2.0 Planning Process

2.1 – Documentation of the Planning Process

44 CFR 201.6(c)(1): Documentation of 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.

In September of 2018, Kansas Region L and its participating jurisdictions began the process to update the Kansas Region L 2014 HMP. It was determined that Jeanne Bunting, the State of Kansas Hazard Mitigation Planner would serve as the project manager, directing this plan update, and would act as the primary point-of-contact throughout the project.

The State of Kansas contracted with Blue Umbrella Solutions to assist in updating the 2014 Kansas Region L HMP. Blue Umbrella’s roles included:

- Ensure that the hazard mitigation plan meets all regulatory requirements
- Assist with the determination and ranking of hazards
- Assist with the assessment of vulnerabilities to identified hazards
- Assist with capability assessments
- Identify and determine all data needs and solicit the information from relevant sources
- Assist with the revision and development of the mitigation actions
- Development of draft and final planning documents

Kansas Region L and its participating jurisdiction undertook the following steps to update and create a robust HMP:

- Review of the 2014 Kansas Region L HMP
- Review of the 2015 Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) HMP
- Review of the MARC Metropolitan Emergency Managers Committee Regional Coordination Guide
- Review of current related planning documents
- Delivery of organizational and planning meetings
- Solicitation of public input as to plan development
- Assessment of potential risks
- Assessment of vulnerabilities and assets
- Development of the mitigation actions
- Development of a draft multi-hazard mitigation plan
- Implementation, adoption, and maintenance of the plan

The process established for this planning effort is based on DMA 2000 planning and update requirements and the FEMA associated guidance for hazard mitigation plans. The FEMA four step recommended mitigation planning process, as detailed below, was followed:

1. Organize resources
2. Assess risks
3. Develop a mitigation plan
4. Implement plan and monitor progress

To accomplish this, the following planning process methodology was followed:

- Inform, invite, and involve other mitigation plan stakeholders throughout the state, including federal agencies, state agencies, regional groups, businesses, non-profits, and local emergency management organizations.
- Conduct a thorough review of all relevant current and historic planning efforts.
- Collect data on all related state and local plans and initiatives. Additionally, all related and relevant local plans were reviewed for integration and incorporation.
- Develop the planning and project management process, including methodology, review procedures, details about plan development changes, interagency coordination, planning integration, and the organization and contribution of stakeholders.
- Develop the profile of the county and participating jurisdictions.
- Complete a risk and vulnerability assessment using a Geographic Information System (GIS) driven approach using data from various local, state and federal agency resources.
- Develop a comprehensive mitigation strategy effectively addressing their hazards and mitigation program objectives. This included identifying capabilities, reviewing pre and post disaster policies and programs, identifying objectives and goals, identifying mitigation actions and projects, and assessing mitigation actions and projects.
- Determination and implementation of a plan maintenance cycle, including a timeline for plan upgrades and improvements.
- Submission of the plan to FEMA Region VII for review and approval and the petition all participating jurisdictional governments for a letter of formal plan adoption.

2.2 – 2019 Plan Changes

44 CFR 201.6(d)(3): A local jurisdiction must review and revise its plan to reflect changes in development, progress in local mitigation efforts, and changes in priorities, and resubmit it for approval within 5 years in order to continue to be eligible for mitigation project grant funding.

The Kansas Region L HMP has undergone significant revision and upgrading since its last edition. Not only has the region made significant efforts to improve the functionality and effectiveness of the plan itself but is has significantly improved its hazard mitigation program. This grants the region’s improved and robust hazard mitigation program a better base to further mold and improve its mitigation strategy over the next five years.

As part of this planning effort, each section of the previous mitigation plan was reviewed and completely revised. The sections were reviewed and revised against the following elements:

- Compliance with the current regulatory environment
- Completeness of data
- Correctness of data
• Capability differentials
• Current state environment

In addition to data revisions, the format and sequencing of the previous plan was updated for ease of use and plan clarity.

During this process, and after a thorough review and discussion with all participating jurisdictions and stakeholders, it was determined that the priorities of the overall community in relation to hazard mitigation planning have not changed during the five years of the previous planning cycle.

