

Update 7-24-19

Jurisdiction: Cole	Title of Plan:	Date of Plan:
Local Point of Contact:	Address:	
Title:		
Agency:		
Phone Number:	E-Mail:	
Funding Source:		
State Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
MOA Sign Date:	Data Collection Date:	Start Risk Assessment Date:
FEMA Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Date Received in FEMA Region VII		
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption		
Plan Approved		

Only Plan Participating Jurisdiction(s):	NFIP Status*			
	Y	NP	S-Date	R-Date
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				

* **Notes: Y= Participating NP = Not Participating in NFIP S- Sanctioned R- Rescinded**

SECTION 1: REGULATION CHECKLIST

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS				
A1. Does the Plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(1))				
A2. Does the Plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as other interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement §201.6(b)(2))				
A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1))				
A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))				
A5. Is there discussion of how the community(ies) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii))				
A6. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a 5-year cycle)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i))				
<u>ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT				
B1. Does the Plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction(s)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))				
B2. Does the Plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))				
B3. Is there a description of each identified hazard’s impact on the community as well as an overall summary of the community’s vulnerability for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))				
B4. Does the Plan address NFIP insured structures within the jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))				
<u>ELEMENT B: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY				
C1. Does the plan document each jurisdiction’s existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3))				
C2. Does the Plan address each jurisdiction’s participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))				
C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))				
C4. Does the Plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))				
C5. Does the Plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including cost benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii))				
C6. Does the Plan describe a process by which local governments will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii))				
<u>ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION (applicable to plan updates only)				
D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))				
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))				
D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))				
<u>ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION				
E1. Does the Plan include documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))				
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))				
<u>ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
Note: If the plan is not adopted by a participating jurisdiction, that jurisdiction would not be eligible for project grants under the following hazard mitigation assistance programs: HMGP, PDM, FMA, and SRL.				
ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENT (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)				
F1. The use of SEMA’s Hazard Mitigation Plan Outline Format is required for County level/multi-jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plans. Does the Plan follow the Plan Outline Format in accordance this state requirement?				
<u>ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				

SECTION 2: PLAN ASSESSMENT (For FEMA)

A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas where these could be improved beyond minimum requirements.

INSTRUCTIONS: The purpose of the Plan Assessment is to offer the local community more comprehensive feedback to the community on the quality and utility of the plan in a narrative format. The audience for the Plan Assessment is not only the plan developer/local community planner, but also elected officials, local departments and agencies, and others involved in implementing the Local Mitigation Plan. The Plan Assessment must be completed by FEMA. The Assessment is an opportunity for FEMA to provide feedback and information to the community on: 1) suggested improvements to the Plan; 2) specific sections in the Plan where the community has gone above and beyond minimum requirements; 3) recommendations for plan implementation; and 4) ongoing partnership(s) and information on other FEMA programs, specifically RiskMAP and Hazard Mitigation Assistance programs. The Plan Assessment is divided into two sections:

1. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement
2. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement is organized according to the plan Elements listed in the Regulation Checklist. Each Element includes a series of italicized bulleted items that are suggested topics for consideration while evaluating plans, but it is not intended to be a comprehensive list. FEMA Mitigation Planners are not required to answer each bullet item, and should use them as a guide to paraphrase their own written assessment (2-3 sentences) of each Element.

The Plan Assessment must not reiterate the required revisions from the Regulation Checklist or be regulatory in nature, and should be open-ended and to provide the community with suggestions for improvements or recommended revisions. The recommended revisions are suggestions for improvement and are not required to be made for the Plan to meet Federal regulatory requirements. The italicized text should be deleted once FEMA has added comments regarding strengths of the plan and potential improvements for future plan revisions. It is recommended that the Plan Assessment be a short synopsis of the overall strengths and weaknesses of the Plan (no longer than two pages), rather than a complete recap section by section.

Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan provides a place for FEMA to offer information, data sources and general suggestions on the overall plan implementation and maintenance process. Information on other possible sources of assistance including, but not limited to, existing publications, grant funding or training opportunities, can be provided. States may add state and local resources, if available.

A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas where these could be improved beyond minimum requirements.

