

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Minutes

Macoupin County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Planning Committee

September 14, 2017

7:00 p.m.

**Macoupin County Jail
215 South East Street, Carlinville**

Committee Members

American Environmental Corporation
Bunker Hill, City of
Carlinville, City of
Dorchester Township
Gillespie, City of
Girard, City of
Macoupin County Offices:
County Clerk
Emergency Management Agency
Public Health Department
Sheriff

Macoupin Family Practice Centers
Royal Lakes, Village of
Staunton Volunteer Fire Department
Virden, City of
West Central Development Council

Welcome and Introductions

James Pitchford, Chairman of the Macoupin County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Planning Committee, welcomed attendees. He described the purpose of this Committee is to update the Macoupin County Hazards Mitigation Plan.

Handout materials were distributed to each member, including a Citizen Questionnaire. The questionnaire will help gauge residents and committee member understanding of the natural hazards that impact the County and also identifies communication preferences.

Why Should We Update Our Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan?

Greg Michaud, American Environmental Corporation (AEC), described why mitigation planning is needed and how participating jurisdictions can benefit.

Since the early 1990s damages caused by weather extremes have risen substantially. In 2016, the United States experienced a minimum of \$47.9 billion in severe storm damages according to NOAA and damage figures for 2017 are expected to rise substantially with the destruction caused by Hurricanes Harvey and Irma. Consequently, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) continues to encourage counties throughout the United States to prepare natural hazard mitigation plans. The natural hazards we are discussing are floods, tornadoes, severe

summer storms (including thunderstorms, hail and lightning events), severe winter storms (including ice and snow storms), extreme heat, drought, earthquakes, and dam failures.

From the damages caused by natural disasters, FEMA has calculated that for every dollar spent on mitigation, \$3 to \$4 dollars can be reaped in savings.

Updating this plan provides three major benefits:

- 1.) When the next federally-declared natural disaster occurs, Macoupin County and all impacted municipalities who participate in the planning process will receive the full amount of money that they are eligible for from FEMA. Macoupin County has had five (5) federal disaster declarations since 1982.
- 2.) Specific projects and recommendations will be developed through the planning process to help each participating jurisdiction reduce damages. By including these projects in this Plan, the participating jurisdictions will have an opportunity to receive state and federal funds to complete the projects.
- 3.) Verifiable information about the natural hazards that occur in Macoupin County will be gathered that will help participants in municipal and county meetings make decisions about how to better protect citizens and property from storm damages.

The Planning Process

The goal of the Committee meetings is to update the 2010 Plan to meet state and federal criteria so that it can be approved by the Illinois Emergency Management Agency (IEMA) and FEMA. A five meeting process has been developed to achieve this goal. Specific activities for the Committee meetings include:

1 st Committee meeting	Orientation to the Planning Process Begin identifying Critical Facilities & Existing Planning Documents
2 nd Committee meeting	Discuss the Risk Assessment Approve Mission Statement & Goals Committee returns the Critical Facilities List, the Existing Planning Documents List, and Shelter Survey
3 rd Committee meeting	Identify completed Mitigation Projects Begin discussing additional Mitigation Projects and Activities Review and update a Mitigation Strategy Committee returns list of Mitigation Projects and Activities
4 th Committee meeting	Finish discussing Mitigation Projects and Activities Committee discusses approval/adoption of the Plan
5 th Committee meeting (Public Forum)	Present the Updated Plan for public review Committee helps answer questions from the public

Severe Weather Events

Committee members were asked to share their memories of severe weather events that have occurred in the County. Flooding, tornadoes, severe thunderstorms, lightning, hail, and severe winter storm events were mentioned. Other hazard events related include:

