

# **Mitigation Projects Meeting Agenda**

## **Tazewell & Woodford Counties Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Advisory Committee**

**July 25, 2023**

**1:30 p.m.**

**East Peoria City Hall**

**401 West Washington Street, East Peoria**

- I. Welcome
- II. Tornado Vulnerability Analyses
- III. Risk Priority Index Exercise Results
- IV. Review of Mitigation Action Tables
- V. Public Forum & Plan Adoption
- VI. Plan Maintenance and Update
- VII. Public Comment



# Meeting Minutes

## Tazewell & Woodford Counties Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Advisory Committee

April 25, 2023

1:30 p.m.

East Peoria City Hall

401 West Washington Street, East Peoria

### Committee Members

Creve Coeur, Village of  
Creve Coeur Fire Protection District &  
Rescue Department  
East Peoria, City of  
East Peoria CHSD #309  
East Peoria D&LD  
East Peoria Sanitary District  
EPIC  
El Paso, City of  
Eureka, City of  
Germantown Hills, Village of  
Minonk, City of  
Morton, Village of

National Weather Service  
Pekin Park District  
Roanoke, Village of  
Tazewell County  
EMA  
Comm. Development  
Tri-County Reg. Planning Commission  
Washington, City of  
WMBD TV  
Woodford County  
EMA  
Highway  
American Environmental Corp.

### Welcome and Introductions

On behalf of the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, Andrea Bostwick-Campbell and Ken Runkle of American Environmental Corporation (AEC) welcomed attendees. Handout materials were distributed to each member.

Andrea provided a brief recap to reorient Committee Members as to what has been accomplished. Before beginning the risk assessment presentation, Andrea asked the participating jurisdictions to submit their completed “Critical Facilities”, “Capability Assessments” and “Shelter Surveys” if they haven’t done so already.

### Risk Assessment

Andrea indicated that due to time constraints she would be providing a regional overview of the findings and pointed out the both regional and county-specific information for each hazard was included in the meeting packet. There have been 13 major federally-declared disasters in the two-county area since 1973. A total of 1,796 verified natural hazard events have been documented over the last 20 to 70 years. There have been 258 events identified since the 2018 Update was completed. A minimum of \$1.1 billion in damages have resulted from 265 documented natural hazard events. In addition, \$74.6 million in crop damages were recorded for 20 events. Eight fatalities and 208 injuries were recorded for 29 of the documented natural hazard events.

The damage amounts are actually much higher based on several facts:

- 1.) damage descriptions for many floods, tornadoes and severe storm events did not include dollar amounts;
- 2.) damages to roads from heat and freeze/thaws conditions were not included; and
- 3.) crop damage figures were unavailable for a majority of the events.

### Tazewell County Overview

Eleven of the 13 major federally-declared disasters include Tazewell County and of the 1,796 natural hazard events documented, 971 events occurred in Tazewell County:

- Since 2018, 145 individual events have occurred in the County.
- At least \$1 billion in property damages was recorded for 152 events
- Approximately 87% of the property damages documented in the two-county area was from the 2013 tornadoes (\$980 million)
- At least \$45.3 million in crop damages was recorded for 12 events
- A minimum of 7 fatalities and 189 injuries were recorded for 18 events
- 3 fatalities and 125 injuries were from the 2013 tornadoes and account for over 65% of all the fatalities and injuries recorded in the two-county area

### Woodford County Overview

Eleven of the 13 major federally-declared disasters include Woodford County as well and of the 1,796 natural hazard events documented, 825 events occurred in Woodford County:

- Since 2018, 113 individual events have occurred in the County
- At least \$84.9 million in property damages was recorded for 114 events
- At least \$29.4 million in crop damages was recorded for 9 events
- A minimum of 1 fatality and 19 injuries were recorded for 11 events

The frequency, magnitude, and property damages for each category of natural hazard for the two-county area were then described.

### Severe Storms

Severe storms are the most frequently occurring natural hazard with 645 events verified in the two-county area, 98 of those events occurring since the 2018 update was completed. One of the 13 major federal disaster declarations for the two-county area included severe storms. Approximately \$10.3 million in damages has resulted from 182 events. Additionally, there was \$1.2 million in crop damage from five events. At least seven fatalities and 610 injuries can be attributed to severe storms. Almost all the injuries and fatalities are attributed crashes associated with wet pavement conditions.

The highest recorded wind speed in the two-county area, not associated with a tornado, is 83 knots (96 mph) and occurred in Tazewell on June 29, 1998. The largest hail recorded in the two-county area is 4.00 inches (grapefruit-sized) at Secor on May 30, 2004.

