

## Chapter 11: Implement the Plan and Monitor Progress

### 11.1: Funding the Implementation

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. The following table provides a list of some of the known funding sources.

**Table 11.1: Mitigation Project Funding Matrix for Local Projects**

Source - Name	Type	Type of projects	Limitations	Levels of funding
<b>Federal</b>				
FEMA – Hazard Mit. Grant Prog.	Grant	Construction and property protection	Only available after Presidential dec.	Up to 85% Fed/State
FEMA—Pre-disaster Mit. Prog.	Grant	Construction and property protection	Annual competition	Up to 75% Federal
FEMA—Flood Mit. Assistance	Grant	Flood projects	Only available after Presidential dec.	Up to 85% Fed/State
FEMA—Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program	Grant	Equip., hiring, training, vehicles, fire prevention	Fire depts only can apply	Annual competition, 95% Federal
USACE—Challenge 21 Program	Grant	Non-structural watershed-based flood	Limited assistance	Limited
USACE—Streambank Protection Program (Section 14)	Grant	Protect critical assets in flood areas	Limited assistance	65% Federal
USACE—Emergency Readiness and Response	Grant/Tech Assist.	Workforce and information	Limited assistance	Limited
DHS—State Homeland Security Prog.	Grant	Various terrorism-related projects	Projects must meet specific requirements	Depends on annual appropriation
FEMA Bioterrorism Program	Grant	Terrorism projects	Projects must meet specific requirements	Depends on annual appropriation
DOC/EDA—Public Works Prog.	Grant	Roads, water, sewer, electric infrastructure	Tied to economic dev projects	Generally 50% of cost
HUD—Brownfields Economic Dev Program	Grant	Remove contaminants from developed land	Tied to economic dev projects	Limited
EPA—Brownfields Programs	Grant	Assessments, cleanups	Tied to economic dev projects	Generally 50% of cost
USDA—Conservation Reserve Prog.	Indiv Assist	Funding to idle land to buffer properties	Not a grant but funding for owners	Payments to landowners
USDA—Water and Waste Prog.	Grant and loan	Water and sewer infrastructure	USDA involved in engineering	Depends on local poverty level
USDA—Solid Waste Program	Grant	Landfill programs	Limited – little brick and mortar funding	Generally 50% of cost
USDA—Community Facilities Prog.	Grant and loan	Generators, equip., vehicles, shelters, and fire station	USDA involved in design	Depends on local poverty level
USDA—Small Watershed Prog.	Grant	Watershed programs	Limited funding	Limited
<b>State of Iowa (including Federal funding to the State)</b>				
State Disaster Fund	Grant	Specific needs	Limited funding	Limited
I-Jobs Funding	Grant	Specific infrastructure and recovery progs.	Short-term in next year	Generally 50% of cost
IDED—Comm. Dev. Block Grant (CDBG)	Grant	Infrastructure and comm. facility projs.	Meet national income objectives	Generally 50% of cost
IDED—CDBG Imminent Threat Fund	Grant	Specific emergency infrastructure	Contingency fund only	May pay most of cost
IDALS—Watershed Improvement Review Board	Grant	Flood control and related projects	Must be watershed-based	May pay most of cost
IDNR—Flood Technical Assist.	Tech Assist	Assistance to communities	Depends on staff availability	No true grant funds
IDOT—Traffic Safety Improvement Program	Grant	Various highway and road projects	Heavy IDOT involvement	Limited
IDOT—Fed-Aid Rail/Hwy Crossing Safety Program	Grant	Signage and traffic lights	Heavy IDOT involvement	Limited
IDOT—State Grade Crossing Safety/Surface Repair Prog.	Grant	Crossing improvements	Heavy IDOT involvement	Limited

Marion County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan of 2012-2016

