Section 6: Plan Implementation and Maintenance

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): [The plan maintenance process shall include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the plan within a five-year cycle.

6.1 Monitoring, Evaluating and Updating the Plan

This plan shall be reviewed and evaluated annually or following a disaster to determine the effectiveness of mitigation actions; reflect changes in laws, regulations and/or policies; reprioritize mitigation actions, if necessary, and consider other issues affecting hazard mitigation in the Kansas City metropolitan area. The Planning Team, in accordance with the roles and responsibilities outlined in Attachment 1, shall be responsible for coordinating annual reviews of the plan for their represented jurisdictions. The annual review process shall include an evaluation of the plan’s effectiveness for the area. Criteria used to evaluate the plan should include:

- The goals and objectives address current and expected conditions
- The nature, magnitude and/or types of risk have changed
- The current resources are appropriate for implementing the plan
- There are implementation problems, such as technical, political or legal or there are coordination issues with other agencies
- The outcomes have occurred as expected
- The agency and partners participated as originally proposed

During these reviews, mitigation goals and actions will be reevaluated and updated to reflect current status as appropriate. Jurisdictions wishing to add new mitigation goals and actions may choose to do so at this time. Those jurisdictions submitting new goals and actions should develop a planning process narrative in accordance with the requirements for mitigation strategies outlined in this plan. The narrative should be submitted to the jurisdiction’s respective Planning Team member for review, who will forward to MARC for formatting and incorporation into this plan. MARC will continue to provide administrative support in accordance with the roles and responsibilities of Plan Author as defined in Attachment 6.1.

In order for mitigation efforts to become more fully incorporated into regional planning efforts for the Kansas City Metropolitan area, the review of the Hazard Mitigation Plan and the mitigation strategies will be included in the annual work plan for the Metropolitan Emergency Management Committee. The Metropolitan Emergency Managers Committee, a committee coordinated by Mid America Regional Council, serves as a forum for local emergency managers to discuss and resolve regional issues, problems, projects and activities related to all-hazards emergency management.

For this update, participating jurisdictions appointed a responsible party to act as a central point of contact and coordinate the update process for their community. These individuals are listed in Attachment 6.2. During the yearly reviews, these same individuals shall be responsible for collating the necessary information from their jurisdiction and forwarding to their respective Planning Team member. For each action proposed by the participating jurisdiction there is a “Primary Agency Responsible” designated for implementing mitigating goals and actions. These agencies shall provide the status of
their mitigation projects to their community’s responsible party, as listed in Attachment 6.2. If a community’s responsible party changes, they shall notify their Planning Team representative of the change.

Every five years, the Planning Team shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan and document the successes, failures, limitations and recommended revisions of hazard mitigation actions resulting in a full update to the plan. The model used for this update process will continue to be used for future updates; the roles and responsibilities outlined in Attachment 6.1 will be maintained. The following generic timeline should be used to guide the update process. All dates are listed as time remaining (T-) until plan expiration:

T – 22 months:
1.) MARC: Notify Planning Team, participating and potential new jurisdictions of upcoming update process.
2.) MARC: Request authorizations from participating jurisdictions for MARC to act as Plan Author on jurisdiction’s behalf (if desired).

T-21 months:
1.) MARC: Apply for grant funding.
2.) MARC/Planning Team: Confirm participation requirements, desired updates, and changes in regulations. Begin full review of plan. Set kickoff meeting dates and times.
3.) MARC/Planning Team: Begin collecting contact information for all potential jurisdictions and organizations to ensure that all potential participants receive the initial invitation to be involved.

T-19 months:
1.) MARC/Planning Team: Complete full review of plan, confirm required updates.
2.) MARC: Begin research on any changes to the hazard profiles and recent hazard events. Create materials for kick off meetings.
3.) MARC: Begin advertising meeting dates and times for participating jurisdictions and other parties interested in contributing to the update process.