### Severe Winter Storms

There have been at least 279 verified events involving severe winter storms (snow and/or ice) since 1950 and 86 extreme cold events since 1995. Twenty-two severe

winter storms and 12 extreme cold events have occurred since the 2018 update was completed. Two of the 13 major federal disaster declarations for the two-county area are related to severe winter storms. Approximately \$3.7 million in damages has resulted from 11 events. At least six fatalities and 313 injuries can be attributed to severe winter storms, almost all of which are attributed to crashes involving ice and snow-covered roadways.

At least 16 major storms have occurred in every decade since 1970. In the last decade, at least 24 severe winter storms took place.

The record maximum 24-hour snowfall in the two-county area is 16.0 inches, which occurred at the Morton COOP Station on January 1, 1999. The coldest recorded temperature is -36°F at the Congerville COOP Station on January 5, 1999.

### Floods

Gaps in historical data were reviewed to document a least 131 verified general flood events and 76 flash flood events in the two-county area. Seven of the 13 major federal disaster declarations for the two-county area are related to flooding. At least \$105.4 million in damages has resulted from 16 flood events. Additionally, there was \$8.3 million in crop damages from two flood events. No injuries or fatalities were recorded as a result of any of the recorded events.

### Excessive Heat

Additional resources were reviewed to fill historic data gaps, which led to the identification of 118 recorded excessive heat events reported in the two-county area since 1995. No injuries or fatalities were recorded as the result of excessive heat events.

The hottest temperature recorded in the two-county area was 111°F at the Minonk COOP Station on July 14 & 15, 1936. Five of the six hottest recorded temperatures in Minonk are from 1936.

### Tornadoes

Since 1950, 115 tornadoes have been verified in the two-county area, with 11 occurring since the 2018 update was completed. Approximately \$1 billion in property damages has resulted from 48 of these tornadoes, which is about 90% of all the property damage recorded in the two counties. Additionally, \$90,000 in crop damages were recorded from 11 separate events. Three fatalities and 184 injuries were recorded as a result of 12 separate tornado events.

The highest recorded F-Scale rating for a tornado in the two-county area was an F4, which occurred on July 13, 2004 in unincorporated Woodford County and an EF4 on November 17, 2013 in Tazewell County. The longest tornado was an F3 that was 21.1 miles long in Tazewell County on July 13, 1995. The widest tornado recorded, 880 yards, occurred twice: an F3 on July 13, 1995 in Tazewell County and an EF4/EF3 on November 17, 2013 in both counties.

### Drought

Six major droughts have occurred during the last four decades – 1983, 1988, 2005, 2011, 2012, and 2013. There has been at least one drought per decade with the exception of the 1990s when no substantial droughts were recorded. The 2012 drought caused an estimated \$65.1 million in crop damages, which is more than 86% of all the crop damage recorded for the two-county area.

Following each declared drought, crop yield reductions were generally experienced, some substantial. Corn and soybean yield reductions were most severe for the 1988 drought when there was a 50.7% to 58.9% reduction in corn yields and an 35.7% to 44.9% reduction in soybean yields.

### Landslides

There have been five documented landslide events in the two-county area since 1985, four in Tazewell County and one in Woodford County. Approximately \$1.1 million damages were recorded from two separate events in East Peoria. One fatality was recorded as a result of the 1995 East Peoria landslide.

### Earthquakes

In the previous 200 years, no earthquakes have originated in the two-county area while seven earthquakes have originated in the adjacent counties of Peoria, Mason, Fulton, LaSalle, and McLean. There are no known fault zones or geologic structures located in the two-county area.

### Mine Subsidence

There are 31 documented underground coal mines located in the two-county area according to the Illinois State Geological Survey's Directory of Coal Mines. No mine subsidence events have been documented. Andrea asked committee members for any additional information about such events.

According to the Illinois State Geological Survey, there are 8,288 acres (2.0% of the land area) and 7,539 housing units (14.3% of the total housing units) in Tazewell County located over or adjacent to mapped mines and land that could be affected if the mine boundaries are inaccurate or uncertain. These figures are 3,650 acres (1.1% of the land area) and 906 housing units (6.8% of total housing units) for Woodford County.

Mine subsidence has the potential to impact Creve Coeur, East Peoria, Marquette Heights, Pekin, Minonk, and Roanoke, as well as unincorporated areas of the two counties.

### Levees

There are nine levees of significance in Tazewell County and none in Woodford County. Seven of the nine levees are located in East Peoria and protect approximately 1,041 structures, 6,034 individuals, and \$543 million in property. The two remaining levees are located in southwest Tazewell County and protect approximately 184 structures, 278 individuals, and \$157.5 million in property.

## Dams

There are 53 classified dams in the two-county area according to the US Army Corps of Engineers' National Inventory of Dams. Six dams are publicly owned, four in Tazewell County and two in Woodford County. The remaining 47 dams are privately owned. There are six dams with a hazard classification of "High" (five in Tazewell and one in Woodford) and 11 dams with a hazard classification of "Significant" (10 in Tazewell and one in Woodford).