- Tornadoes impacted Bunker Hill in 1948 and 1958. The 1948 tornado caused 11 fatalities.
- Lightning struck the public health building in Gillespie on September 4, 2017 causing a power outage. Lightning strikes also occurred in Carlinville and Mt. Olive.
- Royal Lakes experienced straight line winds in early September, 2017 that damaged trees and a house.
- A tornado caused serious damage in Girard in 2011. Three houses were completely destroyed while six houses sustained heavy damage. Minor injuries were reported. This tornado happened just before planting season and a major cleanup effort had to be undertaken to clear the debris out of farm field.
- In 2012 a tornado caused damage to homes in East Gillespie.
- An ice storm followed by heavy snow (8 to 10 inches) in November, 2006 left residents in Bunker Hill without power for seven days. The Dorchester Township Supervisor indicated they were without power for eight days.
- The 1993 flooding impacted the drinking water treatment plant for Bunker Hill, Shipman and Royal Lakes. Residents were without water for a week.
- An ice storm impacted the County on April 19, 1978. Some areas of the County were without power for ten days.
- In September, 2014 a carbon monoxide leak at the North Mac Girard Campus sent 165 students and teachers to the hospital with carbon monoxide poisoning.
- Virden and Girard were without natural gas for three to four days after a car hit a valve in Thayer.
- Repeated straight-line wind events causing damage have occurred in Gillespie and Royal Lakes.
- Gillespie was without water for approximately 10 days in December 1996 due to human error, not a natural hazard event.

Man-made hazards, such as leaking landfills and mine subsidence will also be included in the updated Plan.

Andrea Bostwick, AEC, asked participants to identify any hazard events that have impacted their jurisdiction by completing the form titled “*Hazard Event Questionnaire.*” The information provided will help supplement the information included in the risk assessment. Participants were also asked see if they have any photographs of storm damage they would be willing to provide for inclusion in the updated Plan.

Information Needed from the Committee

Forms

Andrea distributed the following forms to each participating jurisdiction to complete:

Critical Facilities. Completed lists of Critical Facilities will be used to identify facilities vulnerable to natural hazards and will be provided to IEMA and FEMA as a separate supplement. Copies of the Plan made available to the public will not include these lists for security reasons.

Existing Planning Documents List. This list identifies planning documents (Land Use Plans, Flood Ordinances, and related documents) that a jurisdiction already has in place.

Shelter Surveys. Identifies locations designated as severe weather shelters.

Contact Information. Committee members should provide contact information about themselves to help AEC staff during this planning process.

Mission Statement & Goals

Drafts of the original mission statement and updated goals were distributed. The updated goals were drafted in a manner that should help cover most, if not all, mitigation projects that are anticipated to be submitted. Every project included in the Plan should be aimed at one or more of the goals developed by this Committee. Specific goals related to where you live can be added to this list as well. Committee Members were asked to review and discuss these drafts at the next meeting.

Community Participation

Andrea and Greg stressed the importance of attending each committee meeting and indicated that member participation helps the County meet its 25% match for this grant in addition to assuring that member jurisdictions are eligible for IEMA/FEMA funds. They indicated that tag-teaming and designating substitute representatives is permissible when other obligations arise. Andrea pointed out that a designated substitute representative does not have to be an official or employee of the jurisdiction.

Providing the public with opportunities to have input is an important part of the planning process. Andrea requested that each jurisdiction consider making the “**Frequently Asked Questions**” handout in the meeting packet available for public review within your jurisdiction as well as the “**Citizen Questionnaire**” passed out at the beginning of the meeting. She told participants to let her know if they would like electronic copies of any of the forms or handouts.

What Happens Next?

The risk assessment will be the main topic of the next committee meeting.

Participants were asked whether they would prefer to conduct these meetings at night or during the day. A majority of the group indicated their preference for evening meetings.

The second meeting of the Committee was scheduled for:

Tuesday, January 23
Macoupin County Jail
215 South East Street, Carlinville
7 p.m.

With no further questions the meeting was adjourned.

Meeting Minutes

Macoupin County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Planning Committee

January 23, 2018

7:00 p.m.

Macoupin County Jail
215 South East Street, Carlinville

Committee Members

American Environmental Corporation
Benld, City of
Brighton, Village of
Carlinville, City of
Dorchester Township
Gillespie, City of
Girard, City of

Macoupin County Offices:
Assessor
County Clerk
Coroner
Emergency Management Agency
Public Health Department
Staunton, City of
Viriden, City of
Wilsonville, Village of

Welcome and Introductions

Jim Pitchford, Chairman of the Macoupin County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Planning Committee, welcomed attendees.

