Appendix G

City of Harrisonville, Smithville R-II School District
Jurisdiction Specific Information
Prerequisites

This Appendix serves to incorporate the City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District into the Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan in accordance with the requirements of 44 C.F.R. 201.6. It contains all relevant, jurisdiction specific information for the City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District. Where applicable, information pertinent to the entire planning area (i.e., regional and hazard profile data, background information, methodologies, etc.) is referenced back to the Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan by section and page number rather than reproduced in full here. All germane tables and figures contained elsewhere in the Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan are amended in this Appendix to include information particular to the City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District. For consistency and ease of reference, all tables and figures retain their original titling and number sequencing.

As stated on page P.2, all participating jurisdictions were obligated to complete nine participation requirements which could be met through attendance at county meetings, completion of the MARC-developed survey and a review/update of the jurisdiction’s hazard mitigation strategy. ***Note: if a jurisdiction was not able to attend the county meetings, this participation component could be met by working directly with MARC staff and their county planning team representative. In these cases, MARC staff met separately with the jurisdictions in person or via teleconference to gather the required information. Jurisdictions opting for this course of action are noted in Table P.1. The nine participation requirements are listed below:

1.) Attended meetings or separate work sessions (see above ***Note)

2.) Submitted inventory of existing plans relevant to hazard mitigation.

3.) Submitted list of hazards that affect the jurisdiction.

4.) Submitted description of what is at risk (including local critical facilities, if different than regional profile.)

5.) Developed goals for the community.

6.) Developed mitigation actions with an analysis/explanation of why those actions were selected.

7.) Prioritized actions emphasizing relative cost-effectiveness.

8.) Reviewed and commented on draft plan.

9.) Hosted opportunities for public involvement (e.g., linking local Internet presence to a plan Web site).

Eight participation requirements were established for school districts. These could be accomplished with the same general process as that used for cities and villages by: 1) Participating at county meetings. ***Note: if a school district was not able to attend the county meetings, this participation component could be met by working directly with MARC staff and their county planning team representative. In these cases, MARC staff met separately with the districts in person or via teleconference to gather the required information. School districts opting for this course of action are noted in Table P.3. 2) Completion of a MARC-developed survey of hazards and capabilities. 3) Development of mitigation goals and actions. No school districts participated in the 2004 Plan; therefore, were not required to provide updates on the status.
of previous mitigation goals and actions. Listed below are the eight corresponding participation requirements:

1.) Attended meetings or separate work sessions (see above ***Note)

2.) Submitted inventory of existing plans relevant to hazard mitigation.

3.) Submitted list of hazards that affect the jurisdiction.

4.) Developed goals.

5.) Developed mitigation actions with an analysis/explanation of why those actions were selected.

6.) Prioritized actions, emphasizing relative cost-effectiveness.

7.) Reviewed and commented on draft plan.

8.) Hosted opportunities for public involvement (e.g., linking local Internet presence to a plan Web site).

### TABLE P.1: RECORD OF PARTICPATION (Amended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Participation Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td>***X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE P.3: RECORD OF PARTICPATION (SCHOOL DISTRICTS, Amended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Participation Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithville R-II School District</td>
<td>***X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Note: Attended separate work session as described above

As seen above, both the City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District have satisfactorily completed all participation requirements. The first requirement, to attend meetings or work sessions, was accomplished through a series of conference calls with city/school district officials, MARC Staff and appropriate Planning Team representatives. Table 1.1 below lists the dates these meetings were held along with their purpose. The City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District resolutions adopting the Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation plan will be signed pending approval of this Appendix.
Section G.1: Introduction and Planning Process

The City of Harrisonville is located in Cass County, Missouri within the identified planning area of the Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Flood Plain Map included in Attachment 3 identifies the city boundaries. The Smithville R-II School District offices are located at 655 South Commercial Avenue in the City of Smithville, Missouri (a current participant in this Plan). The School District consists of five attendance centers – a primary elementary, upper elementary, middle school, high school and early childhood special education/central office – with a total of 2463 students and 222 staff. A map of the district boundaries is included in Attachment 1. The inclusion of the City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District into the Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan planning process followed and is consistent with the processes outlined in Section 1, pages 1.1. – 1.13. The City of Harrisonville requested addition to the plan through Stan Swaggart, Director, Cass County Emergency Management and Planning Team representative for Cass County jurisdictions. Mr. Swaggart then forwarded this request via MARC to the rest of the Planning Team for review and approval in accordance with FEMA’s Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance. The Smithville R-II School District made application directly to MARC who forwarded the request on their behalf to the Planning Team. The Planning Team, via email correspondence, approved both the City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District’s requests. The City and School District then worked closely with MARC and Planning Team representatives to complete and submit the required information.