Ken Runkle of AEC then provided information about select man-made hazards in the two-county area.

## **Man-Made Hazards Risk Assessment**

Ken informed the Committee that while the focus of this planning effort is directed at natural hazards, FEMA allows a small portion of the planning process to be devoted to an overview of selected man-made hazards.

Although this overview does not have the same depth as the assessment of natural hazards, it provides useful information to place various man-made hazards in perspective. The man-made hazard risk assessment focused on the following categories of:

- generation, storage/handling, and transportation of hazardous substances;
- waste disposal;
- hazardous materials (hazmat) incidents; and
- waste remediation.

Hazardous substances broadly include flammable, explosive, biological, chemical, or physical material that has the potential to harm public health or the environment. For the purposes of these Plans, the term includes both hazardous product and hazardous waste.

## **Generation, Storage/Handling, & Transportation**

In 2021, there were 20 facilities in the two-county area that generated reportable quantities of hazardous substances according to the USEPA.

Based on records obtained from IEMA's Tier II database, there were 146 stationary facilities within the two-county area that stored and/or handled hazardous substances. Sixty-five of these facilities stored and/or handled chemicals identified as "Extremely Hazardous Substances".

## **Waste Disposal**

There is one active commercial solid (household) waste landfill operating in the two-county area: Tazewell County Landfill. There are no facilities within the two-county area permitted to handle Potentially Infectious Medical Waste and no commercial off-site hazardous waste treatment or disposal facilities.

## **Hazardous Materials (Hazmat) Incidents**

A hazardous materials (hazmat) incident refers to any accident involving the release of hazardous substances. Incidents can take place at fixed facilities or as they are being transported. Between 2012 and 2021 there were 148 hazmat incidents reported to IEMA & ICC in the two-county area. Of the 148 incidents, 107 occurred at fixed facilities, while

41 occurred during transport. Of the 41 transportation hazmat incidents, 33 were roadway incidents, 2 were rail incidents, and 6 were barge incidents.

### Waste Remediation

Waste remediation in Illinois is primarily conducted through three programs: the federal Superfund Program (for sites posing the largest threat to public health and the environment), the Illinois Site Remediation Program (SRP), and the Illinois Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Program.

Superfund: There are no active Superfund sites in the two-county area.

Illinois SRP: There are 27 SRP sites located the two-county area. Twenty-three of the sites have received “No Further Remediation” (NFR) or 4(y) letters.

Illinois LUST: There are 377 LUST sites located in the two-county area. Approximately 63% of these sites have received NFR, Non-Lust Determination or Section 4(y) letters or remediation is virtually complete.

### Risk Priority Index Exercise

Following the risk assessment, Andrea led the Committee through a Risk Priority Index (RPI) exercise. The RPI is a quantitative means of providing guidance for ranking the hazards that have the potential to impact each county. This ranking can assist participants in determining which hazards present the highest risks and therefore which ones to focus on when formulating mitigation projects and activities. Each hazard is scored on three categories: frequency, impacts on life and health and impacts on property and infrastructure based on a scoring system provided. Andrea walked the committee through the scoring system using excessive heat as an example and then provided time for the Committee to fill out the PRI form during the meeting. The results will be compiled, and the findings will be presented at the next meeting.

### Mission Statement & Goals

Ken asked Committee members to review the draft mission statement and updated mitigation goals provided in the meeting materials. Both of these are required elements of the Plan. As part of the Plan update process, both items need to be reviewed and re-evaluated. The mission statement was reviewed, and it was determined that no revisions to the wording were needed.

Next Ken discussed the mitigation goals, which are intended to reduce long-term vulnerabilities to natural and man-made hazards. Each project included in the updated Plan should be aimed at one or more of the goals developed by the committee. The updated goals were reviewed, and no revisions were made to the wording.

The mission statement and goals will be added to the Plan update.

### Mitigation Actions Prioritization Methodology

The Mitigation Actions Prioritization Methodology outlines the approach used to classify each mitigation action identified by the participating jurisdictions and is a FEMA-required element of the Plan.

Mitigation actions can be prioritized in a number of ways. Ken explained that the updated methodology is based on two key factors:

- 1) Frequency of hazard—severe storms occur more frequently than earthquakes.
- 2) Degree of mitigation—some projects will significantly reduce damages while other projects only have the potential to reduce damages.

This methodology helps objectively identify which projects and activities have a greater likelihood to significantly reduce the long-term vulnerabilities associated with the most frequently-occurring hazards. After reviewing the updated methodology, the Committee determined that no changes needed to be made.

