

Chapter 3

Hazard Mitigation Goals

The goals for this plan were established by the Jersey County Hazard Mitigation Planning Team. They are consistent with state natural hazard mitigation goals and local community goals of Jersey County and municipalities participating in this multijurisdictional plan.¹ This chapter documents the process utilized to develop the goals of this plan. A complete list of goals and objectives is located at the end of this chapter.

3.1 Public Forum

Having completed hazard profiles and loss estimates for the hazards identified as posing the greatest risk to the county, the Hazard Mitigation Planning Team devised a process to present the findings from this phase of the mitigation planning process to the public and solicit public input on mitigation goals and objectives. On June 3, 2004, members of the Hazard Mitigation Planning Team, Jersey County Board, elected officials from the respective municipalities in the county, and leaders from the private sector were invited to attend a working session at the county government building in Jerseyville. Thirty individuals from each of these constituencies attended this two-hour session moderated by a member of the Hazard Mitigation Planning Team.

The moderator opened the meeting with a ten minute presentation of the entire hazard mitigation planning process to ensure that all participants were familiar with the rationale for mitigation planning, the stages of the planning process, and requirements associated with the eventual mitigation plan submitted to FEMA officials. Participants were reminded that the perspective they brought to the meeting was essential to the establishment of mitigation goals and objectives given the need for the plan to complement existing county and municipal planning efforts (e.g., historic preservation, land conservation, commercial development). Following this initial session, participants were organized into six groups of five participants according to a number each participant received upon arrival. A member of the Hazard Mitigation Planning Team served as a leader for each of the groups.

The moderator began by asking individuals in group to respond in writing to the following question: *What are the top five priorities for your community and Jersey County?* Participants received particular instructions to answer this question from their unique perspective (i.e., mayor, county board member, business leader). The moderator provided some generic examples (enhance public education delivery systems, improve major roads) to spur individual thought and instructed each group to consolidate individual responses into a list of five leading priorities. Lists from each group were then integrated into a list of community priorities. This integrated list is presented in Table 3.1.

¹ State natural hazard mitigation goals are documented in the state's mitigation plan, *2004 Illinois Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan*, October 2004. Copies of local planning documents are provided in Appendix ____.

Table 3.1 Priorities for Jersey County Generated at June 3, 2004 Workshop

- Protection of public safety
 - Improvement of communications infrastructure (cell service, 911 system, etc)
 - Enhancement of flood abatement procedures
 - Improvement of water supply
 - Improvement to elementary and secondary education system (standards, facilities)
 - Preservation of natural lands and historic buildings
 - Protection of individual property rights
 - Prevention of crime
 - Improvement to transportation infrastructure (roads, ferries, etc.)
 - Establishment of county-wide building codes
 - Improvement of land-use policies, including commercial development
-

The purpose of this initial group session, which lasted approximately 20 minutes, was to encourage participants to think about the future of Jersey County and, in particular, to help them understand that hazard mitigation planning is a process that should work in concert with other community planning efforts.

Following this initial exercise, groups were then presented with a table that summarized the research completed for the hazard risk assessment and loss estimation stages of mitigation planning. This table is presented in this document as Table 3.2. As FEMA mitigation planning guidance suggested, when presenting information on risk assessment and loss estimation to members of the public, it is important to consider both the context under which the information is presented and the technical expertise of the audience. The format adopted in Table 3.2 was deemed appropriate for the purpose of providing participants at this particular meeting with a general sense of the impact of each hazard based on the research documented in Chapter 2 of this mitigation plan.

Members of each group were then asked to rate each hazard in terms of its overall impact on the county, using a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 equaled a major impact and 1 equaled little or no impact. Each group discusses similarities and differences in the rankings provided by their group members. As expected, some individual participants ranked certain hazards as having a greater or lesser impact than that suggested by the existing research presented at the outset of the exercise. As group discussion of the rankings revealed, the differences were due largely to the parochial perspectives and interests of the individuals (e.g., individuals located in flood-prone areas of the county significantly more concerned about the impact of overbank flooding compared to residents located miles from the nearest rivers or creeks. Following a period of discussion in each group, the group leaders aggregated individual responses and reported their tallies to the facilitator. These cumulative tallies are reported in Table 3.3. The facilitator then moderated a discussion of the tallies reported by each group. The purpose of this exercise was to build consensus among participants about the relative importance of each hazard in a manner that recognized the geographic diversity of the county.

Table 3.2 Summary of Risk Assessment Research Presented at June 3, 2004 Workshop

Hazard	Probability of Occurrence	Area of Impact	Level of Safety Hazard	Level of Property Damage	Vulnerable Critical Facilities
Earthquake	5-9% of quake 7.5 M or higher within next 15 years; County located in PGA zone of 6g (on scale of 0-180)	Felt county-wide, but the major impact would be in urban areas	Low	Minor; primarily confined to masonry structures; household items not secured	Masonry structures most vulnerable.
Floods (overbank)	50 yr. = 2% yr. 100 yr. = 1% yr.	Floodplain (direct)	Medium	Moderate - Major	Emergency response; municipal bldgs; schools in floodplain
Land subsidence	Low	Impact varies according to soil conditions and slope of land	Low	Minor	N/A
Severe Thunderstorm	Several each year containing various degrees of wind, hail, lightning	Every part of county is vulnerable	Med - High	Minor	Communications vulnerable to disruption; loss of power
Severe Winter Storm	One severe snowstorm on avg. every other year	Every part of county is vulnerable	High	Minor	Communication vulnerable to disruption; loss of power
Tornado	20% chance per year (all recorded have been F1 or F2)	Every part of county is vulnerable	Medium	Med - High	Schools and other large span buildings
Wildfire	Extremely low (county located in light fuel region)	More densely wooded areas	Low	Low	None

