

Chapter 5: Plan Implementation

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.

This part of the plan addresses the following Stafford Act requirement:

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

Clarke County Plan Update Changes to the Implementation Process

Updated information and new guidance documents are provided and referenced. Sections were added to describe more practical issues related to implementation decisions made by the jurisdictions.

5.1: Plan Review and Adoption

A review evaluates a plan for compliance with the DMA of 2000. It also serves as a tool for improving the quality of plans. A high quality plan that is well monitored will guide the community to the maximum reduction of risks. The planning consultant and FEMA have completed the Plan Review comments form, attached in Appendix G. This guidance can supplement the mitigation strategy in Chapter 4 to help the implementation teams and leaders through each action to see how it relates to the DMA of 2000. FEMA guidance for review and implementation of the plan can be found at <https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/risk-management/hazard-mitigation-planning/create-hazard-plan> and <https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/risk-management/hazard-mitigation-planning/regulations-guidance>. The *Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide* of 2011 is featured on this website as the official guidance for plan reviews. This plan, as drafted today, is not final until FEMA approves it. The adopted plan includes those changes that are required. Recommended changes can be made also at any time.

During the local plan review period of March-April 2022, the public was invited to review and comment on the plan, which was available electronically and as hard copies at the Clarke County EMA office. They could make comments directly to the consultant or at the final planning team meeting. The public was alerted through local news media. Jurisdictions that adopted the plan during the initial review period have included resolutions in *Appendix A*.

5.2: Evaluating the Plan

Periodically, as warranted, a major step in the plan implementation process is the plan evaluation. The effort should be made to determine if the planned course of action and the current implementation of the course of action has had the desired effect on each jurisdiction. FEMA has how-to guides, downloadable at <https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/risk-management/hazard-mitigation-planning/create-hazard-plan>, which provide ideas, examples, and funding information that can guide the community in the evaluation and implementation processes. Evaluation can be formal or informal. Formal evaluation includes public meetings where the jurisdiction or a multi-jurisdictional planning team discusses the status of implementation and what can be improved. Informal evaluation may be done internally as related to a given mitigation action and may not be made public or incorporated into the plan file. Again, the public should be invited to all formal meetings where the plan is discussed and possible changes can be made. Local media should be used to alert the public. Each jurisdiction is responsible for evaluation of the parts of the plan relevant to the said jurisdiction.

5.3: Implementation Policies and Issues

The hazard mitigation planning team was created to develop the mitigation plan and guide the plan preparer. The planning team should not formally end with the approval of the plan. The planning team should

become a watchdog to help local officials move the plan’s goals forward and should take a key role in implementing projects. Members can help remind public officials of that particular year’s mitigation strategy and possible funding options and can volunteer in the implementation process for certain actions. The team and local governments may participate in the process and engage regional organizations, state agencies, colleges, schools, NGOs, and churches via memoranda of agreement.

Throughout the mitigation plan, there are gaps in data that are outlined. In addition to specific mitigation actions in this chapter, it is important that the participating jurisdictions review this plan periodically as the County prepares for the next five-year update of this plan. This process would help satisfy FEMA Region VII requirements. Missing data should be found and included by the next major update.

This hazard mitigation plan is a guide for future policy planning for participating jurisdictions in the county. The plan considers demographic trends and projections, community background information, current and future political decisions, and overall important goals and objectives for the county’s jurisdictions. The goals and objectives have been developed to reflect the general consensus of the county’s hazard mitigation planning team, the broad range of elected officials, and the citizenry of the county. These recommendations have been developed to look five-plus years into the future with the expectation that periodic updates will occur in order to reflect changes within the county.

The success of this plan will require the support of the emergency management commission/agency, elected officials, department heads, and volunteers (including civic groups, academia, and general citizens). Cooperation from the public and private sectors will allow implementation of the recommendations that will provide long-term benefits for the entire county and each jurisdiction. By implementing these recommendations, the jurisdictions will be furthering other civic goals also.