Ken acknowledged that while this methodology does not take cost or politics into consideration, these factors may affect the order in which projects are implemented. She also noted that it is important to keep in mind that implementing all of the mitigation projects is desirable regardless of which prioritization category they fall under.

### **Community Lifelines**

Before discussing mitigation projects and the mitigation action tables with the Committee, Andrea took a few minutes to discuss the concept of community lifelines. FEMA has identified seven community lifelines that are the most fundamental services in the community that, when stabilized, enable all aspects of society to function. The seven community lifelines include: safety & security; food, water, shelter; health & medical; energy (power & fuel); communications; transportation; and hazardous materials.

While the concept of community lifelines was developed to support emergency response and planning, FEMA has begun applying it to all phases of emergency management. Efforts to protect community lifelines and prevent and mitigate potential impacts to them is one of the focuses of the BRIC grant program. A handout with a brief description of the community lifelines was included in the meeting packet. Community lifelines will be included in most project description to create a clear connection to the concept.

### **Mitigation Action Tables**

Andrea reiterated that mitigation actions include activities and projects that reduce the long-term risk to people and property from the natural and man-made hazards discussed in the risk assessment.

She then described how the draft methodology, the existing and new lists of mitigation projects, finalized goals, and other information will be presented for Committee review. She chose a frequently-requested mitigation project, a community safe room (tornado-shelter), as an example to show how a typical project is prioritized and entered into the Plan on a Mitigation Action Table. She described how each column in the Mitigation Action Table would be completed for this example project.

She explained that the information in the Mitigation Action Tables would be prepared by AEC, but that the Tables cannot be completed until all of the participants submit their draft lists of projects. Committee Members will have the opportunity at the next meeting to review all of the mitigation projects submitted so that they can make adjustments to their lists if they choose.

It was noted that each jurisdiction will have their own list of jurisdiction-specific mitigation projects and they do not need to get approval from any of the other participating jurisdictions or any of the other participants for any of their projects. Participants were also reminded that this is a list of projects and activities they would like to see accomplished if funding becomes available. For a jurisdiction to be eligible for a project, it must be on its list.

This is a mitigation plan and there are some projects that IEMA/FEMA do not consider mitigation. Projects associated with emergency preparedness, disaster response & recovery and maintenance will not be included in the Plan. Andrea noted that as the committee members put their lists together, if they are unsure about whether a project would be considered mitigation, go ahead, and include it on their list. AEC will review the lists and help make the appropriate determinations.

Committee members were encouraged to contact Andrea or Ken if questions arise before they return to the next Committee meeting.

### **What Happens Next?**

Committee members were asked to return all completed forms to AEC by Friday, June 16 so they can be processed in time for the next meeting, which was scheduled for:

**Tuesday, July 25, 2023**

**East Peoria City Hall, 401 West Washington Street, East Peoria, 1:30 P.M.**

### **Public Comment**

The Tazewell County EMA Director asked whether there had been a shift in FEMA's priorities in terms of project funding. Andrea explained the grant programs available through FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Assistance program including the addition of BRIC and its focus on regional projects that address future conditions.

With no other questions or comments, Andrea adjourned the meeting.

## Tazewell County Risk Priority Index Results - Average

| Hazard                            | Hazard Frequency | Impacts on Life & Health | Impacts on Property & Infrastructure | Risk Priority Index Score | Rank     |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| Tornadoes                         | 4.0              | 3.5                      | 3.5                                  | 11.0                      | 1        |
| Thunderstorms with Damaging Winds | 4.0              | 3.0                      | 3.0                                  | 10.0                      | 2        |
| Floods                            | 4.0              | 2.5                      | 2.5                                  | 9.0                       | 3/4      |
| Winter Storms                     | 4.0              | 2.5                      | 2.5                                  | 9.0                       | 3/4      |
| Hail                              | 4.0              | 2.0                      | 2.5                                  | 8.5                       | 5/6      |
| Lightning                         | 4.0              | 2.5                      | 2.0                                  | 8.5                       | 5/6      |
| Excessive Heat                    | 3.5              | 3.0                      | 1.5                                  | 8.0                       | 7/8      |
| Extreme Cold                      | 3.5              | 3.0                      | 1.5                                  | 8.0                       | 7/8      |
| Heavy Rain                        | 4.0              | 2.0                      | 1.5                                  | 7.5                       | 9        |
| Hazmat Incidents: Transportation  | 3.0              | 2.0                      | 2.0                                  | 7.0                       | 10       |
| Landslides                        | 2.5              | 1.5                      | 2.0                                  | 6.0                       | 11/12    |
| Mine Subsidence                   | 2.5              | 1.5                      | 2.0                                  | 6.0                       | 11/12    |
| Drought                           | 2.5              | 1.5                      | 1.0                                  | 5.0                       | 13/14/15 |
| Hazmat Incidents: Fixed Facility  | 2.0              | 1.5                      | 1.5                                  | 5.0                       | 13/14/15 |
| Levee Failures                    | 2.5              | 1.5                      | 1.0                                  | 5.0                       | 13/14/15 |
| Earthquakes                       | 2.0              | 1.5                      | 1.0                                  | 4.5                       | 16/17    |
| Terrorism                         | 1.5              | 1.5                      | 1.5                                  | 4.5                       | 16/17    |
| Dam Failures                      | 1.5              | 1.0                      | 1.0                                  | 3.5                       | 18       |