G.1.1 Review and Incorporation of Existing Plans

Tables 1.3 and 1.4 below describe how existing plans, studies, reports and technical documents for the City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District were reviewed and integrated in the planning process as discussed in Section 1.3.4, pg. 1.7.
### TABLE 1.3: RECORD OF REVIEW (SUMMARY, Amended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Existing Program/Policy/Technical Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: Not applicable  
X: Jurisdiction has adopted but not reviewed  
N: Jurisdiction has not adopted  
✓: Jurisdiction has adopted and reviewed

**Key:**
- A. Hazard vulnerability analysis
- B. Floodplain management ordinance
- C. Soil and erosion control ordinance
- D. Hazard zone identification
- E. Storm water engineering studies
- F. Elevation certificates
- G. Emergency Management Plan
- H. Growth Management Plan
- I. Capital Improvement Plan
- J. Critical facilities maps
- K. Existing land use maps
- L. Missouri State Hazard Mitigation Plan
- M. Building codes

### TABLE 1.4: RECORD OF REVIEW (SUMMARY, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, Amended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithville R-II</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Intruder/ Active shooter</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: Not applicable  
X: District has adopted but not reviewed  
N: District has not adopted  
✓: District has adopted and reviewed
Section G.2: Regional Profile and Capabilities

The City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District are located within the planning area profile discussed in Section 2, pgs. 2.1 – 2.99; the information contained there remains applicable. The following jurisdiction specific information regarding local community capabilities for Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District is added to that already contained within Section 2.6, pgs. 2.81, 2.84 and 2.87.

Local Community Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Burning Ban</th>
<th>Water Conservation Measures</th>
<th>Soil Report Evals</th>
<th>Wind Resistance Req’s</th>
<th>Safe Room/Shelter Req’s</th>
<th>Flood Buyout Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = Program in place

School District Capabilities

1.) Installed AED devices in all building locations and trained over 50% of staff in American Heart Association First Aid/CPR/AED.

2.) Created a “Classroom” crisis handbook to compliment building and district crisis plan utilizing the “buddy” evacuation procedure.

3.) Funded a full time School Resourced Officer (SRO) after C.O.P.S grant expired.

4.) Participated in school chemical clean-up program coordinated by the Center for Safe Schools and Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR).

5.) Conducted and participated in “Active Shooter” training with area law enforcement.
# Building and Fire Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td>2006 IBC</td>
<td>2006 IFC</td>
<td>2006 IMC</td>
<td>2006 IPC</td>
<td>City Ord. #2903</td>
<td>2006 IFGC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Codes

IC – International Code
IBC – International Building Code
IFC – International Fire Code
IFGC – International Fuel Gas Code
IMC – International Mechanical Code
IPC – International Plumbing Code
IPMC – International Property Maintenance Code
IRC – International Residential Code
NEC – National Electrical Code
NFC – National Fire Code
UBC – Uniform Building Code

UCADB – Uniform Code for Abatement of Dangerous Buildings
UCBC – Uniform Code for Building Construction
UHC – Uniform Housing Code
UMC – Uniform Mechanical Code
UPC – Uniform Plumbing Code
URC – Uniform Residential Code
USC – Uniform Sign Code
Section G.3: Risk Assessment

This portion of the plan contains detailed analyses of each of the eight natural and four technological hazards that may potentially affect the Kansas City area. These hazards include tornadoes and severe thunderstorms, riverine and flash floods, severe winter weather, drought, heat waves, earthquakes, dam failures, wildland fires, hazardous materials incidents, emerging infectious disease, civil disorder and mass transportation accidents. Levee failure was also considered for this update. However, due to data limitations, levee failure analysis is discussed under section 3.2.2 Riverine and Flash Floods. Information specific to each hazard found in this section includes:

