform the mitigation strategy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrate whether any mitigation actions have real-time status updates. ▪ Catalogue the effectiveness of recent mitigation actions based on the state's methodology. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Investigate how the effectiveness of actions can be enhanced going forward. ▪ Identify improvements the state can make to how it evaluates the effectiveness of actions. ▪ What actions did the state include in the strategy to document and build capacity across the state to manage the increased grant program funding?

Element Requirements	Example Commitments/Performance Measures
<p>The state continues to support implementation of local and tribal mitigation actions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the state track its investments in underserved communities with a focus on equitable mitigation outcomes? ▪ Does the state track its investments in local communities with a focus on maintaining local mitigation plans in approved status? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Describe how local and tribal mitigation actions have been advanced in the past performance period with state support and technical assistance. ○ Discuss how those local and tribal mitigation actions enhance resilience and mitigation across the state. Also show how the state’s support and technical assistance has helped to achieve mitigation actions at the local and tribal level.

Appendix 3: Model Enhanced Program Agreement

Enhanced Program Performance Agreement Template

Following the determination that a state plan achieves enhanced status, FEMA and the state may consider preparing a written agreement to provide a “roadmap” to validate the enhanced program during the 5-year approval period. This agreement should cover specific measurable outcomes that FEMA and the state can use to see if the state stays on target for its commitments to the enhanced program.

FEMA may include the agreement as an attachment to the plan approval letter, as appropriate. The state may also include the agreement with the official adoption documentation of the plan to increase awareness and support.

Disclaimer: This Agreement does not set forth any additionally legally enforceable obligations but describes a mutually agreeable performance plan for the enhanced mitigation programs.

The Enhanced Program Performance Agreement (“Agreement”) is organized as follows:

1. Purpose and Outcomes
2. Points of Contact and Roles
3. Performance Measures
4. Attachments
 - a. Annual Performance Plan Template
 - b. Plan Review Tool (if needed)
5. Signatures

1. Purpose and Outcomes

The purpose of this agreement between the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and [insert name] state is to document the performance measures and commitments [insert name] the state will make between [insert approval plan period years].

These performance measures will be revisited each year during the annual validation meeting.

2. Points of Contact and Roles

Examples of roles include:

- Management, such as the official with authority to sign the agreement and with responsibility for the mitigation program

- Lead, such as the mitigation planner
- Support staff, such as FEMA HMA staff

FEMA

1. **[Insert manager name and title]**, (such as FEMA Mitigation Director and/or Risk Analysis Branch Chief) and role
2. **[Insert lead name and title]**, (such as Name, FEMA Regional Mitigation Planner) and role
3. **[Insert support staff name and title]**, (such as Name, FEMA Regional HMA staff) and role

STATE

1. **[Insert manager name and title]**, (such as State Director and/or State Hazard Mitigation Officer) and role
2. **[Insert lead name and title]**, (such as Name, State Mitigation Planner) and role
3. **[Insert support staff name and title]**, (such as Name, State Mitigation Grants staff, Mitigation Team membership) and role

3. Performance Measures

INTEGRATED PLANNING

Requirement	Specific Commitments or Measures based on the most recent approved Hazard Mitigation Plan
E6. The state continues to demonstrate integration, to the extent practicable, with other state and/or regional planning initiatives and FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives. [44 CFR § 201.5(b)(1)]	
The enhanced mitigation program continues to demonstrate ongoing integration with other state and/or regional planning initiatives.	
The enhanced mitigation program continues to demonstrate integration of FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives.	

Requirement	Specific Commitments or Measures based on the most recent approved Hazard Mitigation Plan
E7. The state continues to demonstrate a commitment to a comprehensive mitigation program. [44 CFR §§ 201.3(c), 201.5(b)(4) and 201.6(d)]	
The state continues to demonstrate commitment to statewide programs, initiatives and plans that advance mitigation and resilience.	
The state continues to demonstrate a commitment to mitigation training and capability building.	
The state continues to demonstrate a commitment to its mitigation planning responsibilities by helping local governments update and adopt their plans before they expire.	

EFFECTIVE USE OF EXISTING MITIGATION PROGRAMS TO ACHIEVE MITIGATION GOALS

Requirement	Specific Commitments or Measures based on the most recent approved Hazard Mitigation Plan
E8. The state continues to effectively use existing mitigation programs to achieve mitigation goals. [44 CFR §§ 201.5(a) and 201.5(b)(3)]	
The state continues to demonstrate the full and effective use of existing FEMA programs for which funding is available.	
The state continues to demonstrate the full and effective use of non-FEMA programs.	

DOCUMENTATION OF THE STATE'S IMPLEMENTATION CAPABILITY

Requirement	Specific Commitments or Measures based on the most recent approved Hazard Mitigation Plan
E9. The state continues to implement mitigation actions. [44 CFR §§ 201.5(b)(2)(i), 201.5(b)(2)(ii), and 201.5(b)(2)(iv)]	
The state continues to use the system described in the enhanced mitigation plan to rank mitigation measures established in the enhanced plan.	

