



1 INTRODUCTION AND PLANNING PROCESS

1.1 Purpose

Montgomery County and twenty-three other jurisdictions prepared this local hazard mitigation plan to guide hazard mitigation planning to better protect the people and property of the County from the effects of hazard events. This plan demonstrates the communities' commitment to reducing risks from hazards and serves as a tool to help decision makers direct mitigation activities and resources. This plan was also developed to make Montgomery County and participating jurisdictions eligible for certain federal disaster assistance, specifically, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, Pre-Disaster Mitigation program, and Flood Mitigation Assistance program.

1.2 Background and Scope

Each year in the United States, natural disasters take the lives of hundreds of people and injure thousands more. Nationwide, taxpayers pay billions of dollars annually to help communities, organizations, businesses, and individuals recover from disasters. These monies only partially reflect the true cost of disasters, because additional expenses to insurance companies and nongovernmental organizations are not reimbursed by tax dollars. Many natural disasters are predictable, and much of the damage caused by these events can be alleviated or even eliminated.

Hazard mitigation is defined by FEMA as "any sustained action taken to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to human life and property from a hazard event." The results of a three-year, congressionally mandated independent study to assess future savings from mitigation activities provides evidence that mitigation activities are highly cost-effective. On average, each dollar spent on mitigation saves society an average of \$4 in avoided future losses in addition to saving lives and preventing injuries (National Institute of Building Science Multi-Hazard Mitigation Council 2005).

Hazard mitigation planning is the process through which hazards that threaten communities are identified, likely impacts of those hazards are determined, mitigation goals are set, and appropriate strategies to lessen impacts are determined, prioritized, and implemented. This plan documents Montgomery County's hazard mitigation planning process and identifies relevant hazards, vulnerabilities, and strategies the County and participating jurisdictions will use to decrease vulnerability and increase resiliency and sustainability in Montgomery County.

The Montgomery County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan is a multi-jurisdictional plan that geographically covers everything within Montgomery County's jurisdictional boundaries (hereinafter referred to as the planning area). The following 23 jurisdictions participated in the planning process:

- Unincorporated Montgomery County
- City of Caney
- City of Cherryvale
- City of Coffeyville
- City of Dearing
- City of Havana
- City of Elk City
- City of Independence
- City of Liberty
- Unified School District 436
- Unified School District 445
- Unified School District 446
- Unified School District 447
- Coffeyville Community College
- Independence Community College
- Special Districts
 - Rural Fire District #1
 - Public Wholesale Water Supply District #4
 - Water District #6
 - Water District #7
 - Water District #8
 - Water District #10
 - Water District #11
 - Water District #12
 - Water District #13

In addition to the local governments, several private non-profit entities participated in this effort providing support and contributing to the mitigation strategy:

- St. Andrew Catholic School
- Zion Lutheran School
- Four County Mental Health
- Radiant Electric Cooperative
- Independence Bible School
- Harry Hynes Hospice
- Montgomery County VOAD
- COAC Cultural Arts Council
- Coffeyville Regional Medical Center
- SEK Senior Services
- Class LTD

- MG County RACES
- Action Council
- Crisis Resource Center
- American Red Cross
- Coffeyville Friends of Animals
- Mercy Hospital

This plan was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-390) and the implementing regulations set forth by the Interim Final Rule published in the *Federal Register* on February 26, 2002, (44 CFR §201.6) and finalized on October 31, 2007. (Hereafter, these requirements and regulations will be referred to collectively as the Disaster Mitigation Act.) While the act emphasized the need for mitigation plans and more coordinated mitigation planning and implementation efforts, the regulations established the requirements that local hazard mitigation plans must meet in order for a local jurisdiction to be eligible for certain federal disaster assistance and hazard mitigation funding under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Act (Public Law 93-288).

Information in this plan will be used to help guide and coordinate mitigation activities and decisions for local land use policy in the future. Proactive mitigation planning will help reduce the cost of disaster response and recovery to communities and their residents by protecting critical community facilities, reducing liability exposure, and minimizing overall community impacts and disruptions. The Montgomery County planning area has been affected by hazards in the past and the participating jurisdictions are therefore committed to reducing future impacts from hazard events and becoming eligible for mitigation-related federal funding.