- The probable location of hazards or the areas that may be affected by them
- The severity and magnitude of hazard events
- The probability of future hazard events
- Historical occurrences of hazard events in the region

Many sources were researched for data and information relating to hazards in the Kansas City metropolitan area. Principal sources of all-hazard information included FEMA and SEMA. The National Climate Data Center (NCDC), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and National Weather Service (NWS) were primary sources of information and statistics on weather and/or climate-related hazards. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Center for Earthquake Research and Information (CERI) and the Central United States Earthquake Consortium (CUSEC) were major sources for information on earthquakes and seismic activity in the Midwest and the Kansas City region. The primary sources of information on dams and dam safety were the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Dam Safety Division and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ (USACE) National Inventory of Dams (NID). SEMA and the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) were major sources of fire information related to the Kansas City metropolitan area. Other sources of information included MARC, particularly its Research Services Department; city and county Web sites and officials; existing county, regional and state plans, reports and documents; newspaper and news organization Web sites, articles and accounts of natural disasters; other state and federal agencies, such as the U.S. Census Bureau and Missouri Census Data Center (MCDC); and colleges and universities, especially the University of Missouri and University of Missouri Extension. A bibliography of research sources is contained in Appendix C: Maps and References.

G.3.1 Identifying Hazards

As part of the MARC-developed survey, participants were asked to evaluate (or re-evaluate) hazards affecting their jurisdictions, noting the overall risk each hazard posed to their governance. Table 3.2 identifies which hazards affect the City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District. An “X” indicates the jurisdiction is affected by the hazard; an N/A indicates the hazard is not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Tornado</th>
<th>Floods</th>
<th>Winter Weather</th>
<th>Drought</th>
<th>Heat Wave</th>
<th>Earthquake</th>
<th>Dam Failures</th>
<th>Wildland Fire</th>
<th>HAZMAT Incident</th>
<th>Emerging Infectious Disease</th>
<th>Civil Disorder</th>
<th>Mass Trans Accidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithville R-II</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G.3.1.1 Hazard Analysis Summary

See Section 3.1.1, pgs. 3.5 – 3.15, Tables 3.3 – 3.7 for a summary analysis of each of the 12 hazards, detailed in this Plan, that can potentially affect Cass, Clay, Jackson, Platte and Ray counties and briefly describes (1) magnitude; (2) severity; (3) probability of occurrence; and (4) overall risk to the county.

G.3.2 Hazard Profiles

See Section 3.2, pgs. 3.16 – 3.240 for Hazard Profiles of Tornado, Floods, Winter Weather, Drought, Heat Wave, Earthquake, Dam Failures, Wildland Fire, HAZMAT Incident, Emerging Infectious Disease, Civil Disorder and Mass Transportation Accidents. The City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School Districts are included within the profiled areas.

G.3.3 Vulnerability Assessment

“Vulnerability” describes an asset’s level of exposure or susceptibility to damage from hazards. The vulnerability of an asset — such as residential and commercial property, critical facilities or infrastructure — depends on a variety of factors, including its construction, contents and/or economic value of its functions. Overall vulnerability is synonymous with overall risk discussed in Section 3.1, pg. 3.2, and calculated according to the methodologies outlined therein (reproduced below).

To determine overall risk, two factors were considered: probability of an event occurring and severity of that event. Probability was drawn from historic occurrences and rated Low, Medium or High. These ratings were defined as:

- **Low** — The hazard has little or no chance of happening (Less than 1 percent chance of occurrence in any given year.).
- **Medium** — The hazard has a reasonable probability of occurring (Between 1 and 10 percent chance of occurrence in any given year).
- **High** — The probability is considered sufficiently high to assume that the event will occur (Between 10 and 100 percent chance of occurrence in any given year).

Severity was determined as the potential number of deaths, injuries, or amount of damage (property or environmental) that could result from the hazard. When calculating severity, jurisdictions took into account the likely locations for each hazard. These were also ranked Low, Medium and High, defined as:

- **Low** — Few or minor damage or injuries are likely.
- **Medium** — Injuries to personnel and damage to property and the environment is expected.
- **High** — Deaths and major injuries and damage will likely occur.