Simply listing a project or discussing an issue does not cause anything to be done about it. It is vital that the jurisdictions make a sustained effort to implement projects, actions, and policies as outlined in Chapter 4. Reviewing the text intermingled among the tables and lists also provides ideas on *how* to carry out the plan and meet mitigation goals. This chapter also provides more details about the regular activities involved in carrying out this plan and preparing for future planning efforts.

5.4: Funding the Implementation

Local funding is required to implement local mitigation projects. Possible sources of local funds include:

- Fundraisers,
- General tax revenue,
- Fees for service,
- Tax increment financing and other tax incentives,
- Creation of new utility funds, namely a storm water utility, and
- In-kind labor and use of equipment and machinery.

Funding sources vary over time and by project type, applicant agency, and jurisdiction. However, all jurisdictions in the county have access to funds from outside the local government or applicant organization for most projects. Because this plan is funded in part by a Stafford Act grant program, the following table details the current funding sources available from the Stafford Act. Details are found on at <https://www.fema.gov/grants/mitigation>.

Figure 5.1: FEMA Stafford Act Funding Sources Relevant to the Planning Area

Source – Name	Type	Type of Projects	Limitations	Funding Levels
Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)	Non-competitive grant following a federal disaster declaration	Typically funds the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood elevations and buyouts as well as building reconstruction • Hazard mitigation planning • Tornado safe rooms • Localized flooding prevention • Berms around critical assets, businesses, and homes • Structural retrofits to buildings, utilities, and other infrastructure • Slope stabilization projects • Drainage improvement projects • Post-disaster code enforcement 	75% FEMA for eligible costs; 10% State, 15% local	When State of Iowa issues a funding notice calling for applications following a disaster.
Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC)	Competitive annual grant not tied to a declaration	Generally same activities as HMGP but can be even more flexible if the applicant can show it has a direct impact on loss reduction.	Generally, 75% FEMA for eligible costs; 25% local; however, economically distressed rural communities can receive 90% grants	Annual appropriation nationwide with some sub-allocations to States
Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) Program	Competitive annual grant not tied to a declaration	Flood mitigation activities and detailed research on flooding issues in a community, primarily for communities in good standing with the NFIP.	Limited to communities in the NFIP program and some funding is targeted to RLPs; 75% FEMA for eligible costs; 25% local; higher grant share available for RFPs	Annual appropriation nationwide

Source: <https://www.fema.gov/grants/mitigation>

While almost all actions will require local funds and some in-kind contributions, outside funding will be needed for most projects. Funding is available if one is willing to seek it for most of the proposed mitigation actions. FEMA has several guides on federal funds on <https://www.fema.gov/grants/mitigation>, including brochures, case studies, source lists, and links to other funding sites.

Many other sources of funds, besides FEMA, exist that can help with mitigation project funding. Local organizations that currently undertake projects with mitigation effects, such as NRCS, fire associations, RC&D, and area community colleges, may have funding or may offer programs for local governments, first responders, and landowners already. Flood mapping, watershed planning, and other mitigation projects may fall under resources offered by these state and federal governments as well as ISU Extension.

Local jurisdictions are invited to contact groups serving Clarke County, such as SICOG, to assist with identifying and applying for both FEMA and non-FEMA grants for various mitigation projects. Major funding entities including the following.

Common federal agency funding sources:

- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
- Small Business Administration (SBA)
- US Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

Common State of Iowa funding sources (including federal funds passing through Iowa):

- Iowa Economic Development Authority (IEDA)
- Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR)
- Iowa Finance Authority (IFA)
- Iowa Department of Human Services (DHS)
- Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship (IDALS)
- Iowa Department of Transportation (IDOT)
- Iowa Department of Public Safety (DPS)
- Iowa Department of Public Health (IDPH)

Common sources of NGO funding:

- Community foundations
- Private foundations – which fund specific types of projects and initiatives, mostly with hazard mitigation as a side effect of the effort
- Utilities providers and corporations with a presence in the area
- Service organizations with mitigation focus, such as American Red Cross
- Agricultural entities and companies

It is important to engage public elected officials in the budgeting process using a capital improvement plan and strategic planning to acquire needed expensive equipment and programs over multiple budget cycles.