IDOT—Operation Lifesaver	Grant	Road and rail safety education	Education only – not cash	Limited
IDOT—Various rail and road programs	Grant	Road and rail construction/repair	Heavy IDOT involvement	Some up to 80% State
IDOT—HAZMAT Awareness Program for First Responders	Tech Assist	Training by state officials of HAZMAT	Education only – not cash	Limited
IDPS—Firefighter training programs	Tech Assist	Training for firefighters	Education only – no or limited funding	Limited
IDED—Response 2020	Grant	First response planning funds	No bricks and mortar funds	Limited amt available
Iowa Dry Hydrant Program	Grant	Install rural dry hydrants	Limited number per county	Limited amt available
IDALS—Iowa Buffer Initiative	Grant	Flood control projects	No bricks and mortar	Limited amt available
IDALS—Water Quality Protection Program	Grant	Flood control projects	Water quality focus	Limited amt available
IDALS—State Soil Conservation Cost Share	Grant	Flood control projects	Water quality focus	Limited amt available
IDALS—Iowa Watershed Protection Program	Grant	Flood control projects	Water quality focus	Generally 50% of cost
Iowa Dept of Commerce—Pipeline Safety Program	Tech Assist	Assistance with pipeline inspections	No funding	Limited
IDPH—EMS Education & Training Program	Grant	Education and training for first responders	Limited funding	Limited
IDPH—EMS Provider Authorization/Cert. Prog.	Tech Assist	Certifications management	Limited or no funding	Limited
IDPH—Public Health Nursing Prog.	Tech Assist	Nursing programs	Limited or no funding	Limited
IDPH—EMS System Dev. Prog.	Grant	EMS equip, planning, etc. funding	Limited funding	Limited – usually formula based
IDPH—Bioterrorism Surveillance and Epidemiology Prog.	Tech Assist	Terrorism health focus	Limited or no funding	Limited
IDPH—Public Health & Healthcare Disaster Preparedness Prog.	Tech Assist	Planning and other assistance for public health needs	Limited or no funding	Limited
Private and Non-profit Funding				
American Red Cross	Tech Assist	Staffing, technical assistance, volunteers	Partnerships should be in place before event	Limited
Marion County Endowment Foundation	Grant	Various brick and mortar	Competing for local dollars	Makes good local match for govt grants
US Smokeless Tobacco ATV Grant	Grant	Purchase rescue equipment and ATVs	Limited funding	Generally 50% of cost
Iowa Farm Bureau Federation	Grant	Projects that protect land and environment	Must apply through county IFB office	Gap financing
Grants from local business and industry, such as Pella Corp	Grant	Capital projects with broad support, community programs	Set by the business or company	Can be large grants but usually corporate donations and challenge grants
Alliant Energy Foundation	Grant	Equipment and supplies	Not brick and mortar, must be an Alliant community	Generally 50% of cost or challenge grants
Pella Electric Coop – USDA funding	Grants, loans	Equipment and supplies	Limited funding	Limited

Sources: SICOG, 2011; Iowa Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2007; [www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov), 2007

While almost all actions will require local funds and some in-kind contributions, outside funding will be needed for many of them as a match to local funds. 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 [www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov), including brochures, case studies, source lists, and links to other funding sites. 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. It is important to engage public elected officials in the budgeting process using a capital improvements plan and strategic planning to acquire needed expensive equipment and programs over multiple budget cycles.

In addition, there are many new resources becoming available as a result of the State and FEMA Region VII response to flooding and severe storms since 2007. Flood mapping, watershed planning, and other mitigation projects may fall under resources offered by these state and federal governments as well as ISU Extension.

### **11.2: Plan Review**

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 Crosswalk, attached in *Appendix J*. This guidance can supplement the mitigation plan in *Chapter 10* to help the implementation teams and leaders through each action to see how it relates to the DMA of 2000. The FEMA hazard mitigation planning main guidebook is known as the “Blue Book.” It can be obtained from FEMA free as a PDF file from [www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov). This plan, as drafted today, is not final until FEMA approves the plan with or without changes. The adopted plan includes those changes that are required. Recommended changes can be made also at any time.

### **11.3: Annual Review and Update**

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, and 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 PDM, 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.

FEMA and SICOG can provide templates for plan reviews and updates. The existing planning team or a newly appointed team can be appointed to assist the local jurisdiction with annual updates.

### **11.4: 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’s how-to guide 386-4, “Bringing the Plan to Life: Implementing the Hazard Mitigation Plan,” downloadable from [www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov), provides 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 can be internally as related to a given mitigation action and may not be made public or incorporated into the plan file.