Overall risk was then calculated by averaging probability with severity. Simple numeric values were assigned to the rankings of Low, Medium or High, i.e., Low = 1, Medium = 2, High = 3 for ease of calculation. For example, if a tornado has a high probability (High = 3) of occurring with a high severity (High = 3), then the overall risk is High (3 + 3/2 = 3 = High). However, if a town has a high probability of flooding, but due to mitigation measures only a low severity, then the overall risk is Medium (3 +1/2 = 2 = Medium). Based on the assumption that it was better to overestimate risk rather than underestimate it, all fractions were rounded up to the next whole number. Figure 3.1 graphically depicts this algorithm.
Table 3.32 lists the vulnerability assessments for Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District.

**TABLE 3.32: VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT (OVERVIEW, Amended)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Tornado</th>
<th>Floods</th>
<th>Winter Weather</th>
<th>Drought</th>
<th>Heat Wave</th>
<th>Earthquake</th>
<th>Dam Failures</th>
<th>Wildland Fire</th>
<th>HAZMAT Incident</th>
<th>Emerging Infectious Disease</th>
<th>Civil Disorder</th>
<th>Mass Trans Accidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithville R-II</td>
<td></td>
<td>H, H = H</td>
<td>L, L = L</td>
<td>H, H = H</td>
<td>H, H = H</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>M, M = M</td>
<td>L, L = L</td>
<td>L, L = L</td>
<td></td>
<td>L, L = L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential Loss Estimates**

Potential minimum and maximum loss estimates at the county level are discussed in Section 3.3.3, pg. 3.26. Potential Loss Estimates by Jurisdiction are found in Section 3.3.3a, pg. 3.250. This section attempts to quantify potential monetary loss from area-specific hazards (flooding, earthquake, dam failure, wildland fire) based on building valuations in the hazard area. For a full explanation of the methodology used to calculate the potential loss, see Section 3.3.3a. The potential loss calculation uses building counts derived from the HAZUS-MH software. For an explanation of how these counts were achieved, see Section 2.5.1 pg. 2.73. Table 2.11 shows the building count information for the City of Harrisonville and the City of Smithville. Smithville R-II School District is located completely within the city boundaries of Smithville; therefore its facilities are included under Smithville’s “Education” category in Table 2.11. Tables 3.71 – 3.74 contain the loss estimates for the City of Harrisonville and the City of Smithville. Loss estimates for Smithville R-II School District are accounted for under the City of Smithville’s “Education” category.

**TABLE 2.11: BUILDING COUNT BY TYPE (Amended)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Healthcare</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Gov't</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithville</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.71: JURISDICTIONAL LOSS ESTIMATES BY BUILDING DAMAGE COUNT AND DOLLAR LOSS (000's of $) FOR FLOODING (Amended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td>L 0.55</td>
<td>0.55 29</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,147</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>179.7</td>
<td>29,552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithville</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3.72: JURISDICTIONAL LOSS ESTIMATES BY BUILDING DAMAGE COUNT AND DOLLAR LOSS (000's of $) FOR EARTHQUAKE (Amended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td>L 0.55</td>
<td>0.55 29</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,147</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>179.7</td>
<td>29,552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithville</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3.73: JURISDICTIONAL LOSS ESTIMATES BY BUILDING DAMAGE COUNT AND DOLLAR LOSS (000's of $) FOR DAM FAILURES (Amended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td>H 1.1</td>
<td>1.1 58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6,588</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26,293</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>359.4</td>
<td>59,103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithville</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3.74: JURISDICTIONAL LOSS ESTIMATES BY BUILDING DAMAGE COUNT AND DOLLAR LOSS (000's of $) FOR WILDLAND FIRE (Amended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td>L 0.55</td>
<td>0.55 29</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,147</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>179.7</td>
<td>29,552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithville</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section G.4: Mitigation Strategy

The City of Harrisonville was a participant in the 2004 Hazard Mitigation Plan. As such, they were required to update the status of the goals and actions identified in that plan through the MARC-developed Web site database. For a complete discussion on the Web site and methodologies used to rank priority, inclusion of a cost/benefit analysis, etc. see section 4.1, pg. 4.1. The City of Harrisonville’s completed mitigation strategy is listed in Attachment 2 to this Appendix. For the listing of corresponding mitigation goals and actions see Section 4.1.1, pgs. 4.3 – 4.15.

