

**Sangamon County Multi-jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan Task Force
Meeting Minutes
November 5, 2014**

TASK FORCE MEMBERS	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Feb.
Citizen Member – Greg Michaud, Chair	X		X	X		
Auburn – Rick Marx		X	X	X		
Buffalo – Daniel Miller			X	X		
Cantrall – Phil Holler	X		X	X		
Chatham – Patrick McCarthy	X		X	X		
Curran – Tim Luckey	X		X			
Dawson – Robin Ashton-Hale	X		X			
Divernon – Jim Copelin	X		X	X		
Illioopolis – Jonathan Horsley				X		
Jerome – Dale Lael	X		X	X		
Leland Grove – Paul LaMantia		X	X	X		
Mechanicsburg – Kenneth Metcalf, Sr., Lee Ann Burgener	X		X	X		
New Berlin – Terry Nydegger		X	X	X		
Pawnee – Dave Skinner	X	X		X		
Riverton – Louie Rogers	X					
Rochester – Gael Kent	X	X		X		
Sangamon County – Brian McFadden		X				
Sherman – Mike Moos		X	X	X		
Southern View – Judy Gordon	X		X	X		
Spaulding – Mike Foster	X		X	X		
Springfield – Ken Fustin, Jeph Basset, Kenny Scarlette, Nate Bottom		X	X	X		
Williamsville – John Brennan		X	X	X		
Abraham Lincoln Cap. Airport – Tim Franke		X	X	X		
Ameren – Gretchen Jarrett	X	X	X			
American Red Cross – Glen Fisher	X	X				
CWLP – Rick Meadows	X		X			
Central Management Services – Diane Hoots	X		X	X		
Rural Electric Convenience Coop. – Lou Delaby	X		X			
Sang. Co. Dept. of Public Health – Diana Wade	X		X			
Sang. Co. Dept. of Zoning. – Trustin Harrison, Vice-chair		X				
Sang. Co. GIS. – Tracy Garrison		X	X			
Sang. Co. Farm Bureau – Paul Rice		X	X			
Sang. Co. Highway Dept. – Brian Wright	X	X	X			
Sang. Co. Office of Emergency Mgmt. – Bill Russell	X	X	X	X		
Springfield Homebuilders Assoc. – Steve Sturm	X		X	X		
Springfield Park District – Marcus Miller	X	X	X	X		
Springfield School District #186 – Darrell Schaver	X		X			
Springfield Mass Transit District – Frank Squires						
Springfield Metro Sanitary Dist. – Mike Ashenfelter	X	X		X		
Springfield Metro Sanitary Dist. – Gregg Humphrey	X					
University of Illinois at Springfield – Dave Barrows						
STAFF:						

Abby Bybee	X	X	X			
Molly Berns			X	X		
Gail Weiskopf	X	X	X	X		

Call to order:

Greg Michaud, Chair called to order the fourth meeting of the Sangamon County Multi-jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan Task Force.

Approval of Minutes:

Michaud, Chair asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the October 7, 2014. Steve Sturm made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. John Brennan seconded the motion. The vote to approve was unanimous.

Goals and Objectives

Molly Berns referred to the stapled hand-out, titled *Finalization of Goals and Objectives*. Berns noted that at the last meeting the taskforce had worked on the goals which are listed in boxes on the hand-out. The goals were not approved because of some discussion about adding a new goal to the plan. The goals were offered for consideration. Berns reviewed each goal.

Goal #1 - Maintain and improve communication, education and cooperation between Sangamon County residents, government, and the private sector. The suggestion was to add “education” to the goal.

Goal #2 - Protect the lives, health and safety of the people and animals of Sangamon County from the impact and effects of natural hazards. The suggestion was to keep the goal with no changes.

Goal #3 - Protect existing infrastructure and design new infrastructure to be resilient to the effects of natural hazards (roads, bridges, mass transit, utilities, water supplies, sewers, dams, etc.) The suggestion was to add “etc.” to the goal.

