

## Appendix I-1.0

### Documentation of Public Outreach

The development of the Clinton County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan included extensive public forums and opportunities for the residents to participate. Further, during the twelve-month development phase, invitations to join the planning team were sent to various community representatives. Significant reliance was placed on governmental agencies for their collective expertise. Agencies offering primary support to the plan development phase include: Clinton County Emergency Management Agency, Clinton County Regional Planning Commission, Clinton County office of the Auditor, Clinton County GIS Mapping, and the Clinton County Building and Zoning Department. The Advisory Team routinely met at least once a month and communicated via telephone and email during the twelve-months.

Extensive efforts were made to encourage public participation and support during the planning process. The Mitigation Planning Process was discussed at various presentations before local organizations, such as the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs. Meetings of the governing officials of each of the County's political subdivisions were attended to encourage public input from elected officials and the interested residents.

Public input received from this outreach proved valuable to the planning process. The public input generated ideas and concepts that supported and augmented those of the Planning Mitigation Team.

Letters were sent to the surrounding counties informing them that Clinton County was working on the Natural Hazards Mitigation Project. It was questioned whether the surrounding counties would like to participate, however there was no response. Assistance was provided by the Ohio EMA as well as FEMA provided the manual on how to write the plan.

The following information summarizes the areas visited and the date of the visit.

Adams Township	3/3/2003	Wayne Township	2/10/2003
Chester Township	4/3/2003	Wilson Township	3/11/2003
Clark Township	5/1/2003	Village of Blanchester	4/24/2003
Green Township	3/5/2003	Village of Clarksville	4/21/2003
Jefferson Township	3/15/2003	Village of Martinsville	5/8/2003
Liberty Township	2/26/2003	Village of Midland	5/13/2003
Marion Township	3/6/2003	Village of New Vienna	6/16/2003
Richland Township	3/27/2003	Village of Port William	4/7/2003
Union Township	11/6/2003	Village of Sabina	6/12/2003
Vernon Township	3/18/2003	City of Wilmington	8/7/2003
Washington Township	3/17/2003		

The information presented to each of the political subdivisions included the ranking of the four natural disasters in Clinton County as determined by the research of the Mitigation Planning Committee. These top four are: Tornadoes / Thunderstorms, Snow Storms, Drought and Flood. Potential Mitigation Projects were discussed with each political subdivision indicating what projects they would like to see in their area. The summary of the information from each of these meetings is as follows:

Adams Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. A project they would like to see specifically addressed in their area is the addition of a warning siren at the Clinton Massie Schools.

Chester Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects.

Clark Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects.

Green Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects.

Jefferson Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. The township would like to see a mitigation project that offers the distribution of free NOAA weather alert radios to residents.

Liberty Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. The township would like to see the installation of a warning siren at the State Route 68 Interstate 71 area where there is an increase of population due to development and growth.

Marion Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. The township would like to see an additional warning siren installed in their area to increase current coverage.

Richland Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. The township would like to see a warning siren installed in their area.

Union Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. The township would like to see warning sirens installed in areas where population is increasing.

Vernon Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects.

Washington Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects.

Wayne Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects.

Wilson Township: The Township was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. The township would like to see a warning siren installed in their area.

Village of Blanchester: The village was in agreement with the rankings of the four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. The village is interested in having an additional warning siren installed in the community.

Village of Clarksville: The village was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. The village is interested in having a stream debris removal project implemented to increase water flow through the waterway, which will lessen the impact of flooding.

Village of Martinsville: The village was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects.

Village of Midland: The village was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. The village is interested in having a warning siren installed in their community. They are also interested in a stream debris removal project to lessen the impact of flooding.

Village of New Vienna:

Village of Port William: The village was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters. They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects.

Village of Sabina: The village was in agreement with the rankings of the top four natural disasters, however in their specific area they would rank flooding as number one (#1). They were in agreement with the proposed mitigation projects. The village is also interested in a stream debris removal project to help alleviate the impact of flooding in the village.

City of Wilmington: The August 7, 2003 meeting with the City of Wilmington resulted in agreement with the natural disaster and with the proposed mitigation plan. City officials indicated their willingness to support the Clinton County EMA in any fashion and did not offer any significant projects or topics.

In addition, the Emergency Management Agency attended and manned an informational booth during the Clinton County Fair (July 5-12, 2003) and made the draft plan available for review and comments. Many people looked at the document and expressed interested in the Emergency Management Agency; however, with many of those persons making statements of support for the top four disasters.