Requirement	Specific Commitments or Measures based on the most recent approved Hazard Mitigation Plan
The state continues to assess the effectiveness of mitigation actions and uses the results to inform the mitigation strategy.	
The state continues to support implementation of local and tribal mitigation actions.	

4. Attachments

- a. *Annual Performance Report Template*
- b. *Plan Review Tool (if needed)*

5. Signatures

[NAME]

Mitigation Division Director

FEMA Region [NAME]

Date:

[NAME]

Director

State Emergency Management Department

Date:

[NAME]

Risk Analysis Branch Chief

FEMA Region [NAME]

Date:

[NAME]

State Hazard Mitigation Officer

State Emergency Management Department

Date:

[NAME]

Mitigation Planning Lead

FEMA Region [NAME]

Date:

[NAME]

State Mitigation Planner

State Emergency Management Department

Date:

Appendix 4: Annual Performance Report Template

FEMA Mitigation Division staff will use this enhanced state validation summary template to document and communicate the results of the enhanced state validation. For each enhanced requirement, FEMA and the state will develop a commitment or performance measure based on the state’s mitigation program and the documentation contained in the enhanced mitigation plan. The FEMA Mitigation Division staff must mark each requirement as “On Target” or “Not on Target” and provide performance feedback.

Enhanced State Validation Summary	
State:	
Validation Date(s):	
Performance Period Assessed:	
State Participants:	
FEMA Participants:	

ENHANCED STATE PREREQUISITES

Requirement	State Commitment/Performance Measure(s)	Current Results
E2. The state has met application time frames and submitted complete project applications.		
All applications have been completed and submitted by the end of each program’s respective application period.		
All applications have been entered into FEMA’s electronic data systems.		
A complete Minimum Criteria Checklist for Project Subapplications or equivalent documentation has been prepared for all subapplications.		
All applications have been determined to be complete by FEMA within 90 days of submittal or selection for further review, or after the first request for information response.		
E2 Performance Comments:		

Requirement	State Commitment/Performance Measure(s)	Current Results
E3. The state has prepared and submitted accurate environmental reviews and benefit-cost analyses.		
All applications and amendments have been determined to be complete by FEMA within 90 days of submittal or selection for further review, or after the first request for information response, including all data requested by FEMA to support cost-effectiveness determinations and EHP compliance reviews.		
E3 Performance Comments:		
E4. The state has maintained the capability to submit complete and accurate quarterly progress and financial reports on time.		
All progress reports have been completed and submitted on time.		
All FFR SF-425s have been submitted on time.		
The state consistently complies with the Financial Management Standard requirements described in 2 CFR §§ 200.300 to 200.309.		
E4 Performance Comments:		
E5. The state has completed HMA projects within established performance periods, including financial reconciliation.		
All work as part of HMA subawards has been completed by the end of the period of performance.		
There have been no major findings on the last single audit obtained by the state related to HMA programs during the performance period being assessed.		
All grant closeout activities, including financial reconciliation, have been completed within 120 days from the end of the award performance period.		

Requirement	State Commitment/Performance Measure(s)	Current Results
Actual expenditures have been documented and are consistent with SF-424A or SF-424C.		
E5 Performance Comments:		

INTEGRATED PLANNING

Requirement	State Commitment/Performance Measure(s)	Current Results
E6. The state continues to demonstrate integration, to the extent practicable, with other state and/or regional planning initiatives and FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives.		
The enhanced mitigation program continues to demonstrate ongoing integration with other state and/or regional planning initiatives.		
The enhanced mitigation program continues to demonstrate integration of FEMA mitigation programs and initiatives.		
E6 Performance Comments:		
E7. The state continues to demonstrate a commitment to a comprehensive mitigation program.		
The state continues to demonstrate commitment to statewide programs, initiatives and plans that advance mitigation and resilience.		
The state continues to demonstrate a commitment to mitigation training and capability building.		
The state continues to demonstrate a commitment to its mitigation planning responsibilities by helping local governments update and adopt their plans before they expire.		
E7 Performance Comments:		

EFFECTIVE USE OF EXISTING MITIGATION PROGRAMS TO ACHIEVE MITIGATION GOALS

Requirement	State Commitment/Performance Measure(s)	Current Results
E8. The state continues to effectively use existing mitigation programs to achieve mitigation goals.		
The state continues to demonstrate the full and effective use of existing FEMA programs for which funding is available.		
The state continues to demonstrate the full and effective use of non-FEMA programs.		
E8 Performance Comments:		

DOCUMENTATION OF THE STATE'S IMPLEMENTATION CAPABILITY

Requirement	State Commitment/Performance Measure(s)	Current Results
E9. The state continues to implement mitigation actions.		
The state continues to use the system described in the enhanced mitigation plan to rank mitigation measures established in the enhanced plan.		
The state continues to assess the effectiveness of mitigation actions and uses the results to inform the mitigation strategy.		
The state continues to support implementation of local and tribal mitigation actions.		
E9 Performance Comments:		