

State of Vermont – Hazard Mitigation Grant Application Review Form

Name of Reviewer: _____ Project Name (Town/Type): _____

Requested funding amount (75% - federal share): \$ _____ Date of Review: _____

Threshold Criteria

- Is this a mitigation project (i.e. project does not simply address the deferred or future maintenance, restoration or replacement of existing structures, facilities, or infrastructure)? *(Not fundable if NO)*
- Does the proposal conform to No Adverse Impact Standards in the State Flood Hazard Area & River Corridor Rule and the State Stream Alteration Rule, where relevant? *(Not fundable if NO)*
- Does the community have a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan in place, or a commitment to write one? *(Not fundable if NO)*
- Does the community have a Local Emergency Operations Plan in place? *(Not fundable if NO)*
- Is the community in good standing* with the National Flood Insurance Program? *(Not fundable if NO)*

**Good standing* means that the community does not have unresolved NFIP compliance and enforcement issues documented in the FEMA Community Information System. If a community has documented compliance issues, but has made reasonable commitments and progress toward resolution, the committee may still consider the application for funding.

Topic		Question - Yes +5, No +0 (unless otherwise noted)		Point Value*	
				P	R
I	Effectiveness	1	Is the project supported by technical information demonstrating feasibility?		
		2	Will the project likely be effective at achieving the project objective?		
		3	Is the requested funding sufficient?		
		4	Is the project designed with climate adaptation in mind (e.g. to withstand anticipated future events)?		
		5	What mitigation approach is most applicable to this project? (choose one) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce Vulnerability/Harden (+5) • Avoidance/Move (+15) 	---	
II	Impact	6	Does the project address a site with multiple past damages related to it?	---	
		7	Is the mitigation action a community priority that will result in a significant increase in safety or reduction in risk to a high cost/critical/high impact problem?		
		8	Will the project increase available river corridor/floodplain acreage/storage and/or storage/headwater forests? (up to +5)	---	
		9	Will the project enhance natural habitat? (Yes +5, Neutral +0, Degrade -5)	---	
		10	Will the project protect important cultural or historic features? (Yes +5, Neutral +0, Degrade -5)	---	
		11	Will the project protect economic assets (e.g. businesses, key infrastructure, key employers, etc.)? (Yes +5, Neutral +0, Degrade -5)		
III	Proactivity	12	Is the project identified in the local mitigation plan?	---	
		13	Has the community: (Both +10, One +5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited new encroachments in Flood Hazard Areas? • Limited new encroachments in River Corridors? 		
		14	Has the community taken previous mitigation actions to remedy, study or alleviate the problem?	---	
IV	Unique Circumstances	15	Does the project have special qualities in terms of importance to the community, a compelling narrative, or other circumstance that is not reflected in other questions? (up to +5)	---	
		16	Does the project create significant benefits above the minimum (e.g. BCR \geq 3.0, highly visible example, meets other state/community priorities in addition to mitigation, community involvement in the Community Rating System, etc.)? (up to +10)		
TOTAL					

* The "P" column is used when scoring planning (7%) and 5% initiative projects. The maximum score is 50.

* The "R" column is used when scoring regular projects. The maximum score is 100.