G. 4.1. Smithville R-II School District Mitigation Strategy

As stated previously, no school districts adopted the 2004 plan, and were therefore not required to address the goals and actions outlined above. Instead, school districts developed mitigation strategy narratives based on threats specific to their district. Below is Smithville R-II School District’s mitigation strategy.

A. Local hazard Mitigation Goals

The Smithville R-II School District school safety coordinator consulted with the superintendent of schools, building principals, school resource officer (SRO), Smithville Police Department, Smithville Fire Department, and City of Smithville in order to identify hazards that are of greatest concern in our school district and community. The district used this analysis to establish the following goal:

- Goal: Protect the health and safety of students, employees, and community members from natural and man-made hazards.

B. Analysis of Mitigation Actions

The school district has been actively seeking ways to improve hazard mitigation actions throughout the past five school years. Meetings with the administration, police department, fire department, and the City of Smithville have been conducted frequently to identify weaknesses in our existing plan and to determine a course of action for improvement. The mitigation actions outlined in this document serve as a culmination of these discussions.

C. Implementation of Mitigation Actions

The Smithville R-II School District has identified several mitigation actions that we believe will aid in achieving our goal of improved student, employee, and community safety.

Action 1. Improve Tornado Preparedness

Ideas for Implementation:
- Construct a storm shelter/Safe Room.
- Implement tornado readiness and response procedures in curriculum.
- Conduct additional drills. (Tornado, Intruder, Fire)

Cost/Benefit Analysis: Conducting additional drills would not require additional funding, however we feel that two drills per year is sufficient for students in grades 6 through 12, and a minimum of four drills are required for students in grades kindergarten through fifth. Throughout this process, it was discovered that tornado readiness and response procedures are already included in our curriculum at several grade
levels however; our current facilities are not adequate to safely house nor secure our student and staff population during a drill or actual disaster event.

While construction of a storm shelter would require a higher initial cost, the benefits outweigh this cost when increased student and community safety is considered. Additionally, this project would stimulate the local economy by providing construction opportunities and bringing income to local businesses. This was determined to be high priority because of the high likelihood of tornadoes affecting our school and community and due to the large number of individuals that would be impacted. Secondly, at the present time, there is not an adequate facility to shelter a large population in the event of a disaster or crisis situation.

**Responsible Agency**: Smithville R-II Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools  
**Plan Goal Addressed**: Improve student safety from natural and man-made hazards.  
**Timeline**: Long-term – Within next two years  
**Target Capacity**: 2200  
**Estimated Cost**: $1.95 million  
**Funding**: School District through General Obligation Bonds, Federal Grant  
**Priority**: High

**Action 2. Establish and communicate an effective crisis management plan.**

Ideas for Implementation:
- Establish a school safety committee consisting of the school safety coordinator, superintendent, SRO, additional administrators, certified and non-certified staff, patrons, and students.
- Revise the existing site-based crisis management plan to improve ease of use. (Create Quick Reference Flip-Chart, Update Crisis Management Manual, Provide training)
- Educate and disseminate information for the Board of Education, district staff, parents, patrons, emergency personnel, and city government about the necessity of severe weather and crisis planning at school and at home.
- Conduct meetings and training with emergency personnel on how to access the Safe Room after hours. Create an incident command flow chart for use of Safe Room after normal hours.

**Cost/Benefit Analysis**: Having an effective crisis management plan creates a solid foundation on which other mitigation efforts can be built. Refining the existing site-based plan to improve ease of use represents the most cost-effective measure to effectively communicate the plan. While establishing safety committees, training, etc. are certainly options to consider in the future, making the crisis management plan more easily understandable immediately improves both student and staff safety – as assigned roles, duties/responsibilities, etc. will be more tacitly stated. Since staff will be used to draft and incorporate the revisions, the only costs associated with this course of action are for printed materials.