T-16 months:
1.) MARC/Planning Team/Participating Jurisdictions/Other interested parties: Begin kickoff meetings to review process for update, review historical and recent occurrences of the various hazards, and review data collection and plan participation requirements. Hold follow-up meetings as necessary.
2.) Participating jurisdictions: Begin submitting required information about hazard risks and capabilities (Community Profile information) to MARC.
3.) MARC: Analyze and assess the information received through the Community Profile submission. Develop materials for public meetings to explain hazards and the capabilities on hand. Incorporate information received into draft update.

T-14 months:
1.) MARC/Planning Team/Participating Jurisdictions: Advertise and conduct 1st round of public meetings.
T-12 months:

1.) Participating Jurisdictions: Status report on past mitigation strategies and development of new mitigation strategies. Participating jurisdictions and organizations will consider the hazards that are likely to impact their constituents and the tools/capabilities available to address the hazards and they will create goals and actions to continue building upon the capabilities already in place.

2.) MARC: MARC staff will collect the mitigation strategy information for past and future goals and actions and incorporate the information into the draft update.

T-8 months:

1.) MARC/Planning Team/Participating Jurisdictions: Advertise and conduct 2nd round of public meetings/public input opportunities.

T-6 months:

1.) MARC: Complete first draft, submit to Planning Team for review and approval.

2.) Planning Team: Review/Approve first draft.

T-5 months:

1.) MARC: Submit first draft to SEMA.

2.) MARC: Make corrections to draft.

3.) MARC/Planning Team/Participating Jurisdictions: Advertise and conduct final public review and comment period.

4.) Planning Team: Review/Approve corrections to draft.

T-3 months:

1.) MARC: Submit final draft to SEMA for forwarding to FEMA.

2.) MARC: Make any corrections from FEMA. Submit to Planning Team for review/approval and resubmittal to FEMA.

3.) MARC/Planning Team/Participating Jurisdictions: Once FEMA approves, participating jurisdictions adopt by formal resolution, and forward to FEMA.

A number of data deficiencies were identified through this update to be addressed prior to the next update to extent possible – pending available information. Table 6.1 identifies these deficiencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Deficiency</th>
<th>Action to Be taken</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dam inundation pathways still in process of being shared with local officials or not yet available</td>
<td>Continue to work the MDNR and local dam owners to obtain information/maps showing dam failure inundation pathways as part of EAP update/completion process</td>
<td>Planning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Deficiency</td>
<td>Action to Be taken</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Levee failure analysis information largely unavailable</td>
<td>Continue to work with USACE and other entities to obtain levee failure analysis information as it becomes available</td>
<td>Planning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Future land use data unavailable for Ray County</td>
<td>Incorporate future land use maps for Ray County as developed</td>
<td>Ray County Planning Team representative, MARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Various data collection/interpretation deficiencies were noted for winter weather, heat wave, drought, HazMat and infectious disease due to certain inherent limitations</td>
<td>Continue to reassess hazards and data collection methods for next update. As new collection methods and interpretation techniques become available, incorporate into plan update</td>
<td>Planning Team, MARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Utility infrastructure - Research Services of MARC does not currently have access to this data at present</td>
<td>Through collaboration with jurisdictions and utility companies are working to address this.</td>
<td>Planning Team, MARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Data regarding homes without basements –</td>
<td>The next time MARC asks for a parcel update will seek this information</td>
<td>MARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Building counts – not all jurisdictions maintain a GIS layer of building points or building outlines. MARC digitized many buildings by hand as part of a SOLAR grant, but will not be able to keep it current.</td>
<td>As jurisdictions develop GIS capabilities this information will be incorporated in future updates.</td>
<td>Participating Jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Critical facilities – don’t have measures of size or capacity or capabilities for most of them. This information would help produce more meaningful maps and visualizations.</td>
<td>As jurisdictions continue to implement HAZUS software this information become more accessible.</td>
<td>Participating jurisdictions, MARC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.1: Data Deficiencies Identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Deficiency</th>
<th>Action to Be taken</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Addresses of repetitive flood loss properties would have been helpful in</td>
<td>Continue to work with jurisdictions and the State Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>Participating jurisdictions, MARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapping the general locations where flooding occurs that is more likely to</td>
<td>to determine options for obtaining this type of information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damage property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Data regarding the number of cases and the number of deaths related to</td>
<td>Work with the local health agencies to determine if there are ways that they can</td>
<td>Local Health Agencies, MARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true outbreaks of emerging or re-emerging infectious diseases is not publicly</td>
<td>share information about the number of cases and or deaths attributed to an emerging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessible.</td>
<td>or re-emerging disease outbreak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor data limitations continue to exist for estimating probability of future occurrence and potential damages for emerging infectious, civil disorder, drought, heat waves and severe winter storms. Specific limitations are discussed in each hazard profile.