Element A: Planning Process

How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the planning process with respect to:

- *Involvement of stakeholders (elected officials/decision makers, plan implementers, business owners, academic institutions, utility companies, water/sanitation districts, etc.);*
- *Involvement of Planning, Emergency Management, Public Works Departments or other planning agencies (i.e., regional planning councils);*
- *Diverse methods of participation (meetings, surveys, online, etc.); and*
- *Reflective of an open and inclusive public involvement process.*

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

In addition to the requirements listed in the Regulation Checklist, 44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans identifies additional elements that should be included as part of a plan's risk assessment. The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of:

- 1) *A general description of land uses and future development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions;*
- 2) *The types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas; and*
- 3) *A description of potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures, and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate.*

How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment with respect to:

- *Use of best available data (flood maps, HAZUS, flood studies) to describe significant hazards;*
- *Communication of risk on people, property, and infrastructure to the public (through tables, charts, maps, photos, etc.);*
- *Incorporation of techniques and methodologies to estimate dollar losses to vulnerable structures;*
- *Incorporation of Risk MAP products (i.e., depth grids, Flood Risk Report, Changes Since Last FIRM, Areas of Mitigation Interest, etc.); and*
- *Identification of any data gaps that can be filled as new data became available.*

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the Mitigation Strategy with respect to:

- *Key problems identified in, and linkages to, the vulnerability assessment;*
- *Serving as a blueprint for reducing potential losses identified in the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment;*
- *Plan content flow from the risk assessment (problem identification) to goal setting to mitigation action development;*

- *An understanding of mitigation principles (diversity of actions that include structural projects, preventative measures, outreach activities, property protection measures, post-disaster actions, etc);*
- *Specific mitigation actions for each participating jurisdictions that reflects their unique risks and capabilities;*
- *Integration of mitigation actions with existing local authorities, policies, programs, and resources; and*
- *Discussion of existing programs (including the NFIP), plans, and policies that could be used to implement mitigation, as well as document past projects.*

Element D: Plan Update, Evaluation, and Implementation (Plan Updates Only)

How does the Plan go above and beyond minimum requirements to document the 5-year Evaluation and Implementation measures with respect to:

- *Status of previously recommended mitigation actions;*
- *Identification of barriers or obstacles to successful implementation or completion of mitigation actions, along with possible solutions for overcoming risk;*
- *Documentation of annual reviews and committee involvement;*
- *Identification of a lead person to take ownership of, and champion the Plan;*
- *Reducing risks from natural hazards and serving as a guide for decisions makers as they commit resources to reducing the effects of natural hazards;*
- *An approach to evaluating future conditions (i.e. socio-economic, environmental, demographic, change in built environment etc.);*
- *Discussion of how changing conditions and opportunities could impact community resilience in the long term; and*
- *Discussion of how the mitigation goals and actions support the long-term community vision for increased resilience.*

B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

A variety of mitigation resources are available to communities. SEMA's mitigation website:

http://sema.dps.mo.gov/programs/mitigation_management.asp provides planning and project related information as well as details on how major FEMA mitigation programs are implemented in the State.

SEMA's training website provides information on upcoming training opportunities within the State:

<http://training.dps.mo.gov/sematraining.nsf/TrainingSchedule?OpenForm>.

Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) is a method that determines the future risk reduction benefits of a hazard mitigation project and compares those benefits to its cost. The Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) must be 1.0 or greater to be an eligible project. <https://www.fema.gov/grants/guidance-tools/benefit-cost-analysis>

Review of the Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide (10/1/11) <https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/23194> is encouraged as guidance for the Hazard Mitigation Plan Review Tool. The FEMA HMA guidance (FY15 is the most current) is also encouraged as guidance provides information about application and eligibility requirements. This guidance is available from

http://sema.dps.mo.gov/programs/mitigation_management.asp or through FEMA's grant applicant resources page at http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/hma/grant_resources.shtm.

As noted above, various funding programs are available from several state and federal agencies to assist local jurisdictions in accomplishing their mitigation activities and goals. A detailed listing of programs, information on each program, and contact information is available from the 2013 State Hazard Mitigation Plan on page 4.72/PDF 775. Heidi Carver, State Hazard Mitigation Officer, (Heidi.Carver@sema.dps.mo.gov), Jenner Storey, Deputy State Hazard Mitigation Officer, (Jennifer.Storey@sema.dps.mo.gov) Mary Smith, Lead State Hazard Mitigation Specialist, (Mary.Smith@sema.dps.mo.gov), and Sarah Crawford, State Hazard Mitigation Specialist, (Sarah.Crawford@sema.dps.mo.gov) can provide additional contacts for specific programs.

There are several RiskMAP projects that are currently in Discovery phase. As a Cooperating Technical Partner (CTP), the NFIP and Floodplain Section at SEMA, has a role in implementing these projects. Jurisdictions that are part of these projects have been contacted directly regarding these efforts and have been asked to participate in one or more RiskMAP/ Discovery meetings. These meetings have been scheduled throughout Missouri to present similar information, and all meetings offer opportunities for questions about the program and process.

Karen McHugh (State NFIP Coordinator and State Floodplain Administrator), Linda Olsen, and Lynn Welch. Darryl Rockfield (with the NFIP and Floodplain Section at SEMA) can be contacted for additional information on RiskMAP or Discovery meetings through <http://sema.dps.mo.gov/about/staff.asp>.