Goal #4 - Incorporate natural hazard mitigation into community plans and regulations. The suggestion was to keep the goal with no changes.

And Goal #5: Preserve and protect the rivers and floodplains in Sangamon County. This was suggested by the taskforce to add as a new goal.

Berns asked for discussion of the first four goals and then discuss whether or not to add Goal #5.

Michaud, Chair asked for any comments on the draft goals. There were no further comments so Michaud entertained a motion to accept the goals. There was a motion made by Bill Russell to approve the goals. Judy Gordon seconded this motion. The vote to approve was unanimous.

Michaud, Chair asked for any comments on adding Goal #5. There were no further comments so Michaud entertained a motion to accept adding Goal #5. There was a motion made by Mike Moos to approve the Goal #5. Steve Sturm seconded this motion. The motion passed with one objector.

Berns specified that the objectives from the 2008 plan were listed under each goal on the same hand-out. The taskforce needs to look at each of them and decide if these objectives are still

applicable to the current needs. Going forward each task force member needs to be aware of how each objective could be used for their individual community.

Michaud, Chair asked for the taskforce to consider the objectives under the first four goals for any changes needed.

Several ideas were presented – since education was added to the first goal it should probably be mentioned in the objections, cost of printing brochures and also distributing them.

Michaud, Chair stated that education and public information is a project or an activity that FEMA will fund.

Berns spoke to the fact that FEMA does place a big emphasis on education. She stated that Sangamon County (unincorporated parts) just completed its five- year cycle visit with FEMA for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program and the community rating system. This cycle visit fell under a new manual that was changed by FEMA over the course of the last two years. She stated that public outreach, education, public information plan are currently receiving a lot of focus for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program so much so that they redid their point structure for the community rating system and there is given an incredible amount of points for certain outreach activities like printing and distributing brochures and other educational outreach. She stated that each community should consider emphasizing education components for their plan for funding and other opportunities.

The objective to be added as 1.e. was suggested as follows: “Establish public information/outreach program in regards to Natural Hazard Event Situations”.

The subject of placement of warning sirens was discussed by the group and that more organizing of the location of sirens should be implemented. The example of the City of Springfield having a siren in Piper Glen that was so close to the north side of Chatham was shared with the group and that in the future some sort of community cost- sharing could occur.

Michaud, Chair stated IEMA has made a decision that they do not fund sirens or organization of sirens. Other counties do use other systems like Code Red, Reverse 911, and notification systems using Social Media. Sangamon County gives the communities flexibility to decide among their municipalities the best fit their situation.

Michaud, Chair shared that the cost of replacing or organizing sirens could be put as a mitigation item because there are other non-FEMA grants that are available to replace sirens.

Patrick McCarthy from Chatham stated that with new developments, the developer is required to fund a new siren after a certain amount of new homes have been constructed as part of the developer’s agreement. Although a siren may not be needed where the new development is located, the funding contributes to a new siren when and where it is needed.

Steve Sturm with Springfield Home Builders Association stated Sangamon County takes the lead to call out storm spotters for severe weather, and then the spotters can sound the sirens.

Michaud, Chair asked for a vote for the new objective. The vote to approve was unanimous.

Some discussion was brought up about debris management following a natural disaster event and how that could be handled. It was stated that if the community did not have a plan for debris

removal by default does it go to the county. Diane Hoots raised the issue if debris removal is considered to be hazard mitigation or if it fit more into the category of hazard response. It was also stated that if land or a certain area is set aside as a known zone in an event then the street department can come in and pick up.

Michaud, Chair stated Diane brought a very important questions that while reviewing and updating the objectives taskforce members should know because FEMA draws a very hard line between mitigation and response. He stated that if a community's list of projects is really response oriented, then FEMA will not provide funding. Diane Hoots clarified communities needed to be word projects carefully so that it is obvious that a project is mitigation and not a response.

