## SUMMARY NOTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2023 MEETING OF THE WASHINGTON COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE LOCAL PLANNING TEAM

#### INTRODUCTION

The February 1, 2023, Local Planning Team (LPT) meeting for the Washington County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update was convened at the Washington County Sheriff's Department at 2:05 p.m. The Washington County Department of Emergency Management Manager, Mr. Rob Schmid, gave a brief introduction and then turned the meeting over to Ms. Megan Shedivy, Planner for the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC). Attendance was taken by a sign-in sheet.

In attendance at the meeting were the following individuals:

#### **Local Planning Team Members**

Megan Shedivy, Secretary Planner, SEWRPC

Jeffrey Clark Attorney, Washington County
Tim Derhing Chief of Police, City of West Bend

Josh Glass Assistant Highway Commissioner, Washington County

Laura Herrick Chief Environmental Engineer, SEWRPC Chris Marks Emergency Manager, Village of Richfield

Kurt Rusch Emergency Management Assistant, Washington County

Rob Schmid Manager, Department of Emergency Management, Washington County

Albert Schulteis Chair, Town of Polk

Paul Stephans Fire Chief, Hartford Fire Department Troy Zagel Supervisor, Town of West Bend

Ms. Shedivy welcomed the attendees to the meeting and thanked them for their participation. She briefly reviewed the meeting agenda and the summary notes from the June 7, 2022, LPT kick off meeting. There were no comments on the summary notes from the LPT.

#### CHAPTER 1 "INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND"

Ms. Shedivy began her presentation with an overview of draft Chapter 1. She gave a brief description of the study area (Washington County) as well as the relationship of hazard mitigation planning to other County efforts. Ms. Shedivy indicated that Table 1.2 lists the plan participation efforts in which all villages and cities need to participate in the planning process (i.e., attend meetings, comment on draft chapters, or provide data) in order for the plan to be approved. There were no questions or comments related to this material.

Ms. Shedivy continued with a short discussion on plan adoption. Mr. Clark asked what the incentive for communities was to adopt the plan. Mr. Schmid answered that communities would then be eligible for FEMA funding on projects related to hazard mitigation. Ms. Herrick also mentioned that adoption does not require a financial commitment from communities.

No additional comments or questions were given from the LPT for draft Chapter 1.

#### CHAPTER 2, "BASIC STUDY AREA INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS"

Ms. Shedivy continued with a brief overview of draft Chapter 2. She noted that a table for the critical community facilities in Washington County has been created and this appendix will be posted on the SEWRPC website after the meeting.

Ms. Shedivy briefly described the inventory data that was collected and analyzed, including the County's current and projected demographic trends; civil divisions and projected development; and, current and planned land use characteristics. Ms. Shedivy emphasized that the background or inventory information for the County is an important element of the planning process.

While discussing critical community facilities, Mr. Schmid pointed to Map 2.7 noting that downtown West Bend was recently designated as a historical district.

[Secretary's Note: After the meeting, Ms. Shedivy looked on the Wisconsin Historical Society website

to verify. According to the State Historical Society's listings, that specific location, or district has not yet been listed officially as a historical district so this will not be

added to this plan update.]

Ms. Shedivy then presented Maps 1.1 and 2.2 to illustrate projected urban development areas within the County. She also gave an overview of the demographic characteristics including trends and projections related to population, household, and employment data. Through graphs and tables, Ms. Shedivy was able to demonstrate that the County continues to show an increase in its demographic trends and land use development. It was noted that planned year 2050 data was provided by SEWRPC's VISION 2050: A Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan.

Concluding Chapter 2, Ms. Shedivy gave a general overview on climate change and its relative importance with hazard mitigation planning. She also emphasized that FEMA now considers this information essential and necessary for hazard mitigation. The source of climate change data and how it is presented throughout the Plan was explained to the LPT attendees. Ms. Shedivy stated that Figures 2.1 through 2.4 illustrate temperature and precipitation trends and projections.