5.5: Annual Review and Plan Maintenance Process

The DMA of 2000 suggests that each local jurisdiction review the plan annually. Principally, each jurisdiction’s government body and key staff should review the actual implementation plan for that jurisdiction. A review of capabilities, goals/objectives, and proposed actions is particularly warranted. It is important that the review notes and suggested changes be made at a public meeting and records are kept. If any of the changes relate to a project that is being submitted to FEMA, such as through a BRIC, FMA, or HMGP application, the jurisdiction must adopt the changes at a council or supervisor meeting to make the changes officially part of the plan and thus eligible for mitigation funding. The local jurisdictional body, such as city council, board of supervisors, or school board, is responsible for ensuring reviews are completed.

In *Appendix F* are templates that can be used to help with reviews and updates. Again, the public should be invited to all formal meetings where the plan is discussed and possible changes can be made. Local media should be used to alert the public. Each jurisdiction is responsible for review of the parts of the plan relevant to the said jurisdiction.

Evaluation of progress can be achieved by monitoring changes in vulnerabilities identified in the plan. Changes in vulnerability can be identified by noting:

- Decreased vulnerability as a result of implementing recommended actions;
- Increased vulnerability as a result of failed or ineffective mitigation actions; and/or
- Increased vulnerability as a result of new development (and/or annexation).

The annual reviews and updates to this plan will:

- Consider changes in vulnerability due to action implementation;
- Document success stories where mitigation efforts have proven effective;
- Document areas where mitigation actions were not effective;
- Document any new hazards that may arise or were previously overlooked;

- Incorporate new data or studies on hazards and risks;
- Incorporate new capabilities or changes in capabilities;
- Incorporate growth and development-related changes to inventories; and
- Incorporate new action recommendations or changes in action prioritization.

In order to best evaluate the mitigation strategy during plan review and update, the participating jurisdictions will follow the following process:

- A representative from the responsible office identified in each mitigation action will be responsible for tracking and reporting the action status on an annual basis to the jurisdictional HMPC member and providing input on any completion details or whether the action still meets the defined objectives and is likely to be successful in reducing vulnerabilities.
- If the action does not meet identified objectives, the jurisdictional HMPC member will determine what additional measures may be implemented, and an assigned individual will be responsible for defining action scope, implementing the action, monitoring success of the action, and making any required modifications to the plan.
- As part of the annual review process, the Clarke County Emergency Management Coordinator will provide the updated mitigation strategy with current status of each mitigation action to local elected officials of various jurisdictions requesting that the mitigation strategy be incorporated, where appropriate in other planning mechanisms.

Changes will be made to the plan to accommodate for actions that have failed or are not considered feasible after a review of their 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 and update of this plan to determine feasibility of future implementation. Updating of the plan will occur by written changes and submissions, as the planning team deems appropriate and necessary, and as approved by the Clarke County Board of Supervisors and the governing boards of the other participating jurisdictions.

5.6: Opportunities for Publicity

Once the plan is prepared, support can be maintained and grown throughout the implementation process.

This part of the plan addresses the following Stafford Act requirement:

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

Several times the local media can make comments about the effort and successes that may arise:

- Adoption of the mitigation plan;
- Receipt of approval by FEMA;
- Initiation and completion of tangible mitigation actions or projects;
- Update and evaluation meetings and results.

Annually, each jurisdiction should hold at least one public meeting or hearing that is publicized so that the public can comment on the status of the mitigation plan’s implementation and changes that are needed to the plan.

5.7: Incorporation Into Existing Planning Mechanisms

The County and many of the cities in Clarke County do not have standing formal planning mechanisms such as a comprehensive plan or capital improvements plan through which formal integration of mitigation actions can be documented. As a result, activities that occur in these small communities are developed

through annual budget planning, regular city council meetings, board meetings, and other community forums rather than a formal planning process.

