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Sample language can include the following: This chapter provides an overview of the overall strategy for plan maintenance and outlines the method and schedule for monitoring, updating and evaluating the plan. The chapter also discusses incorporating the plan into existing planning mechanisms and how to address continued public involvement.

## Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan10(a)

**44 CFR Requirement 201.6(c)(4): The plan maintenance process shall include a section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.**

### Responsibility for Plan Maintenance

The MPC can be a standing committee, with oversight by a responsible agency or elected body. Oversight responsibility could fall to such entities as the county emergency management agency, the Regional Planning Commission or Council of Governments, or Local Emergency Operations Committee. If the MPC is not a standing committee, responsibility for maintenance needs to be delegated to another individual or entity. Describe the role of the MPC or other entity in plan monitoring, evaluation and maintenance. Maintenance should involve agreement of the participating jurisdictions, including school and special districts, to:

* + - * Meet annually10(b), and after a disaster event, to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the plan;
      * Act as a forum for hazard mitigation issues;
      * Disseminate hazard mitigation ideas and activities to all participants;
      * Pursue the implementation of high priority, low- or no-cost recommended actions;
      * Maintain vigilant monitoring of multi-objective, cost-share, and other funding opportunities to help the community implement the plan’s recommended actions for which no current funding exists;
      * Monitor and assist in implementation and update of this plan;
      * Keep the concept of mitigation in the forefront of community decision making by identifying plan recommendations when other community goals, plans, and activities overlap, influence, or directly affect increased community vulnerability to disasters;
      * Report on plan progress and recommended changes to the County Board of Supervisors and governing bodies of participating jurisdictions; and
      * Inform and solicit input from the public.

The (MPC or other designated responsible entity) is an advisory body and can only make recommendations to county, city, town, or district elected officials. Its primary duty is to see the plan successfully carried out and to report to the community governing boards and the public on the status of plan implementation and mitigation opportunities10(a). Other duties include reviewing and promoting mitigation proposals, hearing stakeholder concerns about hazard mitigation, passing concerns on to appropriate entities, and posting relevant information in areas accessible to the public.

### Plan Maintenance Schedule

The MPC (or other designated responsible entity) agrees to meet annually10(b) and after a state or federally declared hazard event as appropriate to monitor progress and update the mitigation strategy. The County “A” Emergency Management Director will be responsible for initiating the plan reviews and will invite members of the MPC (or other designated responsible entity) to the meeting.

In coordination with all participating jurisdictions, the Emergency Management Director will be responsible for initiating a five-year written update of the plan to be submitted to the Missouri State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) and FEMA Region VII per Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i) of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, unless disaster or other circumstances (e.g., changing regulations) require a change to this schedule.

### Plan Maintenance Process

The plan must identify how, when and by whom the plan will be assessed for effectiveness at achieving its stated purpose and goals (evaluating). Progress on the proposed actions can be monitored by evaluating changes in vulnerabilities identified in the plan. The MPC (or other designated responsible entity) during the annual10(b) meeting should review changes in vulnerability identified as follows:

* + - * Decreased vulnerability as a result of implementing recommended actions,
      * Increased vulnerability as a result of failed or ineffective mitigation actions,
      * Increased vulnerability due to hazard events, and/or
      * Increased vulnerability as a result of new development (and/or annexation).

Future 5-year updates to this plan will include the following activities:

* + - * Consideration of changes in vulnerability due to action implementation,
      * Documentation of success stories where mitigation efforts have proven effective,
      * Documentation of unsuccessful mitigation actions and why the actions were not effective,
      * Documentation of previously overlooked hazard events that may have occurred since the previous plan approval,
      * Incorporation of new data or studies with information on hazard risks,
      * Incorporation of new capabilities or changes in capabilities,
      * Incorporation of growth data and changes to inventories, and
      * Incorporation of ideas for new actions and changes in action prioritization.

In order to best evaluate any changes in vulnerability as a result of plan implementation, the participating jurisdictions will adopt the following process:

* Each proposed action in the plan identified an individual, office, or agency responsible for action implementation. This entity will track and report on an annual10(b) basis to the jurisdictional MPC (or designated responsible entity) member on action status. The entity will provide input on whether the action as implemented meets the defined objectives and is likely to be successful in reducing risk.
  + - * If the action does not meet identified objectives, the jurisdictional MPC (or designated responsible entity) member will determine necessary remedial action, making any required modifications to the plan.

Changes will be made to the plan to remedy actions that have failed or are not considered feasible. Feasibility will be determined after a review of action consistency with established criteria, time frame, community priorities, and/or funding resources. Actions that were not ranked high but were identified as potential mitigation activities will be reviewed as well during the monitoring of this plan. Updating of the plan will be accomplished by written changes and submissions, as the (MPC or designated responsible entity) deems appropriate and necessary. Changes will be approved by the County “A” Board of (Supervisors or Commissioners) and the governing boards of the other participating jurisdictions.

## Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

**44 CFR Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.**

The updated plan must explain how the jurisdiction(s) integrated information from the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, as a demonstration of progress in local hazard mitigation efforts. If information from the previous plan was not integrated into other planning mechanisms, this must be stated.