## Appendix I-1.1

### Documentation of Public Outreach

#### Mitigation Projects for Clinton County Defined by Township/Village

<u>Township / Village</u>	<u>Warning Siren</u>	<u>NOAA Weather Radios</u>	<u>Debris Removal</u>
Adams Township	X		
Chester Township			
Clark Township			
Green Township			
Jefferson Township		X	
Liberty Township	X		
Marion Township	X		
Richland Township	X		
Union Township	X		
Vernon Township			
Washington Township			
Wayne Township			
Wilson Township	X		
Village of Blanchester	X		
Village of Clarksville			X
Village of Martinsville			
Village of Midland	X		X
Village of New Vienna			
Village of Port William			
Village of Sabina			X
City of Wilmington			

## Appendix I-2.0

### RISK ASSESSMENT: METHODOLOGY, FACTORS AND VALUES

The analysis used by Clinton County was taken from the State of Ohio Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment publication dated January 1998. The hazards affecting Ohio were evaluated using eight factors: Historical Occurrence, Affected Area, Collateral Damage, Warning Time, Population Impact, Fiscal Effects, Duration and Response/Recovery Time. Factors were assigned an even-number numerical value ranging between 2 and 8. The sum totals of factor values were then added, allowing hazards to be compared against each other using the totals.

#### **HISTORICAL OCCURRENCE**

If there is a likelihood of a hazard occurring more than five times within a ten year period, then that hazard has a low probability. If it is likely to occur up to ten times within ten years, it has a medium probability. If the hazard is likely to occur more than ten times in ten years, it has a high probability. There is an excessive probability if the hazard is likely to occur ten or more times in one year.

2	4	6	8
Low	Medium	High	Excessive

#### **AFFECTED AREA**

Each hazard affects a geographic area. A blizzard can affect several states and a flood might only affect a neighborhood creek. Numerical values have been assigned that represent the size of the affected area. Example – A tornado might strike a village, a city, or part of a township within the county. This would be a single site. If it strikes more than one village, city or other sites within a township then there would be multiple sites. If the tornado causes damage at multiple sites in two townships the affected sites would be considered a small area. If the tornado affects sites in three or more townships or an entire county, then for purpose of the hazard analysis, it is in a large area.

2	4	6	8
Low	Medium	High	Excessive

#### **COLLATERAL DAMAGE**

This effect/factor has also been called a secondary event. For example, in addition to all the damage caused by an earthquake, the earthquake may also cause failure of a dam. The dam failure also causes water damage. In the failure of that dam, the collateral or secondary damage is a hazard that was caused by the occurrence of another hazard.

2	4	6	8
No Possibility 0%	Some Possibility 25-50%	Much Possibility 51-75%	High Possibility 76%+

## Appendix I-2.1

### Risk Analysis

The natural hazards affecting Clinton County were selected based on two criteria:

1. Historical basis and documentation of past events.
2. The possibility of an event occurring.

Using the Risk Assessment: Methodology, Factors and Values; the natural hazards identified from historical basis and documentation of past events were ranked according to the eight factors indicated. The ranking of these hazards are indicated in the table below.

EVENT	FACTORS	VALUES
Tornado/Thunderstorms Wind/Hail Storms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Historical Occurrence</li> <li>◦ Affected Area</li> <li>◦ Collateral Damage</li> <li>◦ Warning Time</li> <li>◦ Population Impact</li> <li>◦ Fiscal Effects</li> <li>◦ Duration</li> <li>◦ Response/Recovery Time</li> </ul>	6 8 4 6 4 8 2 4  Total: 42
Snow Storm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Historical Occurrence</li> <li>◦ Affected Area</li> <li>◦ Collateral Damage</li> <li>◦ Warning Time</li> <li>◦ Population Impact</li> <li>◦ Fiscal Effects</li> <li>◦ Duration</li> <li>◦ Response/Recovery Time</li> </ul>	2 8 4 2 4 8 6 4  Total: 38
Drought / Heat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Historical Occurrence</li> <li>◦ Affected Area</li> <li>◦ Collateral Damage</li> <li>◦ Warning Time</li> <li>◦ Population Impact</li> <li>◦ Fiscal Effects</li> <li>◦ Duration</li> <li>Response/Recovery Time</li> </ul>	2 8 2 2 4 8 8 2  Total: 36
Floods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Historical Occurrence</li> <li>◦ Affected Area</li> <li>◦ Collateral Damage</li> <li>◦ Warning Time</li> <li>◦ Population Impact</li> <li>◦ Fiscal Effects</li> <li>◦ Duration</li> <li>Response/Recovery Time</li> </ul>	2 2 2 2 2 6 6 4  Total: 26