This part of the plan addresses the following Stafford Act requirement:

Section 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 improvements, when appropriate.

The planning team is partly responsible to ensure that the public officials are incorporating mitigation actions into relevant plans and planning mechanisms, such as zoning, annexation plans, and bonding proposals. Communities should also include mitigation initiatives as regular line items in community capital or operational budgets to ensure ongoing funding for hazard mitigation initiatives.

The local jurisdictions did not incorporate any of the mitigation actions into existing plans in any formal sense since the previous plan was adopted. However, mitigation ideas were incorporated informally in budget decisions, such as to fund a mitigation action. The jurisdictions commit to improved formal planning efforts in the next five years.

The following matrix describes each jurisdiction’s individual process for integrating hazard mitigation actions into other planning mechanisms.

Figure 5.2: Potential Planning Integration by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Integration Process for Previous Plan	Integration Process for Plan Update
Clarke County	Mitigation plan was incorporated into the current Emergency Operations Plan and the most recent Comprehensive Plan	The plan will continue to be reviewed and integrated, as appropriate, in future updates of the EOP and comprehensive plan. Additionally, annual updates of the mitigation strategy will be provided to the EMA and County department heads for review and incorporation into annual budget planning that is completed by each County department each January-March.
City of Murray	No formal integration reported	No formal comprehensive or capital improvement plans exist for this community. The annual update of the mitigation strategy will be provided to the Mayor and City Clerk for consideration by the City Council as ordinances are reviewed/updated and as funds are available for improvement projects. Short-term and comprehensive planning will be considered.
City of Osceola	Mitigation plan was incorporated into the current Comprehensive Plan	The city has a comprehensive plan, a street improvements plan, and zoning. The city is working on a plan for storm water improvements. The annual update of the mitigation strategy will be provided to the Mayor and City Clerk for consideration by the City Council as ordinances are reviewed/updated and as funds are available for improvement projects. Short-term and long-term planning will be continued.
City of Woodburn	No formal integration reported	No formal comprehensive or capital improvement plans exist for this community. The annual update of the mitigation strategy will be provided to the Mayor and City Clerk for consideration by the City Council as ordinances are reviewed/updated and as funds are available for improvement projects. Short-term planning will be considered.
Clarke CSD	No formal integration reported	The annual update of the mitigation strategy will be provided to the School Superintendent for consideration in the next update cycle of the capital improvement plan.
Murray CSD	No formal integration reported	The annual update of the mitigation strategy will be provided to the School Superintendent for consideration in the next update cycle of the capital improvement plan.
Southwestern Community College Osceola Campus	No formal integration reported	The annual update of the mitigation strategy will be provided to SWCC’s leadership for consideration in the next update cycle of the capital improvement plan.

Jurisdiction	Integration Process for Previous Plan	Integration Process for Plan Update
Clarke County Hospital	No formal integration reported	The annual update of the mitigation strategy will be provided to CCH’s leadership for consideration in the next update cycle of the capital improvement plan.

The following matrix shows the types of planning mechanisms available and how this plan should be incorporated into them.