2.3 – Mitigation Planning Committee

Upon project initiation a mitigation planning committee (MPC), generally consisting of participating county emergency managers, was formed. From project inception to completion, the MPC was involved in each major plan development milestone, and fully informed through on-site meetings and electronic communication. Prior to the plan’s submission to FEMA, the MPC was invited to review the plan and provide input.

In general, all MPC members were asked to participate in the following ways:

• Provide local engagement with all participating jurisdictions
• Attend and participate in meetings
• Assist with the collection of data and information
• Review planning elements and drafts
• Integrate hazard mitigation planning elements with other planning mechanisms
• Facilitate jurisdictional coordination and cooperation
• Assist with the revision and development of mitigation actions

MPC members who were unable to attend meetings due to budgetary or personnel constraints were contacted via email or phone to discuss hazard mitigation planning, including the process, goals, mitigation actions, local planning concerns and plan review.

Each MPC member was thoroughly interviewed regarding their jurisdiction’s and sub-jurisdiction’s mitigation related activities. These interviews were invaluable in fully integrating the resources necessary to produce this plan, document mitigation activities, and document the mitigation resources available to better increase resiliency.

Additionally, the MPC was used as a conduit to solicit input from all participating jurisdictions under the county. Where appropriate, the MPC solicited the assistance of technical experts from various agencies and groups. When the MPC updated and improved the plan’s mitigation strategy, personnel from strategically selected agencies were interviewed to provide input on their mitigation capabilities.

The following participants were selected for the MPC.
Table 2.1: Kansas Region L Mitigation Planning Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cary Gerst</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Planning</td>
<td>Johnson County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Magaha</td>
<td>Emergency Management Director</td>
<td>Leavenworth County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt May</td>
<td>Emergency Management Director</td>
<td>Wyandotte County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Bunting</td>
<td>Mitigation Planner</td>
<td>State of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Eyer</td>
<td>President (Plan Author)</td>
<td>Blue Umbrella Solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 – Local and Regional Stakeholder Participation

44 CFR Requirement 201.6(b)(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.

The Kansas Region L MPC provided the opportunity for neighboring communities, counties, and local and regional development agencies to be involved in the planning process. Where applicable, these entities were kept informed of the hazard mitigation process during state, regional and local emergency management meetings, gatherings and conferences, in person by MPC members, or were solicited for planning information. In addition, relevant federal, regional, state, local, and private and non-profit entities were also invited to both participate in the HMP and provide input and utilized for information and technical expertise. As reflected in both the participating jurisdictions and the relevant data collected in this HMP, a breadth of stakeholders was involved in the planning process.

2.5 – Public Participation

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.

As part of the overall planning process, the public were provided with numerous opportunities to contribute and comment on the creation and adoption of the plan. These opportunities included:

- Advertised meeting invitations on participating jurisdictional websites
- Open meeting opportunities with Kansas Region L MPC members
- Access to an online survey document to provide feedback
- Comment period upon completion of draft plan

Input from the general public provided the MPC with a clearer understanding of local concerns, increased the likelihood of citizen buy-in concerning proposed mitigation actions, and provided elected officials with a guide and tool to set regional ordinances and regulations. This public outreach effort was also an opportunity for adjacent jurisdictions and entities to be involved in the planning process.
Additionally, as citizens were made more aware of potential hazards and the local process to mitigation against their impacts, it was believed that they would take a stronger role in making their homes, neighborhoods, schools, and businesses safer from the potential effects of natural hazards.

The following graphics represents the feedback received from the public from the online survey document.

**Question 1:** In which county or jurisdiction do you live?

![Number of Survey Responses](image)

**Question 2:** In 2014, the Region consisting of Johnson, Leavenworth and Wyandotte counties, the planning committee determined that the hazards listed below are important to the area. Indicate the level of risk, or the scope of potential impacts, in the Region, that you perceive for each hazard:
Johnson County, Potential Scope of Hazard Impact

Leavenworth County, Potential Scope of Hazard Impact
Wyandotte County, Potential Scope of Hazard Impact

- Negligible
- Limited
- Moderate
- Critical
- Catastrophic
**Question 3:** In the Region, the planning committee has determined that a flood event is the second most critical hazard. How important is it for you to have your community participate in or continue to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program?
**Question 4:** The Kansas Division of Emergency Management currently reviews the application for funds for the FEMA Risk Mitigation Grant Program. Your current funding priorities are listed below. Please check those that could benefit your community.