Handout materials were distributed to each member.

Information Needed for the Plan

Before beginning the risk assessment presentation, Andrea Bostwick (AEC) asked the participating jurisdictions to submit their completed “**Critical Facilities**,” “**List of Existing Planning Documents**,” and “**Identification of Severe Weather Shelters**” forms passed out at the previous meeting. This information will be used to prepare the vulnerability assessment.

Risk Assessment

Andrea began the presentation by noting that over \$12.2 million in damages have resulted from approximately 540 documented severe storms and natural hazard events verified in Macoupin County over approximately 50 years. The actual damages are much higher based on several facts:

- 1.) damage descriptions for several thunderstorms with damaging winds, tornadoes and flash floods 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.

Natural Hazards

An overview of the Risk Assessment tables contained in the handout materials was provided. The frequency, magnitude and property damages for each category of natural hazard were described.

Severe Storms

Severe storms are the most frequently occurring natural hazard in Macoupin County with 293 events verified. Over \$6.5 million in damages has resulted from 20 severe thunderstorms with damaging winds, hail and lightning. At least 4 fatalities and 145 injuries can be attributed to severe storms. Most of these injuries and deaths are attributed to wet pavement conditions.

Severe Winter Storms

There were at least 135 verified events involving severe winter storms (snow, ice, or extreme cold) since 1950. Two of the ice storm events, 1978 and 2006, caused approximately \$1.2 million in property damage. Additional damage information was unavailable, including vehicle damage and the amount spent on snow removal and salt spreading. At least 2 fatalities and 86 injuries can be attributed to crashes involving ice and snow-covered roadways.

At least 11 major storms have occurred in every decade since 1950. There have already been nine storms in the current decade.

The record maximum 24-hour snowfall in the County is 14.0 inches at Medora on November 5 & 6, 1951. The coldest recorded temperature is -26°F at Carlinville on February 13, 1905.

Excessive Heat

There have been 38 excessive heat events reported since 1995. Three events in 1995 resulted in over 222 injuries, \$55,000 in property damage and \$410,000 in crop damage for a 21-county area including Macoupin County. Additional damage and injury information was unavailable. However, contrary to general held conceptions, excessive heat causes more death than tornadoes, floods and severe storms.

The hottest temperature recorded in Macoupin County was 114°F at Virden on July 14, 1954.

Tornadoes

Since 1950, 38 tornadoes have been verified in Macoupin County. A minimum of \$4.5 million in property damages has occurred from 11 tornadoes, with an additional \$550,000 in property damages resulting from four tornadoes that impacted two or more counties (a breakdown by county wasn't available). Ten of the tornadoes have recorded property damages of at least \$100,000 per events.

Three fatalities and 10 injuries can be attributed to six of the tornado events.

The average tornado in Macoupin County is approximately 3.9 miles long and 80 yards wide. The longest and widest tornado recorded in the County occurred on May 12, 1978 and was

27.9 miles long and 700 yards wide. The highest recorded F-Scale rating for a tornado in the County is an EF3 that occurred near Girard on April 19, 2011.

Floods

Four of the five federal disaster declarations for Macoupin County are related to flooding. At least 31 flood events have occurred in Macoupin County since 1982. Property damage information was unavailable for all but one of the events. Of the 31 flood events, 28 of the events were classified as flash flooding.

Drought

Four major droughts have occurred during the last four decade – 1983, 1988, 2005, 2011 and 2012. Crop damage figures were not available for any of the events. Following each declared drought, crop yield reductions were substantial. Corn and soybean yield reductions were most severe for the 1983 drought when there was a 56.9% reduction in corn yields and a 43.4% reduction in soybean yields.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Corn</u>	<u>Soybeans</u>
1983	56.9%	43.4%
1988	31.3%	16.2%
2005	19.0%	14.0%
2011*	10.8%	27.3%
2012	34.6%	0.0%

* While not designated a primary disaster area by USDA, abnormally dry to moderate drought conditions from August to November caused yield reductions in the County.