After the climate discussion, Mr. Clark asked if the climate change data in the Plan was specific to Wisconsin. Ms. Herrick responded that the data used came from climate global circulation models downscaled to the State level as used in the Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts (WICCI) reports. Mr. Rusch then asked if the projected increase in the average temperature of Wisconsin (about 5 degrees Fahrenheit) stated in the Plan was correct. Ms. Shedivy replied that the data is based off Figure 2.3, which comes from the WICCI Report.

There were no further questions or comments on draft Chapter 2.

#### CHAPTER 3, "ANALYSIS OF HAZARD CONDITIONS"

Ms. Shedivy began with a general overview of draft Chapter 3 and its main components. She gave a brief discussion on the hazard identification and ranking process; the risk analysis portion; and how each hazard was profiled. She then presented and explained the hazards considered for this Plan update (Table 3.2). Ms. Herrick mentioned that the rankings in Table 3.2 are qualitative and subjective and asked that the LPT review the table to provide additional input.

With no questions or comments related to the layout of draft Chapter 3, Ms. Shedivy continued to the profiled hazards analyzed in the Plan, starting with flooding and stormwater drainage. A brief background on the existing hydrological features within the County was presented with Map 3.1 showing the major streams, lakes, and watersheds as well as the 1-percent-annual-probability (100-year event) floodplains.

Ms. Shedivy then reviewed the different types of flooding concerns (i.e., dam failure, ice jams, agricultural, and stormwater drainage); recently reported flood events; and different County assets vulnerable to flooding impacts, including agriculture, transportation, and structural damages.

For structural impacts caused by flooding, Ms. Shedivy described the parcel-based loss analysis used to estimate potential damages caused by a 100-year flood event. Map 3.3 was presented to illustrate and explain the results of the analysis. Ms. Shedivy clarified that the different colored numbers represent different building types (residential, commercial, agricultural, government, industrial, and other) and the amounts indicate the number of structures estimated to be located within the 100-year floodplain per USPLSS Section Number.

Ms. Shedivy noted that Table 3.9 shows the results of the parcel-based analysis. Municipalities with a large number of structures estimated to be within the 100-year floodplain were noted along with the estimated direct and indirect structural flood damages.

An overview of the County's critical and emergency community facilities and their relative location to the 100-year floodplain was also presented with Maps 3.4 and 3.5. Ms. Shedivy cited the two emergency facilities and six critical community facilities estimated to be located in the 100-year floodplain.

Mr. Schmid asked if the total amount of structures (1,200) from the parcel-based analysis have experienced flooding impacts in the past. Ms. Herrick answered that this number is based on FEMA floodplain mapping and not actual flood experience.

Ms. Shedivy continued the draft Chapter 3 discussion with an overview of the remaining profiled hazards, including severe weather (i.e., thunderstorm-related events), tornadoes, winter storms, extreme temperatures, and drought hazard events in Washington County.

During the winter storm hazard discussion, Mr. Glass asked if snow squall was included as a winter storm category. Ms. Shedivy responded that because snow squalls are not listed as an event type on the National Weather Service storm event database it was not included in the Plan. Mr. Schmid commented that with the increase in reported or experienced winter squall events these most likely will be included in future plan updates.

Mr. Glass also asked if fog was evaluated as a hazard event. Ms. Shedivy replied that because fog, along with several other natural hazards have been found to have either a minimal chance of occurring or offer only limited mitigation options, they were not fully profiled as a hazardous event, however, are still acknowledged and briefly described at the beginning of Chapter 3. Ms. Herrick noted the main impact related to fog is primarily associated with transportation accidents and that warnings related to fog hazards will be mentioned in Chapter 5 under severe weather hazard mitigation alternatives.

Mr. Glass then inquired if the County airports were included in the Plan as critical community facilities, to which Ms. Shedivy replied that they are not in the draft. In response, he and Mr. Clark suggested that the two public airports be added as critical facilities, particularly because the National Guard often utilizes the airports to support disaster response throughout the State.

