

SECTION 10

PLAN MAINTENANCE

This section discusses how the MEMA District 9 Mitigation Strategy and Mitigation Action Plan will be implemented and how the Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan will be evaluated and enhanced over time. This section also discusses how the public will continue to be involved in a sustained hazard mitigation planning process. It consists of the following four subsections:

- 10.1 Monitoring and Evaluating the Previous Plan
- 10.2 Implementation and Integration
- 10.3 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Enhancement
- 10.4 Continued Public Involvement

44 CFR Requirement

44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(i):

The plan shall include a plan maintenance process that includes a section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.

44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(ii):

The plan maintenance process shall include a process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate

10.1 MONITORING AND EVALUATING THE PREVIOUS PLAN

Since the previous county and municipal level plans were adopted, each community has worked to ensure that mitigation was integrated into local activities and that the mitigation plan was appropriately implemented. Each of the communities outlined a process in their previous mitigation plan for monitoring and evaluating the plan throughout the interim period between plan updates.

Each community was ultimately successful in implementing the monitoring and evaluation processes that were outlined in previous plans as all communities held annual meetings to discuss the mitigation plan and the priorities that were outlined in it. Each county's specific process is outlined below with an explanation of how the monitoring and evaluating process was carried out as well as any changes that were identified by the county or its jurisdictions that would be useful to implement during the next update.

George County

The George County Hazard Mitigation Plan (2013) included an annual review process and progress report on mitigation strategies, focusing on those expected to be initiated or completed in that year. This review process was carried out by the Advisory Council every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Advisory Council developed a report on the plan to detail mitigation activities undertaken over the course of the year for the Board of Supervisors. The report also evaluated the plan why certain actions succeeded or failed.

SECTION 10: PLAN MAINTENANCE

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Advisory Council generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Hancock County

The Hancock County Hazard Mitigation Plan (2013) included an annual review process in June of each year. This review process was carried out by the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the information that came out of the meeting were used to update the Risk Assessment section of the plan and modify the Action Plan.

Additionally, the county's Emergency Management Director required semi-annual reviews of the progress towards implementing in the plan. This review was coordinated to review both the plan and coordinate actions defined within the activities of the county's CRS Program Report and NPDES Phase II Stormwater Program Report. These meetings were held in June and December

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Bay St. Louis

The Bay St. Louis Hazard Mitigation Plan (2011) included an annual review process and reviews following a hazard event. This review process was carried out by the Bay St. Louis CRS Coordinator every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, review of changes in vulnerability were especially the focus. Moreover, the city will document where mitigation actions were not effective and where additional data or capabilities could be incorporated.

A representative from the responsible office identified in each mitigation measure was responsible for tracking the action status and reporting on it during the annual review. If the action did not meet identified objectives, the jurisdictional lead determined what additional measures might be implemented to lead to success. Updating of the plan will be by written changes and submissions as approved by the City Council

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the CRS Coordinator and Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Waveland

The Waveland Hazard Mitigation Plan (2013) included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Fire Chief every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, review of changes in vulnerability were especially the focus. Moreover, the city will document where mitigation actions were not effective and where additional data or capabilities could be incorporated.

SECTION 10: PLAN MAINTENANCE

A representative from the responsible office identified in each mitigation measure was responsible for tracking the action status and reporting on it during the annual review. If the action did not meet identified objectives, the jurisdictional lead determined what additional measures might be implemented to lead to success. Updating of the plan will be by written changes and submissions as approved by the City Council.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Fire Chief and Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Harrison County

The Harrison County Hazard Mitigation Plan (2014) included a bi-annual review process in January and June and progress report on the plan, as well as reviews after any disaster events. This review process was carried out by the Harrison County LHMPC every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the County LHMPC developed an end-of-year report on the plan, when requested, to detail mitigation activities undertaken over the course of the year as well as any mitigation projects that have been completed. This was presented to the Harrison County Board of Supervisors. The agenda for each review meeting was determined by the Office of Emergency Management and LHMPC, but always included a review of high and medium priority actions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the LHMPC generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Biloxi

The Biloxi Hazard Mitigation Plan (2013) included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Biloxi Emergency Management Director every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the EM Director was responsible for general upkeep and oversight of the plan and collecting relevant information from other city departments for use in the plan. The EM Director developed meeting agendas, invitations, and scheduled the annual meetings in coordination with the Public Affairs Manager when applicable.