Earthquakes

In the previous 200 years, there has been one earthquake originating in Macoupin County and 13 earthquakes in the adjacent counties. All of these earthquakes measured less than 5.0 magnitude. There are no geologic faults in Macoupin County, but there are five geologic features in the region that could result cause earthquakes to occur.

Dams

There has been one verified dam failure in Macoupin County. The Virden Recreation Club Lake Dam experienced a dam failure on September 2, 2010 that resulted in the closure of the lake and the land returned to farm fields. Eight-eight (88) classified dams exist in Macoupin County. Two of these dams have a “High” hazard potential classification. There are 19 publicly-owned dams within the County and 69 privately-owned dams.

Mission Statement & Goals

Andrea asked Committee members to review the draft mission statement and updated goals provided in the meeting materials. Both of these are required elements of the Plan. She indicated that the updated goals were drafted in such a way that they should cover most, if not all, the mitigation projects and activities that are anticipated to be submitted. Each project included in the updated Plan should be aimed at one or more of the goals developed by the committee. Specific goals can be added to the list.

The draft mission statement was reviewed and no revisions were proposed.

The updated goals were reviewed and discussed and no revisions were proposed.

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

Mitigation

Developing Project Lists

Mitigation actions include activities and projects that reduce or eliminate the long-term risk to people and property from the natural hazards discussed in the risk assessment. The purpose of the next meeting is to develop a list of mitigation projects for each participating jurisdiction.

Status of Existing Projects

Andrea distributed a form to each of the previously participating jurisdictions detailing the mitigation projects and activities included in the original Plan. She explained that as part of the update process the status of these projects needs to be determined. She described how the form should be completed so that this information can be included in the Plan update.

New Projects

The form titled “**New Hazard Mitigation Project Form**” was distributed and Andrea indicated this form should be used to submit new projects and activities for the Plan update. To help the jurisdictions think about and assemble their lists a 2-page list of potential mitigation projects was included in the handout material along with mitigation project lists from jurisdictions in two other counties. These examples can be used to help Committee members when they prepare their list.

She emphasized that submitting a project does not obligate any jurisdiction to complete the project. FEMA is trying to stimulate mitigation to reduce the extraordinary amount of money being expended on storm damages.

Mitigation projects can include studies, structural projects, and information/education activities. She provided advice for completing the mitigation project list including providing a detailed description of the project, the jurisdiction responsible for the project and the time frame to complete the project.

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

What Happens Next?

The Committee set Tuesday, May 1st, as the date for the next meeting. The starting time will remain at 7 p.m. and the location remains the same.

Public Comment

With no additional questions or comments, Jim Pitchford adjourned the meeting.

Meeting Minutes

Macoupin County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Planning Committee

May 1, 2018

7:00 p.m.

Macoupin County Jail
215 South East Street, Carlinville

Committee Members

American Environmental Corporation
Benld, City of
Bunker Hill, City of
Dorchester Township
Gillespie, City of
Girard, City of

Macoupin County Offices:
Assessor
County Clerk
Emergency Management Agency
Public Health Department
Mount Olive, City of
Staunton, City of
Virden, City of

Welcome

Jim Pitchford, Chairman of the Macoupin County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Planning Committee, opened the meeting and welcomed attendees.

Handout materials were distributed to each Committee member.

Critical Facilities

Andrea Bostwick, American Environment Corp. (AEC), provided a brief recap to reorient Committee Members as to what has been accomplished. She noted that the Committee has accomplished all of its objectives up to this point and is on schedule. She then asked all the participating jurisdictions to return the forms titled “Critical Facilities,” List of Existing Planning Documents” and “Identification of Severe Weather Shelters” if they have not already done so. These forms will be used in the Plan’s development.