---

**Percentage of Respondants Prioritizing Mitigation Program Grant Funding Priorities**

- **Power line updates**
- **Acquisition / Demolition / Elevation of flood prone properties**
- **Community, public building and school shelters**
- **Protection of critical facilities**

Johnson County  |  Leavenworth County  |  Wyandotte County

---
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**Question 5:** Have you had the opportunity to read your current Risk Mitigation Plan?

![Chart showing Have Your Read Your Current Hazard Mitigation Plan](chart.png)
Question 6: Do you know where you can find the mitigation plan for your county if you would like to see it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do You Know Where to Find Your Hazard Mitigation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 7: Your opinion is valuable to this planning process. Discuss any other problems that the planning committee should consider when developing a strategy to reduce future losses caused by natural hazard events.

Johnson County

- Be aware of older areas of Johnson County with primarily above-ground utility lines and mature trees. Consider special arrangements with public buildings (city halls, libraries, schools) to ensure power at common locations where residents may seek shelter if needed.
- Debris management has always been a huge issue in numerous weather events for every city to handle.
- Electrical and communication infrastructure are both susceptible to wind/tornado/flooding/winter weather and the local power companies have shown that while they can occasionally perform feats of wonder in getting people back on-line, we have seen that they have a difficult time getting past 75-80% restoration in a short time-span. Power problems multiply out to public health problems and a need for shelter (especially in the winter).
- Electrical grid failure, whether through severe storms or EMP.
- Ensuring emergency transportation is included and all applicable area transportation entities.
- Extreme heat (cooling centers & education), wildfires
- I feel all topics were covered.
• I think an abbreviated version of the mitigation plan would be nice. It is difficult to digest the full plan for the layperson.
• I think for many, telecommunications after a major event is a primary concern. With the reliance of cell phones that restoration of cell towers is an early priority so people can find the other resources.
• I think one of the biggest risks is the water/sewer lines and power lines.
• Ice storm
• I'm certain you've covered this but anticipating the effect of climate change on the increased intensity of weather events.
• I'm primarily concerned with the worsening and increasingly random weather events we're experiencing. Things are becoming less predictable and weather events are becoming more severe. I'm not confident we have infrastructure in place to withstand our weather becoming more brutal. I worry about flooding, I worry about tornadoes, but I also worry about our power, water, and heat delivery systems and the beating they're going to take moving into the future.
• Impact climate change has and will continue to have on frequency/severity of weather events. Also, give consideration to how threats/impacts will change because of this.
• Increase coverage outdoor warning devices. Additional electronic signage on interstates and major parkways and boulevards
• Increased public education
• Not everyone in Kansas was born in Kansas. It would be beneficial if communities/apartment complexes/public gathering places had handouts available for folks who know how to protect themselves and their property in an earthquake...but have no clue of what to do in a tornado. (The protection plan is almost the complete opposite of one another in those situations...and I learned that after the EF-1 tornado on May 2 struck our apartment complex...literally right over my head (on the top floor of our complex). I learned the next day of what to do during a tornado. This information should be made WIDELY available to everyone (and yet it isn’t). Some people weren’t born in the Midwest. Might be nice if new residents could be educated regarding tornado safety, too.
• People without access to a storm shelter. There needs to be a way for people to identify public shelters and those are publicized.
• Permeable sustainable infrastructure. Getting water where it needs to go considering both upstream and downstream users. Cost effective watershed management including combined sewer overflow.
• Please consider how Low income and/or elderly people that have few resources to evacuate or shelter in place.
• The utility/infrastructure system needs to be updated to reduce vulnerability from human and natural interruptions/destruction.
• We just need to realize where we can and can't build homes that will be impacted down the road. We have houses being built in the 500 year flood plans and we have had numerous floods.