The plan must also describe **each participating community’s** process to integrate the hazard mitigation plan data, information, and goals and actions set forth in this update into other planning mechanisms. These local planning mechanisms **must** be named. Planning mechanisms are governance structures that are used to manage local land use development and community decision-making, such as comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, or other long‐range plans. This should be consistent with the list of planning mechanisms captured in the Data Collection Questionnaire. In addition, this should be consistent with planning mechanisms indicated in individual action plans. Following is some sample language:

Where possible, plan participants, including school and special districts, will use existing plans and/or programs to implement hazard mitigation actions. Those existing plans and programs were described in Section \_\_\_\_ of this plan. Based on the capability assessments of the participating jurisdictions, communities in County “A” will continue to plan and implement programs to reduce losses to life and property from hazards. This plan builds upon the momentum developed through previous and related planning efforts and mitigation programs and recommends implementing actions, where possible, through the following plans:

[select plans/programs that pertain to the jurisdictions participating in the mitigation plan]

* + - General or master plans of participating jurisdictions;
    - Ordinances of participating jurisdictions;
    - County “A” Emergency Operations Plan;
    - Capital improvement plans and budgets;
    - Other community plans within the County, such as water conservation plans, storm water management plans, and parks and recreation plans;
    - School and Special District Plans and budgets; and
    - Other plans and policies outlined in the capability assessment sections for each jurisdiction in Chapter 2 of this plan.

The MPC (or designated responsible entity) members involved in updating these existing planning mechanisms will be responsible for integrating the findings and actions of the mitigation plan, as appropriate. The MPC (or designated responsible entity) is also responsible for monitoring this integration and incorporation of the appropriate information into the five-year update of the multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan.

Additionally, after the annual10(b) review of the Hazard Mitigation Plan, the County “A” Emergency Management Director will provide the updated Mitigation Strategy with current status of each mitigation action to the County (Boards of Supervisors or Commissions) as well as all Mayors, City Clerks, and School District Superintendents10(a). The Emergency Management Director will request that the mitigation strategy be incorporated, where appropriate, in other planning mechanisms.

**Table 5.1** below lists the planning mechanisms by jurisdiction into which the Hazard Mitigation Plan will be integrated.

1. Planning Mechanisms Identified for Integration of Hazard Mitigation Plan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Jurisdiction** | **Planning Mechanisms** | **Integration Process for Previous Plan** | **Integration Process for Current Plan** |
| Unincorporated County | Highway Department Capital Improvement Project List | Highway Department attended all planning meetings and identified actions relating to transportation infrastructure were included in annual update to CIP List | Highway Department attended all planning meetings. Identified new actions or ongoing actions relating to transportation infrastructure will be included in annual update to CIP List |
|  |  |  |  |

## Continued Public Involvement

**44 CFR Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): [The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.**

The hazard mitigation plan update process provides an opportunity to publicize success stories resulting from the plan’s implementation and seek additional public comment. Information about the annual10(b) reviews will be posted in the local newspaper, as well as, on the County “A” website following each annual10(b) review of the mitigation plan10(a) and will solicit comments from the public based on the annual review. When the MPC reconvenes for the five-year update, it will coordinate with all stakeholders participating in the planning process. Included in this group will be those who joined the MPC after the initial effort, to update and revise the plan. Public notice will be posted and public participation will be actively solicited, at a minimum, through available website postings and press releases to local media outlets, primarily newspapers.

## CRS Activity Points

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Community Rating System (CRS) Planning Steps (Activity 510)** | **Local Mitigation Planning Handbook Tasks  (44 CFR Part 201)** |
| Step 10. Implement, evaluate, revise | Task 7: Keep the Plan Current |
| Task 9: Create a Safe and Resilient Community  44 CFR 201.6(c)(4) |

## 10. Implement, evaluate and revise. (max: 26)

* + - 1. 2 points - If the community has procedures for monitoring implementation, reviewing progress, and recommending revisions to the plan in an annual evaluation report. The report must be submitted to the governing body, released to the media, and made available to the public. (REQUIRED)   
           
         Preparation of Chapter 5 outlines the community procedures for monitoring implementation, reviewing progress, and recommending revisions to the plan. As noted in Section 5.1.1, the MPC will also need to report on plan progress and recommended changes to the governing bodies of participating jurisdictions; and inform and solicit input from the public. Posting this progress report to the community website is recommended.
      2. Up to 24 points - If the annual evaluation report is prepared by the same planning committee that prepared the plan that is credited in CRS Step 2(a) or by a successor committee with a similar membership that was created to replace the planning committee and charged with monitoring and evaluating implementation of the plan. The points are based on how frequently the committee meets. The committee must continue to meet the representation, quorum, and other criteria that determined the credit points under CRS Step 2(a).
* 6 points - Committee meets only once a year.
* 12 points - Committee meets twice a year.
* 24 points - Committee meets at least quarterly.

This Chapter 5 template document notes “annual” meetings throughout. For additional CRS points, the MPC should seek to meet on a more regular basis and update the text accordingly.