[Secretary's Note: After the meeting, Ms. Shedivy included the two public airports to the Critical Community Facilities table located in the Appendix of the Plan.]

Additionally, Mr. Glass asked if public works facilities, such as highway departments, were considered critical community facilities. He added that because the facility he works at stores and utilizes supplies needed during hazardous events (i.e., sandbags and road salt) such structures should be considered critical. Mr. Sebo agreed with Mr. Glass's suggestion.

[Secretary's Note: After the meeting, Ms. Shedivy examined the location of public works facilities

throughout Washington County. Based upon her review, she found one facility estimated to be within the 100-year floodplain, which is the Village of Jackson's public works building, in which it is already included in the parcel-based loss

analysis structure count.]

Mr. Schmid mentioned that the structural flood damages during the 2008 flood was predominantly due to high lake levels. Ms. Shedivy will add language to the Plan specifically related to high lake levels and structural impacts in Washington County.

[Secretary's Note: After the meeting, Ms. Shedivy re-examined the parcel-based loss analysis for

structures estimated to be impacted by high water events along lake shore properties. She found a number of structures listed and will add text within the flooding hazard section of the Plan describing the potential high lake level impacts in Washington

County. ]

With no more questions or comments, Ms. Shedivy concluded the review of draft Chapters 1 through 3.

#### LOCAL PLANNING TEAM INPUT ON POTENTIAL HAZARD MITIGATION PROJECTS

Before the meeting was adjourned, Ms. Shedivy asked the LPT for additional input on hazard mitigation projects recently completed or planned to be completed during the lifespan of this Plan. She presented a list of project examples and reminded the LPT that projects added to the Plan can facilitate federal funding opportunities to help communities complete the project.

Mr. Sebo suggested looking into the Sugar River Soil Health study at the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). He explained why the study could be useful for the Plan and how it can be used as a template for potential flood mitigation projects in Washington County. Both Ms. Herrick and Ms. Shedivy agreed, and this study will be incorporated into Chapter 5.

Mr. Sebo also suggested including Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) Greenseams properties as potential project(s) related to flood mitigation.

[Secretary's Note: An updated map and information on MMSD's Greenseams projects will be included

in Chapter 5 of the Plan. Recently purchased properties will also be added to Table

1.4.]

There being no further business, Ms. Shedivy thanked the participating LPT members for their attendance and any additional contribution to the draft plan. The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

#### POST MEETING PROJECT DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Zagel suggested including a Cedar Creek cleanout project downstream of Little Cedar Lake. He mentioned that the Town of West Bend and Lake PRD are investigating a potential study with SEWRPC. Mr. Zagel noted that the Creek is full of sediment from adjacent farms which is impeding stream flow and backing up water to Little Cedar Lake during high flow times.

Ms. Herrick also suggested adding streamflow gage(s) to the Milwaukee River as a potential flood hazard mitigation alternative. Mr. Schmid agreed this would be helpful for future flood events and floodplain map updates. This potential project will be included in Chapter 5 of the Plan.

WASHINGTON CO HMPU LPT MEETING DRAFT CHAPTERS 1-3 REVIEW-SUMMARY NOTES 02/01/2023 (00266876). DOC 500-1149 MAS/LKH 02/07/23, 3/1/23

#### Exhibit A

### HAZARD AND VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT SURVEY WASHINGTON COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE

Link and QR Code to Survey: HTTPS://ARCG.IS/1XMYJG1



#### Washington County Hazard Ranking Assessment

#### INSTRUCTIONS

#### To Local Planning Team Members:

Washington County is conducting a study to better understand the preparedness needs and risk perceptions of its Hazard Mitigation Local Planning Team Members as part of the County's Hazard Mitigation Plan update process.

To do so, a questionnaire has been distributed to the Local Planning Team Members. Your feedback is needed and greatly appreciated!

The questionnaire should only take about 5-7 minutes to complete. Responses will be utilized to inform the Natural Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment portion of the Hazard Mitigation Plan update.