1.3 Plan Organization

The Montgomery County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan is organized as follows:

- Executive Summary
- Prerequisites
- Chapter 1: Introduction and Planning Process
- Chapter 2: Planning Area Profile and Capabilities
- Chapter 3: Risk Assessment
- Chapter 4: Mitigation Strategy
- Chapter 5: Plan Implementation and Maintenance
- Appendices

1.4 Planning Process

44 CFR Requirement 201.6(c)(1): [The plan shall document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.

The Kansas Division of Emergency Management contracted with AMEC Earth and Environmental (AMEC) in November 2007 to assist Montgomery County in developing a multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard mitigation plan. Montgomery County Emergency Management took the lead in developing this plan with AMEC's assistance. AMEC's role was to:

- Assist in establishing the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (HMPC) as defined by the Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA),
- Meet the DMA requirements as established by federal regulations and following FEMA's planning guidance,
- Facilitate the entire planning process,
- Identify the data requirements that HMPC participants could provide and conduct the research and documentation necessary to augment that data,
- Assist in facilitating the public input process,
- Produce the draft and final plan documents, and
- Coordinate the Kansas Division of Emergency Management and FEMA Region VII plan reviews.

1.4.1 Multi-Jurisdictional Participation

44 CFR Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process and has officially adopted the plan.

Montgomery County invited incorporated cities, school districts, the community colleges, special districts, private non-profit entities, key business partners, and elected officials in the County to participate in the multi-jurisdictional Montgomery County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Disaster Mitigation Act requires that each jurisdiction participate in the planning process and officially adopt the multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan. Each jurisdiction that chose to participate in the planning process and development of the plan was required to meet plan participation requirements defined at the beginning of the process, which included the following:

- Designate a representative to serve on the HMPC
- Participate in at least one of three HMPC meetings by either direct representation or authorized representation (2 or more was preferred, but 1 was allowed to accommodate Havana, which is a very small city, as well as some small special districts).
- Provide information to support the plan development by completing and returning the AMEC Data Collection Guide
- Identify mitigation actions for the plan

- Review and comment on plan drafts
- Inform the public, local officials, and other interested parties about the planning process and provide opportunity for them to comment on the plan
- Formally adopt the mitigation plan

All of the jurisdictions listed as official participants in this plan met all of these participation requirements. The Unified School District 445 authorized the Montgomery County Emergency Manager to represent them at the meetings. The Authorized Representative Resolution is provided in Appendix B (Item 22).

Table 1.1 shows the attendance of representatives at each meeting; sign-in sheets are included in Appendix B: Planning Process Documentation.

Table 1.1. Jurisdictional Participation in Planning Meetings

Jurisdiction	HMPC Kickoff Meeting	HMPC Meeting #2	HMPC Meeting #3
Montgomery County	X	X	X
City of Caney	X	X	X
City of Cherryvale	X		X
City of Coffeyville	X	X	X
City of Dearing		X	X
City of Havana			X
City of Elk City	X	X	X
City of Independence		X	X
City of Liberty		X	X
Unified School District 436			X
Unified School District 445	AR	AR	AR
Unified School District 446	X		X
Unified School District 447	X		
Coffeyville Community College		X	X
Independence Community College		X	X
Rural Fire District #1	X	X	X
Public Wholesale Water Supply District #4		X	X
Water District #6			X
Water District #7			X
Water District #8	X	X	X
Water District #10			X
Water District #11	X		X
Water District #12		X	X
Water District #13	X	X	X

1.4.2 The 12-Step Planning Process

AMEC and Montgomery County Emergency Management worked together to establish the framework and process for this planning effort using FEMA's *Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation*

Planning Guidance (2008) and the State and Local Mitigation Planning How-To Guides (2001), which include *Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Planning* (2006). The plan is structured around a four-phase process:

- 1) Organize resources
- 2) Assess risks
- 3) Develop the mitigation plan
- 4) Implement the plan and monitor progress

Into this process, AMEC integrated a modified detailed 12-step planning process used for FEMA’s Community Rating System (CRS) and Flood Mitigation Assistance programs. Thus, the modified 12-step process used for this plan meets the funding eligibility requirements of the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, Pre-Disaster Mitigation program, Community Rating System, and Flood Mitigation Assistance program. Table 1.2 shows how the modified 12-step process fits into FEMA’s four-phase process.