During the meetings, the Committee discussed a number of issues including the impacts of past events on the Gulf Coast and an evaluation of project implementation and timeline. Suggestions on improvements were made to the Director and incorporated as needed.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

D'Iberville

The D'Iberville Hazard Mitigation Plan (2011) included an annual review process that took place in June at the beginning of hurricane season. This review process was carried out by the Community Development Director in conjunction with the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Hazard Mitigation Planning

SECTION 10: PLAN MAINTENANCE

Committee developed an end-of-year report on the plan to highlight accomplishments, shortfalls and areas of concern to the Mayor and City Council. Any suggestions for written changes were then incorporated and the Committee determined whether or not to incorporate these suggestions.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Gulfport

The Gulfport Hazard Mitigation Plan (2013) included an annual review process that was carried out in February of each year. This review process was carried out by the Deputy Building Official and Hazard Mitigation Committee every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the Hazard Mitigation Committee reviewed any issues that occurred since the last plan update and made suggestions on improving the plan and any changes that might be required. There were also discussions with the city's Public Information Officer on what information may need to be shared with the public.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Hazard Mitigation Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Long Beach

The Long Beach Hazard Mitigation Plan (2013) included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Fire Chief every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, review of changes in vulnerability were especially the focus. Moreover, the city will document where mitigation actions were not effective and where additional data or capabilities could be incorporated.

A representative from the responsible office identified in each mitigation measure was responsible for tracking the action status and reporting on it during the annual review. If the action did not meet identified objectives, the jurisdictional lead determined what additional measures might be implemented to lead to success. Updating of the plan will be by written changes and submissions as approved by the City Council.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Fire Chief and Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Pass Christian

The Pass Christian Hazard Mitigation Plan (2011) included a bi-annual review process with meetings to take place in the spring and fall. This review process was carried out by the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee every year since the previous plan was approved. During the spring review process, the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee reviewed the overall functionality of the plan and relevance to current conditions. This included a review of new construction and/or planned construction, additional risks and vulnerabilities, and any new actions that might be added to the plan. During the fall review

SECTION 10: PLAN MAINTENANCE

process, the discussions focused on major components of the plan including implementation of activities and nay hazards that occurred since the previous meeting.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Jackson County

The Jackson County Hazard Mitigation Plan (2012) included an annual review process that was focused on the mitigation actions in the plan. This review process was carried out by the Jackson County Hazard Mitigation Committee every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, the County Hazard Mitigation Committee also addressed issues not identified during the past plan update, assessed events that impacted the participating jurisdictions, and evaluated the effectiveness of the planning team. This was also complemented by an annual report that detailed the status of the plan review.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Hazard Mitigation Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Moss Point

The Long Beach Hazard Mitigation Plan (2013) included an annual review process and progress report on the plan. This review process was carried out by the Building Department every year since the previous plan was approved. During this annual review process, review of changes in vulnerability were especially the focus. Moreover, the city will document where mitigation actions were not effective and where additional data or capabilities could be incorporated.

A representative from the responsible office identified in each mitigation measure was responsible for tracking the action status and reporting on it during the annual review. If the action did not meet identified objectives, the jurisdictional lead determined what additional measures might be implemented to lead to success. Updating of the plan will be by written changes and submissions as approved by the City Council.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Building Department and Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Ocean Springs

The Pass Christian Hazard Mitigation Plan (2011) included a bi-annual review process with meetings to take place in the spring and fall. This review process was carried out by the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee every year since the previous plan was approved. During the spring review process, the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee reviewed the overall functionality of the plan and relevance to current conditions. This included a review of new construction and/or planed construction, additional risks and vulnerabilities, and any new actions that might be added to the plan. During the fall review

SECTION 10: PLAN MAINTENANCE

process, the discussions focused on major components of the plan including implementation of activities and nay hazards that occurred since the previous meeting.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Pascagoula

The Pascagoula Hazard Mitigation Plan (2014) included a bi-annual review process with meetings to take place in the spring and fall. This review process was carried out by the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee every year since the previous plan was approved. During the spring review process, the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee reviewed the overall functionality of the plan and relevance to current conditions. This included a review of new construction and/or planed construction, additional risks and vulnerabilities, and any new actions that might be added to the plan. During the fall review process, the discussions focused on major components of the plan including implementation of activities and nay hazards that occurred since the previous meeting.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Pearl River County

The Pearl River County Hazard Mitigation Plan (2011) included a bi-annual review process with meetings to take place in the spring and fall. This review process was carried out by the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee every year since the previous plan was approved. During the spring review process, the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee reviewed the overall functionality of the plan and relevance to current conditions. This included a review of new construction and/or planed construction, additional risks and vulnerabilities, and any new actions that might be added to the plan. During the fall review process, the discussions focused on major components of the plan including implementation of activities and nay hazards that occurred since the previous meeting.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

Stone County

The Stone County Hazard Mitigation Plan (2011) included an annual review process with a yearly meeting. This review process was carried out by the Director of Emergency Operations every year since the previous plan was approved. During the review process, the county reviewed potential hazards and met with county/city department heads. This included a review of severity of area impacted, probability of occurring, impact to life/property, vulnerability of structures, and overall risk assessment. This review then led to an annual report that was presented to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor/Board of Alderman.