## Woodford County Risk Priority Index Results - Average

| Hazard                            | Hazard Frequency | Impacts on Life & Health | Impacts on Property & Infrastructure | Risk Priority Index Score | Rank  |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|
| Tornadoes                         | 4.0              | 3.5                      | 4.0                                  | 11.5                      | 1     |
| Floods                            | 4.0              | 3.0                      | 3.5                                  | 10.5                      | 2/3   |
| Thunderstorms with Damaging Winds | 4.0              | 3.0                      | 3.5                                  | 10.5                      | 2/3   |
| Heavy Rain                        | 4.0              | 2.5                      | 3.5                                  | 10.0                      | 4/5   |
| Lightning                         | 4.0              | 3.0                      | 3.0                                  | 10.0                      | 4/5   |
| Hazmat Incidents: Fixed Facility  | 3.0              | 3.0                      | 3.5                                  | 9.5                       | 6/7   |
| Hazmat Incidents: Transportation  | 3.5              | 3.0                      | 3.0                                  | 9.5                       | 6/7   |
| Dam Failures                      | 1.0              | 4.0                      | 4.0                                  | 9.0                       | 8/9   |
| Winter Storms                     | 4.0              | 2.5                      | 2.5                                  | 9.0                       | 8/9   |
| Extreme Cold                      | 3.0              | 3.5                      | 2.0                                  | 8.5                       | 10    |
| Hail                              | 3.0              | 2.0                      | 3.0                                  | 8.0                       | 11    |
| Excessive Heat                    | 3.0              | 3.0                      | 1.0                                  | 7.0                       | 12    |
| Terrorism                         | 1.0              | 2.5                      | 3.0                                  | 6.5                       | 13    |
| Drought                           | 1.5              | 2.0                      | 2.5                                  | 6.0                       | 14/15 |
| Earthquakes                       | 1.0              | 2.5                      | 2.5                                  | 6.0                       | 14/15 |
| Landslides                        | 1.0              | 1.5                      | 2.5                                  | 5.0                       | 16/17 |
| Mine Subsidence                   | 1.0              | 2.0                      | 2.0                                  | 5.0                       | 16/17 |

# Descriptions of Columns in Mitigation Actions Table

The following provides a brief description of the information that will be contained in each column of the Mitigation Action Prioritization Table.

## **Priority**

Using the mitigation action prioritization methodology developed, each project or activity will be assigned to one of the four categories.

|    |   |
|----|---|
| HM | Actions with the potential to virtually eliminate or significantly reduce impacts from the most significant hazards |
| LM | Actions with the potential to reduce impacts from the most significant hazards                                      |
| HL | Actions with the potential to virtually eliminate or significantly reduce impacts from the less significant hazards |
| LL | Actions with the potential to reduce impacts from the less significant hazards                                      |

## **Activity/Project Description**

Information in this column will be provided by each community and includes a description of each identified project and activity.

## **Hazard(s) to be Mitigated**

Based on the activity/project description, a determination will be made about which hazard or hazards are being mitigated for. The following abbreviations will be used to identify the applicable hazards.

|    |                |     |  |
|----|----------------|-----|--|
| DF | Dam Failure    | LF  | Levee Failure                                  |
| DR | Drought        | MMH | Man-Made Hazard                                |
| EC | Extreme Cold   | MS  | Mine Subsidence                                |
| EH | Excessive Heat | SS  | Severe Storms (Thunderstorms, Hail, Lightning) |
| EQ | Earthquake     | SWS | Severe Winter Storm                            |
| F  | Flood          | T   | Tornado  |
| L  | Landslide      |     |  |

## **Community Lifeline(s) to be Mitigated**

Based on the activity/project description, a determination will be made about whether the action will mitigate risk to any of the seven Community Lifelines. The following abbreviations will be used to identify the applicable Community Lifelines.

|     |                       |     |                   |
|-----|-----------------------|-----|-------------------|
| C   | Communications        | M&H | Health & Medical  |
| E   | Energy (Power & Fuel) | S&S | Safety & Security |
| FWS | Food, Water, Shelter  | T   | Transportation    |
| HM  | Hazardous Material    |     |                   |