Table 3.3 Cumulative Votes on Perceived Impact of Natural Hazards

Severe thunderstorms	88
Tornadoes	87
Severe winter storms	85
Floods (overbank)	84
Earthquakes	50
Wildfires	36
Land subsidence	32

A third group exercise, also lasting approximately 30 minutes, forced participants to consider the focal points of mitigation measures. Individuals were instructed to list aspects mitigation activities should focus on and describe why they thought these aspects are important. Similar to the first group exercise, each group spent time discussing the individual assessments and then arrived at a list of the top five aspects mitigation activities should focus on. The lists from each group were then conveyed to the facilitator. The facilitator then generated an aggregate list of priorities. Each priority in this aggregate list was placed on a separate flip chart sheet and taped to a section of the walls in the meeting location.

Upon entering the meeting location, each participant had been supplied with three colored sticker dots. The final exercise was for each individual to engage in a cumulative voting procedure in which they took their three dots and allocated them to one or more of the priorities for mitigation activities posted on the walls. The results of this procedure are presented in Table 3.4. As the results demonstrate, several participants unaware of current actions (existence of an emergency response plan, relocation of some residents in floodplain area). This process also does not promote a full consideration of the logistical and/or financial feasibility of certain actions (development and maintenance of storm shelters).

Despite these deficiencies, the format of this working session provided a forum whereby community members could learn more about the purpose and process of mitigation planning and provide the Mitigation Planning Team with important input on the potential goals and objectives of mitigation activities. The facilitator concluded the meeting by thanking the participants for their participation in this process and informing them that the information generated in this session would be used by the Mitigation Planning Team to develop goals and objectives that would guide the development of mitigation strategies.

Table 3.4 Results from Voting on Hazard Mitigation Priorities

<u>Priority</u>	<u># of votes</u>
Development of Emergency Communication and Warning System	32
Minimize Loss of Life	24
Develop Emergency Response Plan	22
Protection of Public Health	15
Develop Transportation Infrastructure	13
Public Education	9
Construction of Storm Shelters	9
Relocation of Residents in Floodplain	2
Protection of Public Property	2
Creation of Permanent Hazard Mitigation Committee	0

3.2 Planning Team Session

The Hazard Mitigation Planning Team reconvened in July 2004 to develop goals and objectives for mitigation strategies based on the input provided at the June 3 meeting. A review of the data suggested five main goals. Members then developed objectives designed to advance each of these goals. Consideration was given to objectives that could be undertaken before, during and after a potential hazard in order to minimize the impact of any hazard on the community. A list of the goals and objectives that guide the development of mitigation strategies presented in the remainder of the plan follow below.

3.3 Goals and Objectives

Goal 1 Minimize Loss of Life

Objectives:

- Develop improved systems of delivering warnings about natural hazards to county residents, particularly those in rural areas.
- Develop improved communication systems for emergency responders that will allow them to respond to incidents occasioned by the occurrence of various natural hazards.
- Develop public education campaigns designed to educate residents about steps they can take to minimize the impact of various natural hazards.
- Conduct periodic tests of the county's emergency operation plan.
- Adopt uniform countywide building codes that promote the development of commercial and residential structures capable of withstanding acceptable levels of natural hazard impact.

Goal 2 Protect Public Health

Objectives:

- Develop public education efforts designed to educate the public about measures individual citizens can take to reduce the health risks associated with various natural hazards before, during and after the occurrence of such hazards.
- Improve the following programs with eye to the health risks occasioned by hazards determined most likely to affect the county: sanitation, disease surveillance, vector control, vaccination.

Goal 3 Protect and Develop Infrastructure

Objectives:

- Adopt uniform countywide building codes that promote the development of commercial and residential structures capable of withstanding acceptable levels of natural hazard impact.
- Perform regular maintenance on transportation infrastructure including roads and bridges.
- Review building inspection procedures to ensure appropriate attention to hazard mitigation related features.
- Improve sewage and wastewater treatment infrastructure.
- Review building evacuation procedures posted in all county-owned buildings.
- Review evacuation routes on a regular basis to ensure appropriate access in the event of their use.
- Improve communication systems through the use of federal and state grants and private initiatives.

Goal 4 Protect Public Property and Critical Facilities

Objectives:

- Review building inspection procedures to ensure appropriate attention to hazard mitigation related features.
- Adopt uniform countywide building codes that promote the development of public buildings capable of withstanding acceptable levels of natural hazard impact.
- Retrofit any existing critical facility deemed unreasonably susceptible to natural hazards.
- Ensure that all public buildings are appropriately insured.
- Review security of critical facilities.

Goal 5 Protect Private Property

Objectives:

- Adopt uniform countywide building codes that promote the development of public buildings capable of withstanding acceptable levels of natural hazard impact.
- Adopt zoning ordinances that minimize the risk of exposure to the most prevalent natural hazards.
- Conduct public information campaigns designed to educate citizens about the potential benefits of the following activities: retrofitting, floodproofing, insuring property.