Man-Made Hazards Risk Assessment

Andrea began the presentation by reminding Committee members that at the previous meeting we identified the most frequently occurring natural hazards in Macoupin County. 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. Some of this information should be helpful to first responders so that they can take necessary safety precautions to protect themselves and others.

This Study focuses on the following categories of man-made hazards:

- generation, storage/handling and transportation of hazardous substances
- waste disposal
- hazardous materials (hazmat) incidents
- 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 this Plan, the term includes both hazardous product and hazardous waste.

Generation, Storage/Handling & Transportation

In 2016 there was one company in Macoupin County who generated reportable quantities of hazardous substances according to USEPA. There are two other facilities that have generated hazardous substances in prior years and there remains the potential that they will generate hazardous substances again in the future.

There were 34 stationary facilities within Macoupin County in 2016 that stored and/or handled hazardous substances. Eighteen (18) of these facilities stored and/or handled chemicals identified as “Extremely Hazardous Substances”.

Between 2008 and 2017 there were four roadway accidents/incidents involving hazardous substances and two pipeline releases. Three of the four roadway incidents involved petroleum-based products while the two pipeline releases involved natural gas. Between 2007 and 2016 (the latest year for which data is available) there were nine railway accidents/incidents on the NS and UP/Amtrak rail lines. Almost half of the incidents involved petroleum-based products. There was also one train derailment that involved a hazardous substance but no release occurred.

Waste Disposal

There are no active commercial solid (household) waste landfills operating in Macoupin County. In addition, there are no facilities within the county 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 a fixed facility or as they are being transported. Between 2008 and 2017 there were 54 hazmat incidents recorded in Macoupin County.

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 or candidate sites in Macoupin County.

Illinois SRP: There are eight SRP sites located Macoupin County. Five (5) of these sites have received “No Further Remediation” (NFR) or Section 4(y) letters. The remaining sites do not pose an immediate threat to public health or the environment.

Illinois LUST: There are 148 LUST sites located in Macoupin County. Approximately 70% of these sites have received NFR, Non-Lust Determination or Section 4(y) letter or remediation is virtually complete.

Vulnerability Assessment

Andrea began the vulnerability assessment discussion by noting that the focus of this meeting is the vulnerability posed by tornadoes and floods. The analysis estimates future potential damages in terms of dollar loss to residences, including contents, for each participating jurisdiction based on FEMA acceptable formulas. The potential damages were calculated on the magnitude most likely to be encountered, not on a worst-case event.

Before presenting the analysis she thanked John Bresnan and Pete Duncan for providing the tax assessment figures used in these assessments and Jim Pitchford for providing estimated building counts in the floodplains.

Tornadoes

Since 1950, 38 tornadoes have been verified in Macoupin County. While occurring less frequently than severe thunderstorm and severe winter storms, tornadoes have caused a minimum of \$4.5 million in property damages, 10 injuries and 3 fatalities.

Using information from the each of the 38 verified tornadoes, damages were calculated based on an “average” tornado. The average tornado in Macoupin County is approximately 3.9 miles long, 80 yards wide and impacts approximately 0.16 square miles. Housing densities were calculated from U.S. Census Bureau information for each of the participating jurisdictions. This information, along with a set of assumptions were used to estimate the number of vulnerable residential structures.

Potential dollar losses were then calculated for these vulnerable residential structures using the provided tax assessment values and an additional assumption about the degree of damage sustained by the structures and their contents.

Potential dollar losses caused by an average-sized tornado to residences and their contents would be expected to exceed at least \$5.2 million in any of the participating municipalities, with the exception of Royal Lakes. Losses ranged from \$1.1 million in Royal Lakes to \$11.8 million in Staunton. Losses in the 17 least populated townships differ sharply between the seven most populated townships. Damages estimates ranged from approximately \$32,000 for Honey Point Township to \$2.2 million for Staunton Township.

Floods

In Macoupin County, 6 general floods have been verified since 1982 and 25 flash floods have been verified since 1998. Four of the five federal disaster declarations are related to flooding.