Your input will serve as part of your jurisdiction's participation in the Hazard Mitigation Plan update, which is required under federal guidelines to maintain eligibility for FEMA hazard mitigation funding.

DEADLINE: Please complete the survey by July 7, 2022.

Thank you for your participation!

If you have any questions, please contact Megan Shedivy, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, at 262.953.4286 or <a href="mailto:mshedivy@sewrpc.org">mshedivy@sewrpc.org</a>.

Places indicate which jurisdiction you are representing

r lease malcate which jurisdiction you are representing.

#### **PROBABILITY**

Please indicate what you consider to be the likelihood that this hazard will occur.

- Low Occurs very little or not at all (every 51-100 years)
- Moderate Occurs somewhat or rarely (every 26-50 years)
- High Occurs often or frequently (every 1-25 years)
- Not Applicable does not apply to your area/jurisdiction

Issues to consider for Probability include:

- Known risk
- Historical data and experience
- · Local government or agency experience

	Low	Moderate	High	Not Applicable
Riverine flooding	0	0	0	0
Stormwater flooding	0	0	0	0
Inland lake flooding	0	0	0	0
Tornado	0	0	0	0
Thunderstorm	0	0	0	0
High straight-line wind	0	0	0	0
Lightning	0	0	0	0
Hail	0	0	0	0
Heavy snowstorm	0	0	0	0
Blizzard	0	0	0	0
Ice storm	0	0	0	0

Extreme cold	0	0	0	0
Extreme heat	0	0	0	0
Drought	0	0	0	0
Fog	0	0	0	0
Dust storm	0	0	0	0
Earthquake	0	0	0	0
Wildfire	0	0	0	0
Dam failure	0	0	0	0
Landslide	0	0	0	0
Land subsidence	0	0	0	0

### PROBABILITY: Other (please specify below)

If you would like to rank an	nother natural hazard not all	eady listed, please do so here.
------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

#### **HUMAN IMPACT**

Please indicate what you consider to be the likely level of impacts to human life if the hazard occurs.

- · Low Minimal or minor impact on people
- Moderate Somewhat significant impact on people
- High Severe impact on people
- Not Applicable does not apply to your area/jurisdiction

Issues to consider for Human Impact include:

- · Potential to cause death
- · Potential to cause injury requiring medical treatment

	Low	Moderate	High	Not Applicable
Riverine flooding	0	0	0	0
Stormwater flooding	0	0	0	0
Inland lake flooding	0	0	0	0
Tornado	0	0	0	0
Thunderstorm	0	0	0	0
High straight-line wind	0	0	0	0
Lightning	0	0	0	0
Hail	0	0	0	0
Heavy snowstorm	0	0	0	0
Blizzard	0	0	0	0
Ice storm	0	0	0	0
Extreme cold	0	0	0	0

Extreme heat	0	0	0	0
Drought	0	0	0	0
Fog	0	0	0	0
Dust storm	0	0	0	0
Earthquake	0	0	0	0
Wildfire	0	0	0	0
Dam failure	0	0	0	0
Landslide	0	0	0	0
Land subsidence	0	0	0	0

#### PROPERTY IMPACT

Please indicate what you consider to be the likely level of physical losses and damages to property if the hazard occurs.

- Low Minimal or minor impact on properties
- Moderate Somewhat significant impact on properties
- High Severe impact on properties
- Not Applicable does not apply to your area/jurisdiction

Issues to consider for Property Impact include:

- The potential to cause damage to property or crops
- The cost to replace damaged property
- The cost to set up a temporary replacement for damaged property
- The cost to repair damaged property
- The time to recover from the property damage

	Low	Moderate	High	Not Applicable
Riverine flooding	0	0	0	0
Stormwater flooding	0	0	0	0
Inland lake flooding	0	0	0	0
Tornado	0	0	0	0
Thunderstorm	0	0	0	0
High straight-line wind	0	0	0	0
Lightning	0	0	0	0
Hail	0	0	0	0
Heavy snowstorm	0	0	0	0
Blizzard	0	0	0	0
Ice storm	0	0	0	0
Extreme cold	0	0	0	0

# PROPERTY IMPACT: Other (please specify below) If you would like to rank another natural hazard not already listed, please do so here.