## **Type of Mitigation Activity/Project**

There are four primary types or categories of mitigation projects and activities. Based on the activity/project description, a determination will be made about which category each action falls into. The following abbreviations will be used for each category/type.

|      |                           |      |                                     |
|------|---------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| E&A  | Education & Awareness     | NSP  | Natural Systems Protection          |
| LP&R | Local Plans & Regulations | S&IP | Structure & Infrastructure Projects |

# Descriptions of Columns in Mitigation Actions Table

## **Size of Population Affected**

For this column a general descriptor of small, medium or large will be used. These terms do not have specific definitions since they are relative to the size of the community that is being discussed. A “large” population affected in one municipality is different than a “large” population affected in another. These terms are only meant to give the reader a sense of the magnitude and are not meant as an exact measurement.

## **Goals**

This column identifies the goal or goals that each activity/project fulfills.

## **Reduce Effects of Hazard(s) on Buildings & Infrastructure (New/Existing)**

This column was included to address a FEMA requirement to identify whether the mitigation projects and activities proposed by each jurisdiction reduce the risk from natural hazards to existing building and infrastructure as well as limit any risk to new development and redevelopment. These columns will be filled in with a Yes, No or NA (Not Applicable).

## **Organization/Department Responsible for Implementation & Administration**

Information in this column will be provided by each jurisdiction and identifies the position, office and/or department responsible for implementing and administering each activity/project identified. More than one organization/department may be identified.

## **Time Frame to Complete Activity**

Information in this column will be provided by each jurisdiction and identifies a general time frame (i.e., 2 years, 5 years, etc.) in which participants would like to see the project/activity successfully completed. In many cases the time frame is dependent on obtaining funding. To allow for the unpredictability in securing funding, a time range (i.e., 2-4 years, 3-5 years, etc.) can be used.

## **Funding Source(s)**

This column generally identifies how a project will be funded – including through grants, loans, municipal funds, etc. The funding source identified for each project/activity is the most likely source to be pursued.

## **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

This column was included to address A FEMA requirement that each jurisdiction considered the benefits that would result from a project or activity versus the cost of the action. For this column the general descriptors of high, medium and low will be used.

These terms are not meant to translate into a specific dollar amount since the cost/benefit for any given community may depend, in part, on their size and fiscal situation. This analysis is only meant to give the reader a general sense of costs and benefits associated with an activity/project. A complete cost-benefit analysis is not required for this Plan. When a grant application is submitted for a project, a detailed cost/benefit analysis will be included at that time. The cost/benefit analysis does not prioritize a project. Just because a project has a low or limited benefit, does not mean it will not be funded.

## **Finalized Mitigation Goals**

### **Tazewell & Woodford Counties Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Advisory Committee**

- Goal 1: Educate people about the natural hazards they face and the ways they can protect themselves, their homes, and their businesses from those hazards.
- Goal 2: Protect the lives, health, and safety of the people and animals in the County from the dangers of natural hazards.
- Goal 3: Protect existing infrastructure and design new infrastructure (roads, bridges, utilities, water supplies, sanitary sewer systems, etc.) to be resilient to the impacts of natural hazards.
- Goal 4: Incorporate natural hazard mitigation into community plans, regulations and activities.
- Goal 5: Place a priority on protecting public services, including critical facilities, utilities, roads and schools.
- Goal 6: Preserve and protect the rivers and floodplains in our County.
- Goal 7: Ensure that new developments do not create new exposures to damage from natural hazards.
- Goal 8: Protect historic, cultural, and natural resources from the effects of natural hazards.



## 5.0 PLAN MAINTENANCE

This section focuses on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requirements for maintaining and updating the Plan once it has been approved by FEMA and adopted by the participating jurisdictions. These requirements include:

- establishing the method and schedule for monitoring, evaluating and updating the Plan;
- describing how the requirements of the Plan will be incorporated into existing planning mechanisms; and
- detailing how continued public input will be obtained during the plan maintenance process.

These requirements ensure that the Plan remains an effective and relevant document. The following provides a detailed discussion of each requirement.

### 5.1 MONITORING, EVALUATING & UPDATING THE PLAN

Outlined below is a method and schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the Plan. This method allows the participating jurisdictions to make necessary changes and updates to the Plan and track the implementation and results of the mitigation actions that have been undertaken.

#### 5.1.1 Monitoring and Evaluating the Plan

The Plan update will be monitored and evaluated by a Plan Maintenance Subcommittee of the Mitigation Advisory Committee (MAC or Committee) on an annual basis. The Subcommittee will be composed of the participating jurisdictions who sought Plan approval and other key members of the Committee. The Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (TCRPC) will chair the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee.