Unlike most counties in Illinois, flooding is not among the top natural hazard concerns for Macoupin County. The County has the smallest percentage of acres located in the floodplain (2.4%) of any county in Illinois. Since riverine flooding is not a major hazard, Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) have not been developed for a majority of the County making it difficult to identify structures in the floodplain. Only 3 municipalities – Carlinville, Gillespie & Staunton – have current FIRMs and these maps are over 30 years old.

While only a small area of land in Macoupin County is in the floodplain and thus susceptible to flooding from rivers and streams, almost the entire County is vulnerable to flash flooding. While flash flooding has occurred more frequently, identifying residential structures vulnerable to flash flooding is problematic. Most are located outside of the base floodplain and the number of structures impacted can change with each event depending on the amount of precipitation received, topography and the land use of the area. In addition, there is no standard loss estimation model for flash flooding. Therefore, the damage estimates made in this vulnerability assessment are based solely on riverine flooding that impact residential structures within a base floodplain.

Benld, Brighton, Bunker Hill, Girard, Mount Olive, Royal Lakes, Virden and Wilsonville would not experience this kind of riverine flooding since there are no streams or creeks with floodplains located within their municipal limits. However, flash flooding would impact these municipalities as well as the rest of Macoupin County.

A set of assumptions were used along with the assessed values to calculate the potential dollar losses. Potential dollar losses caused by riverine flooding in Macoupin County to vulnerable residential housing units, including contents, would be expected to range from around \$17,000 for one structure in Carlinville to over \$80,000 for four structures in Staunton.

Mitigation Actions Prioritization Methodology

The mitigation actions prioritization methodology describes the method used to prioritize the mitigation actions (projects and activities) identified by the participating jurisdictions. It simply outlines the approach used to classify each action. This prioritization methodology is a FEMA-required element of the Plan.

Mitigation actions can be prioritized in a number of ways. Andrea 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 *eliminate* damages while most projects will *reduce* damages.

Andrea 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.

Mitigation Projects

Committee Members were asked to submit their existing and new Mitigation Projects forms. Andrea then described how the Mitigation Actions Prioritization Methodology, the lists of Mitigation Projects, finalized goals and other information will be presented for Committee review at the next Committee meeting in Mitigation Actions Tables.

Andrea chose a frequently needed mitigation project, a community safe room (storm-safe shelter), as an example to show how a typical project is prioritized and entered into the Plan on a Mitigation Table. She described how each column in the Mitigation Action Table would be completed for this example project.

Andrea explained that the information in the Mitigation Project Table would be prepared by AEC, but that the Table cannot be started until all of the participants submit their lists of projects. She noted that each municipality should have at least one new mitigation project in the Plan before it is submitted to IEMA/FEMA. All mitigation projects submitted will be organized by participating jurisdiction and 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.

It was noted that each municipality should develop their own list of mitigation projects. They do not need approval by the County. Participants were also reminded that this is a wish list of projects and activities they would like to see accomplished if the money becomes available. Including projects in the Plan does not obligate the jurisdiction to fund or complete any of the projects.

If any participant is uncertain about the length of time that might be needed to complete a project, “To Be Determined” is acceptable to FEMA if the information is unknown at the time the Plan is being assembled.

What Happens Next?

It is anticipated that about three months will be needed for participants to assemble their mitigation project lists. Consequently, the Committee agreed to schedule the next meeting on:

Tuesday, August 7th
Macoupin County Jail
Board Room on the 2nd Floor
7 p.m.

Public Comment

No additional questions or comments were raised. Jim Pitchford adjourned the meeting.

Meeting Minutes

Macoupin County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Planning Committee

August 7, 2018

7:00 p.m.

Macoupin County Jail
215 South East Street, Carlinville

Committee Members

American Environmental Corp.
Bunker Hill, City of
Carlinville, City of
Gillespie, City of
Girard, City of

Macoupin County Offices:
Assessor
County Clerk
Emergency Management Agency
Mount Olive, City of
Staunton, City of
Virden, City of

Welcome and Introductions

Jim Pitchford, Chairman of the Macoupin County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Planning Committee, opened the meeting and welcomed Committee Members. He noted that the focus of this meeting is to review and complete each jurisdiction's list of Mitigation Projects.