Michaud, Chair asked if any changes were needed for the objectives under the first four goals.

Suggestions that came from a group discussion

Goal 2 Objective 2.a. add "warming centers" to this objective.

Goal 3 Objective 3.d. duplicate and add to Goal 5 as objective 5.a.

Several members offered some information regarding their experiences with flooding in communities and suggested that even if a community did not have floodplain, every community should be concerned because development in one community can affect the drainage for another community. Members also offered information about how subdivision developments are handled in their communities and the process by which problems are handled.

Michaud, Chair suggested if a community has flooding issue as a mitigation project, we needed to determine if funds were available. The Chair asked Molly to contact Ron Davis at IEMA prior to the next meeting to see if that would indeed be funded because there are many instances where the property is privately held, FEMA won't fund that unless there is an intergovernmental agreement between the two municipalities or an agreement with the property owner.

It was suggested that a new taskforce be established to develop a long-term plan to address drainage issues. It was then suggested that the development of the taskforce be put into the Natural hazards Mitigation Plan as a new objective. The group all agreed that this would be an important objective and such a plan would be beneficial.

Berns suggested, "Establish a county-wide taskforce to analyze and compile information related to drainage issues and prepare a plan to address the issues." Nate Bottom offered, "Establish a county-wide taskforce to develop a storm water drainage master plan and erosion control." The group decided to add Bottom's wording to the plan.

Michaud, Chair asked if any other changes were needed for the objectives under the first four goals.

Goal 3 Objective 3.b. duplicate wording and add to Goal 5 as objective 5.b.

Append the Water Shed Map available through Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

Goal 4 and Objective 4.b. duplicate the thought and add to Goal 5 as Objective 5.c.
Add Erosion control.

Michaud, Chair asked if there were any other thoughts before moving on to mitigation projects.

Berns explained the hand-out titled, *Mitigation Actions & Strategies*, this primarily came from the original plan. When updating a plan each action item for individual communities must be reviewed in the current plan. Part of the process is to identify the completed, deleted or deferred actions and, if deleted or deferred, identify why. Noting the reasons why the action item wasn't completed is necessary under the new crosswalk to get the updated plan approved by FEMA. New mitigation actions that are going to be identified during the planning process that fit in with these goals will need to be noted as well. If mitigation actions remain unchanged, explain why changes are not necessary. Mitigation actions will be revised based on new community information, any updates to each jurisdiction's participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and the Task Force will identify, analyze and prioritize actions related.

Berns explained that the Mitigation Actions – Priorities and Implementation used in the current plan seem to be adequate for the updated plan.

Berns noted homework for each jurisdiction consists of going through the old plan and comparing each action item, determining if the item was completed, deleted or deferred. Community representatives should make notes to identify why and identify each jurisdiction's priority to the projects using the Project Prioritization Method. This can be used as a tool for village board members to identify new actions items, projects that need to be omitted, items that have been completed, and generate new ideas from the general public and local officials. Taskforce members may copy the old plan and make notes or complete a new list just so long as it is legible. Berns asked the members to begin to work through their community's action items and provide copies at the next meeting with the understanding that due to the holidays. members may not be able to meet with their Village leaders until early December. Berns commented that while this would be an ongoing process, members should plan to have it completed by late December.

Next Meetings:

The next meeting is Tuesday, December 2, 2014 at 5:30pm in the County Board Chambers. And will be the last meeting before the draft plan is prepared. At that meeting all loose ends will be finalized and the group would also need to decide on a maintenance plan. The plan would need maintained and is not a plan that will be adopted by the communities and forgotten. Berns explained that this plan is an ongoing process and would require a review every year and an update every five years.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

Adjournment:

Michaud, Chair entertained a motion to adjourn. Mike Moos made the motion and Steve Sturm seconded it. The vote was unanimous.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gail Weiskopf