**Responsible Agency**: Smithville R-II School District School Safety Coordinator  
**Plan Goal Addressed**: Improve student safety from natural and man-made hazards.  
**Timeline**: Short-term – completion goal of August 2011  
**Estimated Cost**: $750  
**Funding**: Local school district  
**Priority**: High
Action 3. Minimize the threat of intruders and civil disturbances.

Ideas for Implementation
- Install video identification system at each main entrance. (Primary Elementary, Upper Elementary, Middle School, High School, and ECSE center).
- Install interior security doors which will require visitors to pass through the administrative office in each building before access the general population.
- Install a keyless entry system on all exterior doors to Safe Room to allow access of emergency personnel after school hours.
- Number all exterior doors with identification plates to allow first responders identified access.

Cost/Benefit Analysis: Installing all of the above additional security measures would outweigh the initial costs as these measures have shown to significantly reduce school violence incidents across the nation. Eventually, all of these measures will be pursued. But, for the purposes of this plan, the most logical and cost effective solution to achieve the desired action is to install a keyless entry system on all exterior doors to the Safe Room to allow access of emergency personnel after school hours.

Responsible Agency: Smithville R-II School District Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools

Plan Goal Addressed: Improve student safety from natural and man-made hazards.

Timeline: Short term – completion goal December 2011

Estimated Cost: $10,000 for keyless entry system on all exterior doors (total of two) to Safe Room

Funding: Local School District General Obligation funds, District capital improvement funds, and Federal Funds

Priority: High

G.4. 2 Implementation of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)

As shown in Table 4.1, the City of Harrisonville is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program. Mitigation goals and actions related to continued compliance with the NFIP are indicated by double asterisks (**) in the City’s mitigation strategy as found in Attachment 2. Flood hazard boundary maps for both the City of Harrisonville and Smithville R-II School District are found in Attachment 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CID</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Initial FHBM Identified</th>
<th>Initial FIRM Identified</th>
<th>Current Effective Map Date</th>
<th>Reg-Emerg Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>290068#</td>
<td>HARRISONVILLE, CITY OF</td>
<td>CASS COUNTY</td>
<td>03/15/74</td>
<td>11/1/1979</td>
<td>03/16/06</td>
<td>11/1/1979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section G.5: Plan Maintenance

Section G.5.1 Monitoring, Evaluating and Updating the Plan

Accomplished in accordance with the procedures outlined in Section 5.1, pgs. 5.1 – 5.3.

Section G. 5.2 Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Throughout the planning process information for each hazard risk assessment was requested from and provided to each jurisdiction. Utilizing this two-way approach, participating jurisdictions helped form the risk assessment section while at the same time incorporating information from it into their own local planning mechanisms. The MARC-developed survey asked jurisdictions to provide information on eight different categories:

- Ordinances related to natural hazard mitigation
- Land use planning
- Zoning
- Subdivision regulations
- Building codes
- Land acquisition
- Other community programs
- Technical documents

For each category, the jurisdiction was asked to list how their answers would be incorporated into the Hazard Mitigation Plan, which would then drive local planning mechanisms. The end goal is the establishment of a cyclical process whereby local planning mechanisms input data for the update of the Hazard Mitigation Plan, which in turn outputs strategies, goals, actions, hazard data, etc., for reincorporation back into local planning mechanisms. Table 5.1 below summarizes the information provided by the City of Harrisonville through the survey.
### TABLE 5.2: INCORPORATION INTO HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING (SUMMARY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Natural Hazard Mitigation Ordinances</th>
<th>Land Use Planning</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Subdivision Regulations</th>
<th>Building Codes</th>
<th>Land Acquisition</th>
<th>Other Community Programs</th>
<th>Technical Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonville</td>
<td>Used to describe local capabilities</td>
<td>Used to describe local capabilities</td>
<td>Used to describe local capabilities</td>
<td>Used to describe local capabilities</td>
<td>Used to describe local capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation goals and actions, hazard information incorporated into Emergency Management, Growth Management and Capital Improvement Plans</td>
<td>Used to identify areas for mitigation activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 1: SMITHVILLE R-II SCHOOL DISTRICT BOUNDARY