

## CHAPTER X

### MONITORING, EVALUATING AND UPDATING THE PLAN

Recognizing that many mitigation projects are ongoing, and that while in the implementation stage communities may suffer budget cuts, experience staff turnover, or projects may fail altogether, a good plan needs to provide for periodic monitoring and evaluation of its successes and failures and allow for updates of the *Plan* where necessary.

In order to track progress and update the Mitigation Strategies identified in the Action Plan (Table 13), it is recommended that the Town revisit the *Salem Hazard Mitigation Plan* annually, or after a hazard event. If it is not realistic or appropriate to revise the *Plan* every year, then the *Plan* will be revisited no less than every five years. At each review of the *Plan* the need for new mitigation actions should be reviewed. A list of general mitigation strategies has been included in the *Plan* as a starting point by which to establish new additions to the Action Plan (Appendix A).

The Emergency Management Director is responsible for initiating the review of the *Plan* with members of the Town that are appropriate including members of the public. In keeping with the process of adopting the 2004 *Salem Hazard Mitigation Plan*, a public hearing to receive public comment on *Plan* maintenance and updating will be held during the review of the *Plan*. This publicly noticed meeting will allow for members of the community not involved in developing the *Plan* to provide input and comments each time the *Plan* is revised. The final revised *Plan* will be adopted by the Board of Selectmen appropriately, at a second publicly noticed meeting.

Changes should be made to the *Plan* to accommodate for projects that have failed or are not considered feasible after a review for their consistency with STAPLEE, the timeframe, the community's priorities, and funding resources. Priorities that were not ranked high, but identified as potential mitigation strategies, should be reviewed as well during the monitoring and update of the *Plan* to determine feasibility of future implementation.

As indicated earlier in this document an additional means of *Plan* evaluation is the incorporation of the plan components within the Capital Improvements Program (CIP). Within the context of a CIP the projects are reviewed and measured against criteria related to their integration with other projects and their readiness. Through this document the qualitative aspects of each project are measured using the STAPLEE and other FEMA based methodologies. Locally the Town has added another layer of mitigation project evaluation through the CIP. The below table represents the rating criteria for the CIP projects, of which, the majority of the mitigation projects are inclusive. The criterion essentially tells the departments and implementation team the opinion of the volunteer CIP committee as to each projects significance and readiness. This type of review takes the projects outside the purpose of Hazard Mitigation and reviews the projects against their ability to be implemented and their significance against other projects throughout the community. The CIP process occurs annually and as the projects move through the process they are continually evaluated. Therefore, in addition to the review associated with the public safety and other Hazard Mitigation processes, the mitigation projects are evaluated continually through the CIP process and the process associated with their approval at Town Meeting.

	<u>Rating Criteria</u>	
Category	Significance	Readiness
<b>Essential</b>	<b>4:</b> (highest priority) Projects, which are required to complete or renovate a major public improvement; projects, which will remedy a condition dangerous to the health, safety, and welfare of the public; or projects which will provide facilities for a critically needed community program; are in response to a State or Federal mandate; have available other sources of funding which will not be available at a future date.	<b>4:</b> The project clearly and specifically depicts by virtue of plans, studies, cost estimates and other sufficiently detailed documentation that it is ready to proceed given its scheduled placement in the plan. The project is an integral part of a larger long range program/plan whereby this project and other related projects are clearly and specifically integrated, coordinated, and prioritized.
<b>Desirable</b>	<b>3:</b> (second priority) Projects which will benefit the community; whose validity of planning and timing have been established; where other limited sources of funding are available; in response to a pending State or Federal mandate that is within the five years of the CIP.	<b>3:</b> The project by virtue of plans, studies, cost estimates and other documentation demonstrates a readiness to proceed given its scheduled placement in the plan. The project is part of a larger long range program/plan whereby this project and other related projects are integrated, coordinated, and prioritized.
<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>2:</b> (third priority) Projects which are adequately planned, but which can be postponed if budget reductions are necessary.	<b>2:</b> The project by virtue of plans, studies, cost estimates and other documentation provides a conceptual overview of a readiness to proceed given its scheduled placement in the plan. The project is presented as generally related to a concept of a larger long range program/plan whereby this project and other related projects are conceptually integrated, coordinated, and prioritized.
<b>Deferrable</b>	<b>1:</b> (fourth priority) Projects which are not entirely ready; have no pending mandate; will not pose a threat to the health and safety of the public if deferred.	<b>1:</b> The project lacks; plans, studies, cost estimates and other documentation that provides even a basic overview of a readiness to proceed given its scheduled placement in the plan. The project has little or no relation to a larger long range program/plan and this project and other possibly related projects are not integrated, coordinated, and prioritized.