Figure 5.3: Integration of This Plan into Other Planning Mechanisms

Current Planning Mechanism	Jurisdictions Currently in Place	Method of Incorporation	Who Responsible or Lead?
Comprehensive land use plan	Clarke County, Osceola	Review each, develop plans in other jurisdictions	Zoning commissions and staff
Capital improvements plan	Osceola	Modernize each, develop plans if they are outdated	Public works directors, engineers, and staff
Economic development plan	All participate in a regional plan	Add a mitigation section to annual regional plan	City clerks, supervisors, SICOG
Open space/conservation plan	No formal plans	Incorporate mitigation projects affecting open spaces into plans that are drafted	Conservation board/staff, city parks & recreation staff
Watershed protection plans	Limited areas of Ringgold County; parts of Osceola	Address mitigation actions in watershed areas	EMC and NRCS/SWCD; City of Osceola
Zoning ordinance	Clarke County, Osceola	Review zoning code concerning applicable hazards	Zoning commissions and staff
Subdivision regulations	Clarke County, Osceola	Review subdivision code concerning applicable hazards	Zoning commissions and staff
Building codes	Clarke County and Osceola in process	Update building codes for fire and wind standards; adopt them	Building inspector, floodplain manager
Tree maintenance codes	Limited in all areas	Consult with utilities	City and county public works officials
Soil erosion/water control ordinance	Limited in all areas	Consult with NRCS/SWCD & DNR	EMA and NRCS/SWCD
Solid/hazardous waste regulations	All county through landfill region	Review regulations as to what can be landfilled, add hazard maps	EMA and landfill commission
Public health regulations	All county through Public Health	Collaborate with PH agencies to incorporate new protocols	EMA and public health board and staff
Historic district programs	Osceola	Provide data to assist in protecting properties	Osceola Chamber, preservation groups
Downtown revitalization programs	Osceola	Provide data to assist in protecting properties	Cities, chambers, SICOG, preservation groups
Long-range transportation plan	All county through the regional planning agency	Incorporate hazard maps and transportation improvement ideas	County engineer, IDOT, Chariton Valley Planning
Water source plan	All county through intergovernmental agreements	Include mitigation actions related to relevant hazards	SIRWA, RC&D (if one created)
Storm water management program	Murray and Osceola in process	Include mitigation actions related to flash flooding	Floodplain manager, city clerk, EMC, county engineer
Housing and special needs plans	No formal plans adopted	Consider mitigation recommendations in housing plans and funding requests for improvements	SICOG, SIRHA, hospital, special needs boards
Administrative operations processes – departments and boards; local budgets	All jurisdictions	Convene meetings where realignment of tasks, new or improved tasks and processes, and goals are updated	EMC, elected officials, clerks and board chairs

It is strongly recommended that staff and elected/appointed officials become aware of the mitigation strategy and its practical applications. An annual review of local planning mechanisms is warranted, simply to give the local leaders an opportunity to think about how mitigation actions affect the local planning mechanisms and to ensure local plans are current. Each jurisdiction is responsible for incorporation of mitigation ideas into relevant plans. Policies should be in place to govern local decisions about how to use jurisdictional budget funding for specific activities that are not mitigation directly but might affect mitigation priorities. An example might include a mitigation checklist to be used for all capital and land use decisions. The FEMA guide, “Integrating Hazard Mitigation Into Local Planning: Case Studies and Tools for Community Officials,” (March 2013) is a good resource to assist local officials in this process.

5.8: Five-year Major Updates

FEMA approved mitigation plans expire five years after the date FEMA approves the mitigation plan (see Appendix G for the FEMA letter). In order to not miss out on potential FEMA funding, a new plan should be authored and submitted for FEMA approval before that date. Because it takes considerable time for a multi-jurisdictional plan update, the community should begin this process by early 2026. From time to time, HMGP funding is available to fund up to 85% of the planning costs for the plan update. The jurisdictions will be required to address the results of implementation of this plan, how hazard impacts have changed, and how goals and objectives have changed. Further, many of the FEMA recommended but not required improvements will have to be addressed in the five-year update.

5.9: Non-Adopting Jurisdictions

Appendix A contains adoption resolutions to date, which enables these jurisdictions to apply for FEMA mitigation funds. All jurisdictions can adopt the plan within the next year and be included or can participate in the next plan update.

5.10: Acknowledgements

After adoption, a hard copy of the approved plan will be held at the Clarke County Emergency Management office. Persons can view the plan free of charge or make copies at low cost. Electronic copies will be available to any agency or individual by contacting the EMA at 641.342.6654 or SICO at 641.782.8491.

The planning consultant thanks the hard work the Clarke County Emergency Management Agency, the planning team, reviewers at the Iowa HSEMD and FEMA Region VII who assisted with reviews during the plan’s writing, and other professionals, including those from other COGs, who provided insight into improving the plan.