Before beginning this presentation, Andrea Bostwick, American Environmental Corp. (AEC), provided a brief recap to help reorient Committee members as to what has been accomplished and what will be covered at this meeting. She informed the Committee that all of the objectives had been accomplished. In addition, she informed the Committee that the County had met its 25% participation match for the grant.

Information packets about the Mitigation Projects and related items were distributed to Committee Members.

Mine Subsidence Risk Assessment

For this meeting Andrea presented information about mine subsidence. Mine subsidence is the sinking or shifting of the ground surface resulting from the collapse of an underground mine. There are eighty-eight (88) documented underground coal mines in Macoupin County. Between 2009 and 2017, there have been four (4) documented mine subsidence events in the County. Three (3) of the events occurred in Benld and one (1) occurred in Wilsonville. Damages occurred with all four (4) events; however, total dollar amounts were not readily available. The 2009 event in Benld did lead to the demolition of the 7-year-old, \$7.5 million Benld Elementary School. No injuries or fatalities were reported as a result of any of the events.

An Illinois State Geological Survey Study estimates that approximately 18.4% of the total land area and 60.1% of the total housing units in Macoupin County are vulnerable to mine subsidence. Andrea showed Committee Members a map of at-risk areas in Macoupin County and answered questions about mitigation projects dealing with mine subsidence.

Mitigation Project Submittal & Action Tables

Andrea commended the Committee Members for assembling their lists of mitigation projects and activities. One-hundred and five (105) mitigation projects and activities were described and prioritized in the Action Tables.

Committee members were asked to review the Action Tables containing the descriptions of the mitigation projects and activities. Andrea moved throughout the room to discuss questions with each member. Some additional mitigation projects were provided and will be added to these tables. Andrea advised Committee Members who wished to add additional to provide them to her as soon as possible.

Plan Maintenance and Update

Andrea described the Plan maintenance and update commitments that are detailed in the Plan. A subgroup of the Planning Committee will meet annually under the direction of the Macoupin County EMA to report on the progress of their projects and make any additions or edits to their list of projects. There is no penalty for not building any project. The intent of the planning process is to encourage mitigation, not to penalize municipalities or counties. The information gathered at these annual meetings will be provided to IEMA and will make the five year Plan update process easier.

Every five years, the Plan is formally updated and resubmitted to IEMA/FEMA. At the five year update, any jurisdiction who wants to become part of the Plan may do so. Any new jurisdiction must supply the same information that all of the current jurisdictions supplied. Any jurisdiction that is not already part of this Plan update has to wait until the five year Update before they can join.

A public forum will be conducted to present the draft Updated Plan to the public. Interested persons can comment on the Plan at this forum or by providing comments to Committee members or the Macoupin County EMA.

The first jurisdiction to formally adopt the Updated Plan begins the five year clock. If a jurisdiction decides not to adopt the Plan, FEMA will still approve the Plan and those jurisdictions who adopt the Plan will become eligible for state/federal funds.

She cautioned all of the jurisdictions not to adopt the Updated Plan until after FEMA provides preliminary approval. FEMA will not accept adoption resolutions that are dated prior to the time when conditional approval is awarded. An e-mail will be issued notifying the Committee members that the Plan has received approval with a copy of a model adoption resolution attached.

What Happens Next?

Public Forum

The final Committee meeting will be conducted in the early evening as an open-house style public forum where the draft Updated Plan will be presented for review and comment. Contrary to conventional public meetings, at an open-house style public forum the public can come and go at their convenience.

The Committee chose to hold the public forum on:

Wednesday, November 14
Macoupin County Jail
2nd Floor Board Room
215 South East Street, Carlinville
6 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Unless otherwise specified, Committee members will receive an electronic copy of the draft plan to make available for public comment. A two week public comment period will follow the public forum.

Public Comment

With no other questions, the meeting was adjourned by Jim Pitchford.