**Leavenworth County**

• Keep the public involvement a priority
• Additional public included emergency exercises. Do one downtown with hundreds of participants to help prepare the community
• Communication is vital in our rural area.
• community participation, education, apathy
• Consider what personnel have overlapping duties between agencies or immediate family members involved in emergency response - could an out of town death have an entire family unavailable for response?
• Cyber attacks
• Due to the location of Leavenworth, evaluation of resources, companies and travel if an event were to impact a major area, how would these services reach the community if a bridge were impacted or railway was offline.
• Eastern Kansas is a major rail hub for the US. Does coordination with the railroads occur to mitigate damage as a result of natural or man-made disasters? What mitigation measures are underway to account for climate change? Fewer, but more severe storms are already being observed. Drinking water supply and security is a concern.
• Embed local weather updates in municipality websites.
• Expand tornado warnings through social media.
• Flash Flooding is underrated as a threat to our Community
• Flooding in Basehor is limited due to geographic advantages. High winds or the tornado threat are an occasional threat.
• Flooding This is caused by the bridges that come into are town it was not engineered right it should have been one bride not two. I think this is the big problem to are town flooding problem.
• Food and water emergency distribution plan.
• I believe that the above has covered all issues
• I believe they do a great job. I'm sure there are numerous issues the general public are not even aware of, including myself. I know that electrical service is restored ASAP and emergency services handle an enormous burden at those times and thank God for them.
• I feel we are unprepared for emergencies, both natural and man-made. Historically, our local governing bodies and emergency response departments have built metaphorical "walls" instead of "bridges" throughout the county. We must all work together toward a common goal that is in the public's best interest. Our law enforcement, fire, and EMS agencies are struggling to recruit and retain qualified personnel. Many of our agencies have less-than-spectacular reputations with our KC Metro-area peers and we are often referred to as "training departments," meaning our employees only stay long enough to get a job at higher-paying departments in the KC metro area. Many fire departments are still reliant on volunteers, who in some cases aren't available or interested in acquiring basic certifications and training.
• Information technology infrastructure
• Interoperability and resource outreach
• It’s Kansas, we never know what we will have happen here, better to be prepared for it then regret it later. I just think they should look into doing the most they can to help prepare our community. Weather has gotten even more unpredictable lately.
• Keep us informed
• Maybe more attention on providing safe drinking water in relation to a potential biochemical attack.
• More aid to the lower-class municipalities for mitigation actions
• None let them do their job
• Please do not waste taxpayer money.
• Think about earthquakes
• Tornado sirens  2009 Tornado hit my house with NO warning. Since then nothing has been added. When they test you can’t hear them. Also, Hemphill Road has turned into a cross road since the I-70 interchange was built. Need to pave Hemphill rd.
• Tornado sirens. There are no audible sirens in the northern part of the county that can be heard in case of emergency
• Water lines located within LV county are not sufficient and need updating. Attempting to build in the county is a nightmare as the current infrastructure cannot handle additional facilities. This needs updating before costs get out of control.
• Weather threat to safe aircraft passage in/out of KCI and over the county.
• Well labeled evacuation routes (for floods, fire)
• what about other hazards such as prison or prisoner-related events or active-shooters? Preparedness activities for health care providers?
• Wide spread uncontrolled fire event.

Wyandotte County

No responses.

Question 8: Do you have any mitigation project that you would like to see implemented and what are they?

Johnson County

• 1)Acquisition of property in flood prone area. 2) Do not allow building of residential or commercial property in flood prone areas.
• A move to underground infrastructure.
• Additional public education
• Being a water sensitive city or identifying the integrative path which may consider identifying becoming a water sensitive city within 20-50 years. Implementing commercial (inviting new businesses in) planning with green initiative to reward businesses for taking a part in the urban water management to slow down the runoff from their paved properties, building’s roof tops, etc. and reducing the impact to the combined sewer overload.
• City of De Soto depends on sewer pump stations in a disaster we will need emergency power for up to seven pump stations to prevent sewer backups.
• Continue SMAC funding within Johnson County
• Flooding seems to be a critical problem in our area. Development decisions and decisions related to our transportation infrastructure do not seem to be including design guidelines to prevent flooding. The new development that is taking place and the expansion of the highways and other roadways seems to be adding more and more impervious surface in Johnson County - and then we are surprised that placed like 103rd and State Line flood.
• Indian creek flood plain planning. Ensure storm sewers can handle heavy rains and that creek overflow doesn’t back up into nearby homes
• More flood mitigation projects.
• More green space in flood prone areas
- More native grassland to absorb floodwaters in all JoCo watersheds.
- Perhaps adding additional "natural" wetlands or habitats for flood control vs. a grass pit or concrete storm sewers.
- RE: Our utility systems -- It makes sense to me to find ways to make these systems more self-contained and more robust. Every home should have solar and wind power. Furnaces and water heaters should be electric with battery backups. Etc.
- Two issues that come to mind: (1) consideration of storm drainage from highways DURING MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES (lanes are often rerouted, temporary jersey barriers installed, etc. without sufficient regard to what impact the temporary changes will have on storm water drainage such that temporary flooding of areas not usually flooded can result during high precipitation events) and (2) maintenance of existing storm drainage systems from highways (many water inlet grates become plugged with trash which washes onto them during precipitation events [and some have small trees growing out of them!] thus causing temporary flooding on highways not usually flooded). These issues can cause sudden hydroplaning and loss of control thus resulting in property damage and potential personal injury.
- What can the region do to reduce environmental impact? Natural hazards are going to happen and we should look at those mitigation tactics too, but can we also look at current practices to ensure we're not contributing to making things worse?
- Wildland risk assessment for JoCo.