The TCRPC will assume lead responsibility for monitoring and tracking the implementation status of the mitigation actions identified in the Plan update. It will be the responsibility of each Plan participant to provide the TCRPC with an annual progress report on the status of their existing mitigation actions and identify whether any actions need to be modified. New mitigation actions may be added to the Plan during the annual monitoring and evaluation period or at any time during the plan maintenance cycle by contacting the TCRPC and providing the appropriate information.

#### **Monitoring & Evaluating**

- ❖ A Plan Maintenance Subcommittee will be formed to monitor and evaluate the Plan update.
- ❖ The *Plan update will be monitored and evaluated* on an *annual basis*.
- ❖ Each Plan participant will be responsible for providing an annual progress report on the status of their mitigation actions.
- ❖ Plan participants can add *new mitigation actions* to the Plan *during the annual monitoring phase or by contacting* the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission.

The Plan Maintenance Subcommittee will also evaluate the Plan update on an annual basis to determine the effectiveness of the Plan at achieving its stated purpose and goals. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the Plan update, the Subcommittee will review the mitigation actions that have been successfully implemented and determine whether the action achieved the identified goal(s) and had the intended result (i.e., losses were avoided, or the vulnerability of hazard-prone areas were reduced).

The Subcommittee will also ask each Plan participant to identify any significant changes in development or priorities that have occurred within the previous 12 months; whether any new plans, policies, regulations, or reports have been adopted; and if any hazard-related damages to critical facilities and infrastructure have been sustained.

In order to streamline the plan maintenance process, the TCRPC will provide each Plan participant with a Plan Maintenance Checklist along with the necessary forms to complete and return. **Appendix \_\_** contains a copy of Checklist and associated forms.

The TCRPC will then prepare a progress report detailing the results of the annual Plan monitoring and evaluation period and provide copies to the Subcommittee. The annual progress report will include:

- information on any hazard-related damages sustained by critical facilities and infrastructure within the planning area during the previous year.
- implementation status of the mitigation actions identified in the Mitigation Strategy.
- identification of any new mitigation actions proposed by the Plan participants.
- information on changes in development, priorities, and planning and regulatory capabilities for the Plan participants.
- identification of how information will be disseminated to stakeholders and constituents on the Plan and its progress in effort to seek continued public participation.

If any existing mitigation actions are modified or new mitigation actions are identified for the Plan participants then Section 4.7 of the Mitigation Strategy will be updated and the Plan update resubmitted to the Illinois Emergency Management Agency (IEMA) and FEMA for reference.

On an as needed basis the TCRPC, in consultation with the Subcommittee, will evaluate requests from non-participating jurisdictions to “join” the Plan before the five-year update. Consideration will be given if certain conditions are met as outlined in Appendix D of *FEMA’s Local Mitigation Planning Policy Guide*.

### 5.1.2 Updating the Plan

The Plan must be updated within five years of the of the Plan approval date indicated on the signed FEMA final approval letter. (This date can be found in Section 6, Plan Adoption.) This ensures that all the participating jurisdictions will remain eligible to receive federal grant funds to implement those mitigation actions identified in this Plan.

The TCRPC, with assistance from the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee, will be responsible for updating the Plan. The update will incorporate all of the information gathered during the monitoring and evaluation phase and will also include:

#### **Updating the Plan**

- ❖ The TCRPC, with assistance from the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee, will be responsible for updating the Plan.
- ❖ The Plan ***must be updated within 5 years*** of the ***date of the final approval letter*** provided by FEMA.
- ❖ Once the Plan update has received FEMA/IEMA approval, each participating jurisdiction ***must adopt the Plan to remain eligible to receive federal mitigation funds.***

- ❖ a review of the Mitigation Strategy, including potential updates to the mitigation goals and prioritization methodology;
- ❖ an evaluation of whether additional natural or man-made hazards need to be addressed or included in the Plan;
- ❖ a review of new hazard data that may affect the Risk Assessment Section;
- ❖ identification of any changes in priorities within each participating jurisdiction; and
- ❖ identification of any changes in development that have occurred in hazard prone areas that would increase or decrease the participating jurisdictions' vulnerability.

A Mitigation Advisory Committee will be reformed to update the Plan and a public involvement strategy similar to the one employed for this Plan update will be implemented to ensure that the public and stakeholders have ample opportunities to become engaged and provide input during the development of the Plan update. In addition, any jurisdictions that did not take part in the previous Plan update may do so at this time. It will be the responsibility of these jurisdictions to provide all of the information needed to be integrated into the Plan update.