Table 1.2. Mitigation Planning Process Used to Develop the Montgomery County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

DMA Process	Modified CRS Process
1) Organize Resources	
201.6(c)(1)	1) Organize the Planning Effort
201.6(b)(1)	2) Involve the Public
201.6(b)(2) and (3)	3) Coordinate with Other Departments and Agencies
2) Assess Risks	
201.6(c)(2)(i), (iii)	4) Identify the Hazards
201.6(c)(2)(i), (iii)	5) Profile the Hazards
201.6(c)(2)(ii), (iii)	6) Identify Assets
201.6(c)(2)(ii), (iii)	7) Estimate Losses
3) Develop the Mitigation Plan	
201.6(c)(3)(i)	8) Set Goals
201.6(c)(3)(ii)	9) Review Possible Activities
201.6(c)(3)(iii)	10) Draft an Action Plan
4) Implement the Plan and Monitor Progress	
201.6(c)(5)	11) Adopt the Plan
201.6(c)(4)	12) Implement, Evaluate, and Revise the Plan

Phase I Organize Resources

Step 1: Organize the Planning Effort

The planning process officially began with a kickoff meeting in Independence, Kansas, on June 12, 2008. Montgomery County Emergency Management mailed letters of invitation to the kickoff meeting to county, municipal, district, state, federal, and other stakeholder representatives. This list is included in Appendix B.

A Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (HMPC) was created that includes representatives from each participating jurisdiction, departments of the County, and other local, state, and federal organizations responsible for making decisions in the plan and agreeing upon the final contents. Kickoff meeting attendees discussed potential participants and made decisions about additional stakeholders to invite to participate on the HMPC. A complete list of all agencies and organizations that participated on the Montgomery County HMPC is provided in Appendix B.

The HMPC contributed to this planning process by:

- providing facilities for meetings,
- attending and participating in meetings,
- collecting data,
- managing administrative details,
- making decisions on plan process and content,
- submitting mitigation action implementation worksheets,
- reviewing drafts, and
- coordinating and assisting with public involvement and plan adoptions.



The HMPC communicated during the planning process with a combination of face-to-face meetings, phone interviews, and email correspondence. The meeting schedule and topics are listed in Table 1.3. The sign-in sheets, agendas, and meeting minutes for each of the meetings are included in Appendix B.

Table 1.3. Schedule of HMPC Meetings

Meeting	Topic	Date
HMPC #1	Kickoff meeting: introduction to DMA, the planning process, and hazard identification. Distribution of data collection guide to jurisdictions.	June 12, 2008
HMPC #2	Review of risk assessment. Identification of plan goals and objectives.	August 14, 2008
HMPC #3	Mitigation action identification and prioritization. Determine process to monitor, evaluate, and update plan.	October 6, 2008

During the kickoff meeting, AMEC presented information on the scope and purpose of the plan, participation requirements of HMPC members, and the proposed project work plan and schedule. Plans for public involvement (Step 2) and coordination with other agencies and departments (Step 3) were discussed. AMEC also introduced hazard identification requirements and data. The HMPC discussed past events and impacts and future probability for each of the hazards required by FEMA for consideration in a local hazard mitigation plan. The HMPC refined the list of hazards to make it relevant to Montgomery County.

Participants were given the AMEC Data Collection Guide to facilitate the collection of information needed to support the plan, such as data on historic hazard events, values at risk, and current capabilities. Each participating jurisdiction completed and returned the worksheets in the Data Collection Guide document to AMEC. AMEC integrated this information into the plan, supporting the development of Chapters 2 and 3.

Step 2: Plan for Public Involvement

44 CFR Requirement 201.6(b): An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan. In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process shall include: (1) An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval.

At the kickoff meeting, the HMPC discussed options for soliciting public input on the mitigation plan and developed an outreach strategy by consensus.

During the drafting stage, the HMPC held “Disaster Planning Resource Fairs” at public libraries during the week of November 3-8, 2008. Several FEMA publications were made available as well as a flyer summarizing the progress of planning efforts underway and a short questionnaire to capture public comments. The public was informed of the availability of plan information through an announcement in the *Independence Daily Reporter*. Copies of the plan summary flyer, questionnaire, and newspaper notice are included in Appendix B.