### **11.5: Opportunities for Publicity**

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

### **11.6: Planning Team’s Role in Implementing the Plan**

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 can evolve into one of a

watchdog over the practices of land developers and public officials. 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, state universities, schools, and churches via memoranda of agreement.

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

**Table 11.2: Implementation of Plan Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms**

Current Planning Mechanism	Jurisdictions Currently In Place	Method of incorporation	Who Responsible or Lead
Comprehensive land use plan	In place for the county and larger towns only	Review each, develop plans in other jurisdictions	Zoning commissions and staff
Capital improvements plan	Not much formal in place	Modernize each, develop plans if they are outdated	Public works directors and staff
Economic development plan	Larger towns have plans and staff, no regional org specifically for this task	Add a mitigation section to annual regional plan	City clerks, supervisors, Chambers, ED groups, regional associations
Open space/conservation plan	Limited, focused on county conservation sites	Incorporate mitigation projects affecting open spaces into plans	Conservation board/staff, City parks/recreation staff
Watershed protection plans	Limited, focused on certain watershed areas	Address mitigation actions in watershed areas	EMC and NRCS/SWCD
Zoning ordinance	In place in larger towns and county	Review zoning code concerning applicable hazards	Zoning commissions and staff
Subdivision regulations	In place in larger towns and county	Review subdivision code concerning applicable hazards	Zoning commissions and staff
Building codes	In place in larger towns and county	Update building codes for fire and wind standards	Building inspector, floodplain manager
Tree maintenance codes	Found in most jurisdictions; generally limited in scope	Consult with utilities	City and county public works officials
Soil erosion/water control ordinance	None known to be in place	Consult with NRCS/SWCD & DNR	Local governments, NRCS/SWCD
Solid/hazardous waste regulations	Limited but in all jurisdictions	Review regulations as to what can be landfilled, add hazard maps	EMC and landfill commission
Public health regulations	All jurisdictions	Collaborate with PH agencies to incorporate new protocols	EMC and public health board and staff
Historic district programs	Pella, Knoxville	Provide data to assist in protecting properties	Development groups with State IDED assistance
Downtown revitalization programs	Pella, Knoxville	Provide data to assist in protecting properties	Development groups with State IDED assistance
Long-range transportation plan	Mainly county, but all cities to lesser degree	Incorporate hazard maps and transportation improvement ideas	County engineer, IDOT, Area RPA
Water source plan	All jurisdictions through rural water associations	Include mitigation actions related to relevant hazards	CIRWA, Marion RWA, Mahaska RWA, Knoxville Water Works, Pella
Storm water management program	Limited in most of the towns, traditional sewer	Include mitigation actions related to flash flooding	Floodplain manager, public works, EMA
Housing and special needs plans	Limited for each city – not part of City itself	Consider mitigation recommendations in housing plans and funding requests for improvements	Area Housing Trust Fund, CIRHA, hospitals, special needs boards
Administrative operations processes – departments and boards	All jurisdictions but small cities have very limited budgets for staff	Convene meetings where possible realignment of tasks, new or improved tasks and processes, and board goals are updated	EMA, 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.

### **11.7: Five-year Major Updates**

FEMA approved mitigation plans expire five years after the date FEMA approves the mitigation plan (see *Appendix J* for the FEMA letter). In order not to 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 mid 2014. From time to time, HMGP and PDM funding is available to fund up to 85% of the planning costs for the plan update. The scope of work for a plan update is similar to this initial plan except one of the added features is that the initial plan will be thoroughly evaluated in the new plan. The jurisdictions will be required to address the results of implementation of the initial 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.

### **11.8: Non-Adopting Jurisdictions**

Several jurisdictions in the county that could receive FEMA funds have either not participated in the plan or did not participate adequately in order to meet planning requirements. These jurisdictions can finish participation in the process and adopt the plan and request FEMA approval in order to access those funds. They can also participate in the next county multi-jurisdictional plan update, whether or not their participation is as an initial plan or an update.

### **11.9: Final Summary**

After adoption, the approved plan will be held at each city hall, the county courthouse, emergency management office, and at other relevant locations for future review and consultation. Persons can view the plan free of charge or make copies at low cost.

A public meeting will be held after any and all plan updates and public comments, concerns, opinions, and questions will be given serious consideration.

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