Although there were some minor revisions made to the plan during the interim update period, there were few major revisions identified during these annual reviews and the Emergency Operations Director generally agreed that the plan was on course and that the monitoring and evaluating process itself was sufficient to ensure implementation of the plan.

10.2 IMPLEMENTATION AND INTEGRATION

Each agency, department, or other partner participating under the MEMA District 9 Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan is responsible for implementing specific mitigation actions as prescribed in the Mitigation Action Plan. Every proposed action listed in the Mitigation Action Plan is assigned to a specific “lead” agency or department in order to assign responsibility and accountability and increase the likelihood of subsequent implementation.

In addition to the assignment of a local lead department or agency, an implementation time period or a specific implementation date has been assigned in order to assess whether actions are being implemented in a timely fashion. The counties in the MEMA District 9 Region will seek outside funding sources to implement mitigation projects in both the pre-disaster and post-disaster environments. When applicable, potential funding sources have been identified for proposed actions listed in the Mitigation Action Plan.

The participating jurisdictions will integrate this Hazard Mitigation Plan into relevant city and county government decision-making processes or mechanisms, where feasible. This includes integrating the requirements of the Hazard Mitigation Plan into other local planning documents, processes, or mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate. The members of the MEMA District 9 Regional Hazard Mitigation Council (RHMC) will remain charged with ensuring that the goals and mitigation actions of new and updated local planning documents for their agencies or departments are consistent, or do not conflict with, the goals and actions of the Hazard Mitigation Plan, and will not contribute to increased hazard vulnerability in the MEMA District 9 Region.

Since the previous plans were adopted, each county and participating jurisdiction has worked to integrate the hazard mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms where applicable/feasible. Examples of how this integration has occurred have been documented in the Implementation Status discussion provided for each of the mitigation actions found in Section 9. Specific examples of how integration has occurred include:

- Integrating the mitigation plan into reviews and updates of floodplain management ordinances
- Integrating the mitigation plan into reviews and updates of emergency operations plans
- Integrating the mitigation plan into review and updates of building codes
- Integrating the mitigation plan into the capital improvements plans/programs through identification of mitigation actions that require local funding

Opportunities to further integrate the requirements of this Plan into other local planning mechanisms shall continue to be identified through future meetings of the RHMC, individual county meetings, and the annual review process described herein. Although it is recognized that there are many possible benefits to integrating components of this Plan into other local planning mechanisms, the development and maintenance of this stand-alone Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan is deemed by the MEMA District 9

RHMC to be the most effective and appropriate method to implement local hazard mitigation actions at this time.

10.3 MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND ENHANCEMENT

Periodic revisions and updates of the Hazard Mitigation Plan are required to ensure that the goals of the Plan are kept current, taking into account potential changes in hazard vulnerability and mitigation priorities. In addition, revisions may be necessary to ensure that the Plan is in full compliance with applicable federal and state regulations. Periodic evaluation of the Plan will also ensure that specific mitigation actions are being reviewed and carried out according to the Mitigation Action Plan.

The MEMA District 9 RHMC shall meet every year to evaluate the progress attained and to revise, where needed, the activities set forth in the Plan. The findings and recommendations of the RHMC shall be shared with interested municipal and county Board/Council members. The RHMC will also meet following any disaster events warranting a reexamination of the mitigation actions being implemented or proposed for future implementation. This will ensure that the Plan is continuously updated to reflect changing conditions and needs within the region. MEMA will be responsible for reconvening the RHMC for these reviews.¹

FIVE YEAR PLAN REVIEW

The Plan will be thoroughly reviewed by the RHMC every five years to determine whether there have been any significant changes in the region that may, in turn, necessitate changes in the types of mitigation actions proposed. New development in identified hazard areas, an increased exposure to hazards, an increase or decrease in capability to address hazards, and changes to federal or state legislation are examples of factors that may affect the necessary content of the Plan.

The plan review provides MEMA District 9 county officials with an opportunity to evaluate those actions that have been successful and to explore the possibility of documenting potential losses avoided due to the implementation of specific mitigation measures. The plan review also provides the opportunity to address mitigation actions that may not have been successfully implemented as assigned. MEMA will be responsible for reconvening the RHMC and helping conduct the five-year review.