In the questionnaire, the general public was asked to indicate the level of risk, or extent of potential impacts, in Montgomery County that they perceive for each hazard. They were asked to

rate the impacts of each hazard profiled in this plan as 1=negligible, 2=limited, 3=moderate, 4=critical, or 5 catastrophic. Nineteen surveys were completed resulting in the ranking order provided in Table 1.4 from greatest perceived impacts to least perceived impacts. To provide a comparison, the ranking order developed by the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee is provided in the far right column. The methodology used by the committee is discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

Table 1.4 Public Perception of Hazard Impacts (High to Low)

Public Hazard Ranking	Average Impact Rating	HMPC Hazard Ranking
Tornado	4.63	Tornado
Flood	4.42	Windstorm
Hailstorm	3.79	Winter Storm
Dam and Levee Failure	3.58	Utility / Infrastructure Failure
Winter Storm	3.37	Flood
Utility/Infrastructure Failure	3.11	Drought
Windstorm	2.74	Major Disease Outbreak
Drought	2.58	Dam and Levee Failure
Extreme Heat	2.42	Agricultural Infestation
Lightning	2.37	Hailstorm
Agricultural Infestation	2.16	Wildfire
Major Disease Outbreak	2.05	Extreme Heat
Wildfire	2.05	Lightning
Soil Erosion and Dust	1.68	Landslide
Earthquake	1.58	Expansive Soils
Expansive Soils	1.47	Soil Erosion & Dust
Landslide	1.37	Earthquake

The public was also asked to review the types of mitigation actions being considered by the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee and place a check next to the five types of mitigation actions that they felt should be given the highest priority. Table 1.5 provides the compiled results of this question. In addition, Appendix C provides a comparison table of the public prioritization versus the HMPC prioritization.

Table 1.5 Public Prioritization of Types of Mitigation Actions

Project Type	Total Public "votes"
Wastewater treatment plant and infrastructure floodproofing	10
Water treatment floodproofing	10
Levee system modification/improvement	9
Mosquito Control	9
Ice Storm Mitigation for Utility lines	8
Tornado saferoom construction in new and existing schools	7
Community/Hospital Tornado Shelters	6
Outdoor Warning Siren installation/expansion	6
Back-up Generators for Critical/Special Needs Facilities	5
Emergency Communications expansion/improvement	3
Floodwater Erosion Control	3
Public Information/Emergency Procedures	3
Continued Participation in the National Flood Insurance Program	2
Crop Disease Prevention Research	2
Digital map layers for hazard areas	2
Geographically Separate Power Grid	2
Power plant and infrastructure floodproofing	2
Swift water rescue training	2
Floodprone Property Buyout	1
Reverse 911	1
Stormwater Improvement Projects	1
Wildfire prevention and damage reduction	1
Landslide damage prevention for roads	0
Lightning Arresting Systems on buildings and power infrastructure	0
Peak demand power outage mitigation	0
Perimeter Monitoring of Critical Facilities and Utilities	0

The public was also given an opportunity to provide input on a draft of the complete plan prior to its submittal to the State and FEMA. Montgomery County provided the plan draft for review and comment on the Montgomery County website at http://www.mgcountyks.org/emerg_prep.htm and in hard copy at the following locations:

- Montgomery County Courthouse
- Caney City Library
- Cherryvale Public Library
- Coffeyville Public Library
- Independence Public Library

The plan was available at these locations from November 17-28, 2008. The jurisdictions announced the availability of the draft plan and the public comment period in the *Coffeyville Journal and the Independence Daily Reporter*. Copies of these articles are provided in Appendix B.

The HMPC invited other targeted stakeholders to comment on the draft plan by letter, which is described in greater detail in Step 3: Coordinate with Other Departments and Agencies. Minor comments and corrections were received and incorporated in the plan.

Step 3: Coordinate with Other Departments and Agencies

44 CFR Requirement 201.6(b): An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan. In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process shall include: (2) An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process. (3) Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.