Leavenworth County

- Safe rooms in all schools and flood prone property be acquired
- Auto stream gauge on Stranger Creek at Potter in Atchison County. What's happening at Potter will affect Easton in a matter of hours.
- Ensure coms are set up, 2-way battery operated radios as backup. Be aware of local store equipment as forklifts are invaluable in unloading supplies.
- Flooding prevention-work along the Missouri River Banks in some critical areas
- I do not have a mitigation project.
- I would encourage setting the 500-year base flood elevation in place of the 100-year. Native American communities in the Southwest built their pueblos outside of the floodplain because they grew tired of repeatedly losing everything. They learned the consequences of building in the floodplain.
- Improve 3-Mile Creek drainage basin to prevent flooding from Shawnee Street upstream to 20th Street
- More buried power lines
- No. I appreciate the work that Emergency Management does. The responses I have seen to crises has been excellent.
- Paved North/South roads West of Stranger Creek for access during flooding.
- Please push for adequate funding through grants and department consolidations, requirements for training/certifications/credentialing, and unity across governing bodies and emergency response departments. Thank you for seeking feedback from the community.
- Road repair, there are still lots of pot-holes that are deep.
- Safe room for new construction, Leavenworth Public Schools
- Safe shelters
- Stranger Creek flood control.
- The natural gas pipeline in Kickapoo township—perhaps residents need a greater awareness?
- Tornado sirens, Improve gravel roads near I-70 interchange.
- Yes. Backup 911 center

**Wyandotte County**

No responses.

### 2.6 – Planning Meetings

Within Kansas Region L there are many jurisdictions and organizations who have a vested interest in participating in the creation and adoption of the hazard mitigation plan. An integral part of the planning process included the identification, development, and coordination of all these entities. As such, a series of three organizational and planning meetings were scheduled and all past and potential future participants were notified by the State of Kansas as to the dates and locations of the meetings. In addition, communities neighboring the region were invited to participate in the planning process.

It is worth noting that all neighboring Kansas counties are undergoing a similar mitigation planning effort, and as part of this statewide process all county and state planners are working together toward common mitigation goals. During the creation and adoption of this plan communication channels were opened to facilitate the cross pollination of ideas, to incorporate neighboring regions concerns, and to ensure the overall preparedness of the State of Kansas.

A series of kick-off meetings were held with MPC members, available representatives from jurisdictions within the planning region, local and regional stakeholders, and the public invited. At the kickoff meeting, the planning process, project coordination, scope, participation requirements, strategies for public involvement, and schedule were discussed in detail. During the meeting, participants were led through a guided discussion concerning hazard data sourced from their previous hazard mitigation plans. Additionally, research was conducted prior to the meeting on recent regional hazard events to further inform the discussion. Participants were encouraged to discuss past hazard events, past impacts, and the future probability for all identified hazards. At the conclusion of the meeting, all participants were provided with a data collection forms to solicit information needed to properly complete the HMP. The forms asked for information concerning data on historic hazard events, at risk populations and properties, and available capabilities. Additionally, participating jurisdictions were provided with their mitigation actions from the previous plans for review and comment and asked to identify any additional mitigation actions.