#### **BUSINESS & GOVERNMENT AGENCY IMPACT**

Please indicate what you consider to be the likely level of impact to the operations of businesses and government agencies if the hazard occurs.

- · Low Minimal or minor impact on operations
- Moderate Somewhat significant impact on operations
- High Severe impact on operations
- · Not Applicable does not apply to your area/jurisdiction

Issues to consider for Business & Gov. Agency Impact include:

- · Business or agency interruption
- · Employees unable to report to work
- · Customers or clients unable to reach facility
- · Company or agency in violation of contractual agreements
- · Imposition of fines and penalties or legal costs
- Interruption of access to critical supplies
- Interruption of product or service distribution
- Financial impact or burden
- Interruption of critical care and emergency services

	Low	Moderate	High	Not Applicable
Riverine flooding	0	0	0	0
Stormwater flooding	0	0	0	0
Inland lake flooding	0	0	0	0
Tornado	0	0	0	0
Thunderstorm	0	0	0	0
High straight-line wind	0	0	0	0
Lightning	0	0	0	0
Hail	0	0	0	0
Heavy snowstorm	0	0	0	0
Blizzard	0	0	0	0
Ice storm	0	0	0	0
Extreme cold	0	0	0	0

Extreme heat	0	0	0	0
Drought	0	0	0	0
Fog	0	0	0	0
Dust storm	0	0	0	0
Earthquake	0	0	0	0
Wildfire	0	0	0	0
Dam failure	0	0	0	0
Landslide	0	0	0	0
Land subsidence	0	0	0	0

# BUSINESS & GOV. AGENCY: Other (please specify below) If you would like to rank another natural hazard not already listed, please do so here.

#### **PREPAREDNESS**

Please indicate what you consider to be the current level of preparedness for dealing with the hazard and its impacts if the hazard occurs.

- Low Low level of preparedness, or not prepared
- · Moderate Medium level of preparedness
- High High level of preparedness
- Not Applicable Does not apply to your area/jurisdiction

Issues to consider for Preparedness include:

- The status of current plans that address the hazard
- The frequency of drills that address the hazard
- The status of training related to the hazard and its impacts
- Insurance
- The availability of back-up systems
- The availability of community resources

	Low	Moderate	High	Not Applicable
Riverine flooding	0	0	0	0
Stormwater flooding	0	0	0	0
Inland lake flooding	0	0	0	0
Tornado	0	0	0	0
Thunderstorm	0	0	0	0
High straight-line wind	0	0	0	0
Lightning	0	0	0	0
Hail	0	0	0	0
Heavy snowstorm	0	0	0	0
Blizzard	0	0	0	0
Ice storm	0	0	0	0
Extreme cold	0	0	0	0

Extreme heat	0	0	0	0
Drought	0	0	0	0
Fog	0	0	0	0
Dust storm	0	0	0	0
Earthquake	0	0	0	0
Wildfire	0	0	0	0
Dam failure	0	0	0	0
Landslide	0	0	0	0
Land subsidence	0	0	0	0

PREPAREDNESS: Other (please specify below)  If you would like to rank another natural hazard not already listed, please do so here.	
What specific areas in your jurisdiction are heavily impacted by natural hazard events?	al
Please provide a list of the hazard mitigation activities/projects your jurisdiction has initiated and/or completed since 2018, including project, funding source, and completion date. Project examples include flooded structure buyouts, stormwater management efforts, tornado shelters and/or siren installation or update, etc.	

Are any of the hazard mitigation projects listed in the above question considered nature-based, such as green infrastructure, bioengineering, etc.?
Please provide a list of weather hazard related outreach activities your jurisdiction/local communities have initiated and/or completed since 2018.
Additional Comments
If you have any questions, comments, concerns, or would like to rank another natural hazard not already listed, please do so here.