There are numerous organizations whose goals and interests interface with hazard mitigation in Montgomery County. Coordination with these organizations and other community planning efforts is vital to the success of this plan. Montgomery County Emergency Management invited other local, state, and federal departments and agencies to the kickoff meeting to learn about the hazard mitigation planning initiative. Many of the agencies participated throughout the planning process on the HMPC and were listed previously in Step 1: Organize the Planning Effort.

In addition, the HMPC developed a list of neighboring communities and local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, as well as other interests, to invite by letter to review and comment on the draft of the Montgomery County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. A copy of this letter and the address list is provided in Appendix B.

As part of the coordination with other agencies, the HMPC collected and reviewed existing technical data, reports, and plans. These included the Kansas State Hazard Mitigation Plan, Montgomery County Basic Operations Plan, Independence Flood Insurance Study (1995),

Coffeyville Flood Insurance Study (1975), Coffeyville Country Club Dam Emergency Action Plan (1993), Data Recovery of the June-July 2007 Flood in Region VII (2007), reports from the National Flood Insurance Program's Community Information System, Kansas Forest Service Community Wildfire Hazard Assessment Report for Montgomery County (2008), as well as other data from state and federal agencies. This information was used in the development of the hazard identification, vulnerability assessment, and capability assessment and in the formation of goals, objectives, and mitigation actions. These sources are documented throughout the plan and in Appendix A: References.

Phase 2 Assess Risk

Step 4: Identify the Hazards

AMEC assisted the HMPC in a process to identify the natural hazards that have impacted or could impact communities in Montgomery County. At the kickoff meeting, the HMPC examined the history of disaster declarations in Montgomery County, the list of hazards required by FEMA for consideration, and additional hazards included in the Kansas State Plan. The committee then worked through this list of all potential hazards that could affect the planning area. They discussed past hazard events, types of damage, and where additional information might be found. There were several hazards that the committee chose to exclude from further review. Justification is provided for each hazard removed from further review in Section 3.1.

Step 5: Profile the Hazards

During the kick-off meeting, the HMPC refined the list of hazards to make the analysis relevant to Montgomery County, discussed past events and impacts and came to consensus on the probability level for each hazard. During the second meeting, the planning committee reviewed the magnitude, duration, and warning elements that were utilized in preparation of the preliminary hazard profiles and made recommendations for modifications to more accurately reflect the impacts of the hazards in the planning area. A profile of each of these hazards was then developed. Web resources, existing reports and plans, and existing geographic information systems (GIS) layers were used to compile information about past hazard events. This information, supplemented by information provided by the HMPC, was used to develop profiles detailing the location, previous occurrences, probability of future occurrences, and magnitude/severity of each hazard. The data collection guide distributed at the kickoff meeting also provided information to identify hazards and vulnerabilities. More information on the methodology and resources used to identify and profile the hazards can be found in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

Step 6: Identify Assets

After profiling the hazards that could affect Montgomery County, the HMPC collected information to describe the likely impacts of future hazard events on the participating jurisdictions. This step included two parts: a vulnerability assessment and a capability assessment.

Vulnerability Assessment—Participating jurisdictions inventoried their assets at risk to natural hazards—overall and in identified hazard areas. These assets included total number and value of structures; critical facilities and infrastructure; natural, historic, and cultural assets; economic assets; and vulnerable populations. The HMPC also analyzed development trends in hazard areas. FEMA’s loss estimation computer software, HAZUS-MH, was utilized to provide information on populations at risk as well as estimated numbers and values of buildings at risk. The assets at risk were discussed for the planning area as a whole for those hazards that do not vary geographically. Additionally, utilizing the HAZUS-MH tool, assets at risk to a 100-year flood in Montgomery County were discussed separately as this hazard varies across the planning area

Capability Assessment—This assessment consisted of identifying the existing mitigation capabilities of participating jurisdictions. This involved collecting information about existing government programs, policies, regulations, ordinances, and plans that mitigate or could be used to mitigate risk to disasters. Participating jurisdictions collected information on their regulatory, personnel, fiscal, and technical capabilities, as well as ongoing initiatives related to interagency coordination and public outreach. This information is included in Chapter 2 Planning Area Profile and Capabilities.