A mid-term planning meeting was held with MPC members. Based upon the initial research, discussions held during the kickoff meetings, information obtained from the data collection forms, additional research, and subsequent discussion with MPC members, the results of the hazard identification, classification, and delineation were discussed in detail. In addition, sections of the HMP were made available for review and comment. Based on the supplied hazard information, participants were asked to assist in the development and review of mitigation goals and actions.
A final planning meeting was held with MPC members, available representatives from jurisdictions within the planning region, local and regional stakeholders, and the public invited. The completed draft HMP was made available for review and comment.

The following table presents the date and location of each planning meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Kickoff)</td>
<td>09/10/2018</td>
<td>Johnson County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/17/2018</td>
<td>Leavenworth County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/17/2018</td>
<td>Wyandotte County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Mid-Term)</td>
<td>12/05/2018</td>
<td>Johnson County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Final)</td>
<td>02/11/2019</td>
<td>Wyandotte County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the minutes and sign-in sheets from all meetings may be found in Appendix C.

2.7 – Existing Plan Incorporation

44 CFR 201.6(b)(3): Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.

The hazard mitigation plan is an overarching document that is both comprised of, and contributes to, various other jurisdictional plans. In creating this plan, all the planning documents identified below were consulted and reviewed, often extensively. In turn, when each of these other plans is updated, they will be measured against the contents of the hazard mitigation plan.

Below is a list of the various planning efforts, sole or jointly administered programs, and documents reviewed and included in this hazard mitigation plan. While each plan can stand alone, their review and functional understanding was pivotal in the development of this plan and further strengthens and improves Kansas Region L’s resilience to disasters.

- All participating jurisdictions Codes and Ordinances
- All participating jurisdictions Comprehensive Plans
- All participating jurisdictions Critical Facilities Plans
- All participating jurisdictions Economic Development Strategic Plans
- All participating jurisdictions Emergency Operations Plans
- All participating jurisdictions Flood Mitigation Assistance Plan
- All participating jurisdiction Land-Use Plans
- Community Wildfire Protection Plans
- Any other newly created or relevant jurisdictional plan

Information from each of these plans and programs is utilized within the applicable hazard sections to provide data and fully inform decision making and prioritization.
State and Federal Level Plan Integration

The following list illustrates local, state and federal programs integrated, where applicable, and referenced in Kansas Region L’s mitigation efforts.

- State of Kansas Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
- Flood Mitigation Assistance Program
- National Flood Insurance Program
- Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program
- Repetitive Loss & Severe Repetitive Loss Program
- FireWise Communities Program
- Relevant Dam Emergency Action Plans (if document not secured)
- Community Rating System

Regional Level Plan Integration

The MARC Regional Coordination Guide (RCG) is an all-hazard, capabilities-based guide designed to address any of the hazards potentially affecting the metro area. The RCG ensures that a series of formal actions are in place to facilitate communication and cooperation between the many agencies and organizations in the region that might be involved in emergency events that require some degree of regional coordination. Participation in the activities described in the RCG is voluntary and the RCG is not intended to be an operational document. The RCG is organized using a Base Guide and 15 Emergency Support Function annexes. The Base Guide provides the overall organizational structure for regional coordination, while the ESF annexes address the regional issues associated with specific emergency functions. The RCG was developed with oversight from the MEMC Plans Subcommittee and support from planning task forces and workgroups comprised of local government officials, response personnel, voluntary agency representatives and members of the private sector. In addition, the regional coordination protocols described in the RCG have been endorsed by the Regional Homeland Security Coordinating Committee RHSCC, which provides oversight and policy guidance for homeland security issues and funding in the metro area.

Integration Challenges

The 2014 plan update successfully integrated approved Kansas Region L local hazard mitigation plans into one regional HMP. This represents a success of our streamlined program of allowing jurisdictions to participate in multi-jurisdictional regional-level plans. This program not only reduces the cost and the burden to local jurisdictions, it also allows for closer collaboration and integration of local communities in all areas or planning and response. However, and as always, challenges exist due to the day to day demands of the working environment, including scheduling conflicts, budget restrictions, and staffing changes and shortages related to both the utilization and incorporation of the HMP and completion of identified hazard mitigation projects. Additionally, the size and complexity of the Kansas Region L area
present additional challenges, including county and local planning integration, regional funding, population diversity and potentially differing growth priorities.