During the five-year plan review process, the following questions will be considered as criteria for assessing the effectiveness and appropriateness of the Plan:

- Do the goals address current and expected conditions?
- Has the nature or magnitude of risks changed?
- Are the current resources appropriate for implementing the Plan?
- Are there implementation problems, such as technical, political, legal or coordination issues with other agencies?
- Have the outcomes occurred as expected?
- Did County departments participate in the plan implementation process as assigned?

¹ A sample Mitigation Action Progress Form and Plan Update Evaluation Worksheet (from FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook*) are included in Appendix B. These documents can be used to guide the evaluation of mitigation actions and future plan updates.

Following the five-year review, any revisions deemed necessary will be summarized and implemented according to the reporting procedures and plan amendment process outlined herein. Upon completion of the review and update/amendment process, the MEMA District 9 Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan will be submitted to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer at MEMA for final review and approval in coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Because the plan update process can take several months to complete, and because Federal funding may be needed to update the plan, it is recommended that the five-year review process begin at the beginning of the third year after the plan was last approved. This will allow the participants in the MEMA District 9 Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan to organize in order to seek Federal funding if necessary and complete required plan update documentation before the plan expires at the end of the fifth year.

DISASTER DECLARATION

Following a disaster declaration, the MEMA District 9 Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan will be revised as necessary to reflect lessons learned, or to address specific issues and circumstances arising from the event. It will be the responsibility of MEMA to reconvene the RHMC and ensure the appropriate stakeholders are invited to participate in the plan revision and update process following declared disaster events.

REPORTING PROCEDURES

The results of the five-year review will be summarized by the RHMC in the plan update and will include an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Plan and any required or recommended changes or amendments. The results will also include an evaluation of implementation progress for each of the proposed mitigation actions, identifying reasons for delays or obstacles to their completion along with recommendations as to whether and how to continue to pursue the action.

PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS

In general, the RHMC agreed that any minor amendments suggested by a county or participating municipality would be automatically accepted into the plan as long as the amendment only impacted that jurisdiction. However, if the amendment proposed a large-scale change to the structure of the plan or impacted other jurisdictions, the following amendment process would need to be followed.

Upon the initiation of the amendment process, the MEMA District 9 counties will forward information on the proposed change(s) to all interested parties including, but not limited to, all directly affected County departments, residents, and businesses. Information will also be forwarded to MEMA. This information will be disseminated in order to seek input on the proposed amendment(s) for no less than a 45-day review and comment period.

At the end of the 45-day review and comment period, the proposed amendment(s) and all comments will be forwarded to the RHMC for final consideration. The RHMC will review the proposed amendment along with the comments received from other parties, and if acceptable, the committee will submit a recommendation for the approval and adoption of changes to the Plan.

SECTION 10: PLAN MAINTENANCE

In determining whether to recommend approval or denial of a Plan amendment request, the following factors will be considered by the RHMC:

- There are errors, inaccuracies, or omissions made in the identification of issues or needs in the Plan.
- New issues or needs have been identified which are not adequately addressed in the Plan.
- There has been a change in information, data, or assumptions from those on which the Plan is based.

Upon receiving the recommendation from the RHMC, and prior to adoption of the Plan Amendment, the participating jurisdictions may hold a public hearing, if deemed necessary. The governing bodies of each participating jurisdiction will review the recommendation from the RHMC (including the factors listed above) and any oral or written comments received at the public hearing. Following that review, the governing bodies will take one of the following actions:

- Adopt the proposed amendments as presented
- Adopt the proposed amendments with modifications
- Refer the amendments request back to the RHMC for further revision
- Defer the amendment request back to the RHMC for further consideration and/or additional hearings

10.4 CONTINUED PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

44 CFR Requirement
44 CFR Part 201.6(c)(4)(iii): The plan maintenance process shall include a discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process

Public participation is an integral component to the mitigation planning process and will continue to be essential as this Plan evolves over time. As described above, significant changes or amendments to the Plan shall require a public hearing prior to any adoption procedures.

Other efforts to involve the public in the maintenance, evaluation, and revision process will be made as necessary. These efforts may include:

- Advertising meetings of the RHMC in local newspapers, public bulletin boards and/or County office buildings
- Designating willing and voluntary citizens and private sector representatives as official members of the RHMC
- Utilizing local media to update the public on any maintenance and/or periodic review activities taking place
- Utilizing the MEMA District 9 county websites to advertise any maintenance and/or periodic review activities taking place
- Keeping copies of the Plan in public libraries

SECTION 10: PLAN MAINTENANCE

Overall, the RHMC and participating counties will continue to provide outreach concerning mitigation through TV and other media as well as through outreach events such as local fairs or public events. In this way, the public will have continual interaction with the mitigation process and the efforts taken by local officials to implement mitigation.