Step 7: Estimate Losses

Where sufficient information was available, a variety of methods was used to estimate losses for each profiled hazard that received a moderate or high planning significance level. For the flood hazard, FEMA’s loss estimation computer software, HAZUS-MH was utilized to estimate losses in the planning area as a result of a 100-year flood event. The methodology is described in detail for each hazard analysis that included a loss estimate. This information can be found in Section 3.3.3

Results of the risk assessment were presented and comments discussed at the second meeting of the HMPC on August 14, 2008. AMEC provided the draft risk assessment to the HMPC in September 2008 for review and comment by the committee.

Phase 3 Develop the Mitigation Plan

Step 8: Set Goals

AMEC facilitated a brainstorming and discussion session with the HMPC during their second meeting to identify goals and objectives for the overall multi-jurisdictional mitigation plan. To focus the committee on the issues brought out by the risk assessment, key issues were summarized for each hazard profiled. Then the HMPC discussed definitions and examples of goals, objectives, and actions and considered the goals of the state hazard mitigation plan and other relevant local plans. Then, as a group, the HMPC achieved consensus on the final goals and objectives for the multi-jurisdictional plan, which are described in Chapter 4.

Step 9: Review Possible Activities

Prior to the third HMPC meeting, a worksheet was sent to each of the HMPC members for them to develop and record ideas for potential mitigation actions. This worksheet summarized the key issues or problem statements brought out by the risk assessment for each hazard profiled and invited committee members to develop actions to address the problems. The action ideas were requested to be returned ahead of the meeting and were compiled into a list for discussion during the meeting. This “Action Idea” worksheet is provided in Appendix B. During the meeting, the HMPC reviewed the list of actions that had been submitted. As each action was presented, the responsible jurisdiction was identified. After reviewing the actions that were submitted prior to the meeting, additional actions were brainstormed and the responsible jurisdictions identified. Once all actions had been discussed and the responsible jurisdiction identified, the HMPC members were instructed to complete an action identification worksheet and a modified STAPLEE worksheet for each action they wished to include in the plan. The purpose of the action identification worksheet is to document background information, ideas for implementation, alternatives, responsible office, partners, potential funding, cost estimates, benefits, and timeline for each identified action. The modified STAPLEE worksheet was reviewed for the committee members to keep in mind the various elements as they conducted the prioritization exercise described below as well as answer any questions. Special emphasis was placed on the cost-effectiveness of the actions. HMPC members were instructed that a principal eligibility factor for FEMA’s mitigation grant programs requires applicants to demonstrate that the action will not cost more than the anticipated value of the reduction in both direct damages and subsequent negative impacts to the area if future disasters occur. It was explained to the HMPC that cost-effective mitigation actions are those actions that, over time, have a higher value of avoided damages than the cost to implement the measure.

To facilitate the prioritization exercise, the actions that had been submitted prior to the third meeting utilizing the “Action Idea” worksheet had been condensed and listed under general categories and hung on the walls on large white paper. During a break in the meeting, the additional actions that were brainstormed during the meeting were added under the appropriate general category. There were 26 general categories of actions in all. Each member of the HMPC was given six red “voting dots” to place next to the categories that they felt were most important to implement, keeping in mind the STAPLEE considerations that had just been reviewed. Projects were then sorted into high, medium, or low priority based upon the number of votes they received. This process is described in more detail in Chapter 4 Mitigation Strategy.

Step 10: Draft the Plan

A complete draft of the plan was made available online and in hard copy for review and comment by the public and other agencies and interested stakeholders. This review period was from November 17-28, 2008. Methods for inviting interested parties and the public to review and comment on the plan were discussed in Steps 2 and 3, and materials are provided in Appendix B. Comments were integrated into a final draft for submittal to the Kansas Division of Emergency Management and FEMA Region VII.

Phase 4 Implement the Plan and Monitor Progress

Step 11: Adopt the Plan

To secure buy-in and officially implement the plan, the governing bodies of each participating jurisdiction adopted the plan. Scanned copies of resolutions of adoption are included in the Prerequisites section at the beginning of this plan.

Step 12: Implement, Evaluate, and Revise the Plan

The HMPC developed and agreed upon an overall strategy for plan implementation and for monitoring and maintaining the plan over time during Meeting #3. This strategy is described in Chapter 5 Plan Maintenance Process.