#### 6.2 Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Incorporation of the mitigation strategies, goals and actions into other planning mechanisms, as identified by each jurisdiction, is discussed in full in *Section 3 Capabilities Assessment*. The planning process used to update the plan will continue to tie hazard risk assessment for each jurisdiction to the capabilities and resources that the jurisdictions have available. Through the Community Profile, jurisdictions and organizations identify the hazards that for which their jurisdictions are most at risk. In addition, the jurisdictions and organizations report on the administrative, technical, financial, and programmatic (education and outreach) resources that they have in place. Participating jurisdictions and organizations are encouraged to consider this information as they identify mitigation goals and actions. In the end, the goals is to establish a cycle where the Hazard Mitigation Plan update process drives changes and improvements in the local planning mechanisms and capabilities and also, local planning processes will ultimately identify projects and initiatives that can be supported in the Hazard Mitigation Plan.

#### 6.3 Continued Public Involvement

Public involvement in the mitigation planning process — from plan development through implementation of mitigation actions and plan review, evaluation and revision — is important to the success and sustainability of a community’s (and the region’s) mitigation efforts. As stakeholders in the mitigation process, the public should be given the opportunity to influence the policy decisions that will affect their communities.
The citizens of jurisdictions that have adopted this plan will be encouraged to participate in the plan maintenance and review process. Copies of this plan will be provided to the following public libraries or library systems serving the participating jurisdictions:

**Ray County Library**
215 East Lexington
Richmond, MO 64085

**Kansas City Public Library**
14 West 10th Street
*Kansas City, MO*

**Mid-Continent Public Libraries**
(Administrative Headquarters, serving Jackson, Platte and Clay Counties)
15616 East 24 Highway
Independence, MO

**Cass County Libraries**
(Administrative offices)
400 E. Mechanic St.
Harrisonville, MO 64701

Copies of the plan will also be available from MARC and from the participating jurisdictions. In addition, this plan will be posted on MARC’s Web site and the Web sites of participating jurisdictions, if possible. Contact information and the method for submitting comments and suggestions regarding the plan (i.e., e-mail, fax, etc.) will also be posted on the aforementioned Web sites. The availability of this plan will also be publicized in MARC’s printed, online and electronic newsletters, such as *Management Matters* and *ReMARC*. Participating jurisdictions will also publicize the availability of this plan in community newsletters and related publications as well as advertising on community TV channels. All information regarding plan availability will continue to be posted in accordance with the provisions of the Missouri Sunshine Law. Additional information regarding Missouri’s Sunshine Law can be found on the Web site of Missouri’s Attorney General at [http://ago.mo.gov/sunshinelaw/](http://ago.mo.gov/sunshinelaw/).

During the yearly reviews, the Planning Teams should redirect the public to the plan’s availability and again solicit information on topics of mitigation concern to the community. Specific information regarding public involvement efforts as part of the planning process can be found in Section 1.3.5. Additional media outlets for potential advertising can be found in the 2010 Plan.