A public forum will be held to present the Plan update to the public for review and comment. The comments received at the public forum will be reviewed and incorporated into the Plan update. The Plan update will then be submitted to IEMA and FEMA for review and approval. ***Once the Plan update has received state and federal approval, FEMA requires that each of the participating jurisdictions adopt the Plan to remain eligible to receive federal funds to implement identified mitigation actions.***

## **5.2 INCORPORATING THE MITIGATION STRATEGY INTO EXISTING PLANNING MECHANISMS**

As part of the planning process, the Committee identified each participating jurisdiction's existing capabilities (i.e., existing authorities, policies, programs, technical information, etc.) and resources available to support or accomplish mitigation and reduce long-term vulnerability. **Figures PP- through PP- identify the existing authorities, policies, programs, technical information, and resources available by capability type by jurisdiction. *It will be the responsibility of each participating jurisdiction to incorporate, where applicable, the mitigation strategy and other information contained in the Plan update into the planning mechanisms identified for their jurisdiction.***

Adoption of this Plan update will trigger each participating jurisdiction to review and, where appropriate, integrate the Plan into other available planning mechanisms. The Plan Maintenance Subcommittee's annual review will help maintain awareness of the Plan among the participating jurisdictions and encourage active integration of the Plan into their day-to-day operations and planning mechanisms. Any time a mitigation action is slated for implementation by a participating jurisdiction, it will be integrated into their capital improvement plan/budget.

Based on conversations with the Committee, **xxx** of the jurisdictions have identified the need to adopt, review, and/or strengthen current policies or programs in the near future. Several of the participating jurisdictions (**xxx, xxx, and xxx**) have limited capabilities to integrate the mitigation strategy and other information contained in the Plan update into existing planning mechanisms.

These jurisdictions are small in size and may not have the financial resources or trained personnel to develop planning mechanisms such as comprehensive plans or building and zoning ordinances.

Given that the TCRPC often assists and supports the participating jurisdictions in their planning efforts, they will also play a role in assuring the information presented in this Plan update is utilized and expanded on, when appropriate, in existing planning mechanisms. This can be achieved through discussions at regularly scheduled meeting with participating jurisdictions and when existing plans and programs are reviewed and updated.

### **5.3 CONTINUED PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

The County and participating jurisdictions understand the importance of continued public involvement and will seek public input on the Plan update throughout the plan maintenance cycle. Any meetings held by the Plan Maintenance Subcommittee will be noticed and open to the public. Stakeholders and public will be encouraged to participate and provide feedback. Following distribution of the annual progress report, each participating jurisdiction will be encouraged to discuss the findings at their monthly board/council meetings to help maintain awareness of the Plan and encourage integration of the Plan in day-to-day operations.

Participating jurisdictions will also be encouraged to make the annual progress report available via social media and on their websites, as available, and at their offices. As the lead organization responsible for maintaining the Plan update, the TCRPC will also periodically post mitigation-related topics to social media including where to access the approved Plan, information on the hazards that have the potential to impact the County, interesting facts about each hazard, and no or low-cost actions that residents can take to reduce their risk from natural hazards.

A copy of the approved Plan will be maintained and available for review at the TCRPC and on the Commission's website. Individuals will be encouraged to provide feedback and submit comments for the next Plan update to the TCRPC or Woodford County EMA Director. The comments received will be compiled and included in the annual progress report and considered for incorporation into the next Plan update. Separate Committee meetings and a public forum will be held prior to the next Plan update submittal to ensure that the public and stakeholders have ample opportunity to become engaged, provide input during the development of the Plan update, and comment on the proposed revision to the Plan update.

## 6.0 PLAN ADOPTION

The final step in the planning process is the adoption of the approved Plan update by each participating jurisdiction. Each jurisdiction must formally adopt the Plan to become or remain eligible for federal grant funds to implement mitigation actions identified in this Plan.

### 6.1 PLAN ADOPTION PROCESS

Before the Plan update could be adopted by the participating jurisdictions, it was made available for public review and comment through a public forum and comment period. Comments received were incorporated into the Plan update and the Plan was then submitted to the Illinois Emergency Management Agency (IEMA) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for their review and approval.

Upon receipt of the Approval Pending Adoption (APA) letter from FEMA, the Plan update was presented to the County and participating jurisdictions for adoption. ***Each participating jurisdiction was required to formally adopt*** the Plan to become or remain eligible to receive federal grant funds to implement the mitigation actions identified in this Plan. Any jurisdiction that chose not to adopt the Plan update did not affect the eligibility of those who did.

**Figure PA-1** identifies the participating jurisdictions and the date each formally adopted the Plan update. Signed copies of the adoption resolutions are located in **Appendix \_**. FEMA signed the final approval letter on **(Date)** which began the five-year approval period and set the expiration date of **(Date)** for the Plan.

| Figure PA-1<br>Plan Adoption Dates |                    |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Participating Jurisdiction         | Plan Adoption Date |
|                                    |                    |
|                                    |                    |
|                                    |                    |
|                                    |                    |
|                                    |                    |
|                                    |                    |
|                                    |                    |
|                                    |                    |
|                                    |                    |

