

Mitigation Projects and Goals

Each participating jurisdiction was asked to identify mitigation projects and goals that would help their communities become more disaster resistant. For the City of Springfield and Greene County, all of the **goals and actions** from the previous plan submitted in 2004 were still applicable, so all were carried forward and new ones were added. **The status of all goals and actions are identified and the status is described for the goals and actions listed in the Springfield – Greene County 2004 Hazard Mitigation Plan and the City of Willard 2004 Hazard Mitigation Plan.**

While the City of Springfield and Greene County are two separate jurisdictions, the goals for both jurisdictions were combined as they require cooperation and execution amongst several combined agencies (e.g. Springfield-Greene County Office of Emergency Management, Springfield-Greene County Health Department, etc). Due to the unique working relationship city and county offices have, the combination of their projects and goals seemed appropriate.

Listed below are the definitions and the processes used to complete this section:

I. Mitigation Action Determination

Definition of Mitigation

According to the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, mitigation is defined as “any sustained action taken to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk to human life and property from hazards. The goal of mitigation is to reduce or eliminate loss of lives and property”.

Mitigation Strategies

Mitigation includes any activities that prevent an emergency, reduce the chance of an emergency from happening, or lessen the damaging effects of unavoidable emergencies. Efforts by Federal, State and local governments can restrict development in vulnerable areas, direct new development to less vulnerable areas and promote ways to safeguard existing development in hazard-prone areas. Citizens can perform mitigation through practicing sound safety and property prevention measures.

There are six strategies for mitigation that produce safer environments. They include prevention, life & property protection, natural resource protection, emergency services, infrastructure projects and public information/education.

- **Prevention:** regulatory methods include planning and zoning, building regulations, land use regulations, Stormwater management, etc...
- **Life and Property Protection:** Methods include land acquisition, relocation of structures, modifying “at-risk” structures and flood proofing at-risk structures.
- **Natural Resource Protection:** reduces hazard impacts through measures such as erosion and sediment control or wetland protection.

- Emergency Services: measures include public warning, response capacity, critical facilities protection and public health and safety.
- Infrastructure Projects: include the control of natural hazards through projects such as reservoirs, channel modifications and storm sewers.
- Public Information/Education: includes providing hazard maps and information on area hazards, instructions on prevention and mitigation strategies, outreach programs and technical assistance and education.

Mitigation Versus Preparedness, Response and Recovery

Mitigation does not include other functions such as preparedness, response, or recovery. Preparedness includes plans and preparations made to save lives and property and to facilitate response operations. Response includes actions taken to provide emergency assistance, save lives, minimize property damage, and speed recovery immediately following a disaster. Recovery includes actions taken to return to a normal or improved operating condition following a disaster.

Mitigation Plan Benefits

Hazard mitigation planning is a tool that communities use to:

- Reduce injury, death or property loss
- Identify specific problems and appropriate solutions
- Achieve multiple objectives in a sustained and efficient manner
- Reduce future risks
- Prioritize post-disaster projects
- Enhance funding opportunities through Federal, State and local programs.
- Promote public participation and ownership of solutions.

II. County Hazard Mitigation Goals, Action, Objectives, Strategy and Coordination

This plan has established a set of goals to assist the community in fulfilling the established purpose of this plan. Mitigation goals for Greene County and the participating jurisdictions were acquired from numerous planning processes (completed and ongoing).

- Protect the public's safety, health and welfare by increasing the public's awareness of existing hazards and by fostering both individual and public responsibility in mitigating risks due to those hazards.
- Increase the ability of Greene County and all participating jurisdictions to mitigate the effects of hazards through enhancing existing or designing new policies, ordinances or regulations that will reduce the potential damaging effects of hazards without hindering other community goals.
- Manage area growth through sustainable principles and practices.
- Identify new and existing needed mitigation measures for consideration; look for funding mechanisms to support the completion of these measures.

Proposed Mitigation Projects

The mitigation plan identifies projects developed through data collection and research. These projects are considered to be important community mitigative actions. Mitigation plan activities may be considered for funding through Federal and State grant programs, and when other funds are made available through County or City budget processes. To assist in ensuring activity implementation, each action item includes information, on the timeline and coordinating organizations. Upon implementation, the coordinating organizations may look to partner organizations for resources and technical assistance.

- Goal: A state of affairs that a plan is intended to achieve and that (when achieved) terminates behavior intended to achieve it
- Action: the state or process of acting or doing
- Project Status: New, Ongoing, Completed or Terminated
- Progress: The progress of the project if it is ongoing (from previous plan)
- Objective: the goal intended to be attained (and which is believed to be attainable)
- Coordinating Organization: The organization that will gather resources, locate applicable funding, or oversee project activity, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Coordinating organizations may include municipal, county, or regional agencies that are capable of or responsible for implementing mitigation activities and programs
- Priority Rank: High, Medium and Low
- Priority Timeline: Action items include both short and long-term activities. Each action item includes an estimate of the timeline for implementation. Short-term action items that City or County agencies may implement with existing resources and agencies/organizations within *one to two years*. Long-term action items may require new or additional resources and may take between *two to five years* to implement. For events with an undetermined or variable time frame, the term “*continuing*” has been used.
The Priority Rank and Priority Timeline were used together to prioritize projects and goals for each Jurisdiction. A very important goal that is likely to gain funding and be accomplished quickly might have a rank of High and a Timeline of 1 to 2 years, while a project that is not as important or is not likely to gain funding soon, might have a rank of medium and a timeline of 3-5 years. Of course, none of these are set in stone, as funding sources may appear or disappear and due to other circumstances, a low ranking goal may become more important to a community (such as after a tornado, a safe room may move up the list).
- Type of Strategy: Prevention, Life & Property Protection, Natural Resources Protection, Emergency Services, Infrastructure Projects or Public Information/Education
- Potential Funding Sources: Internal funds generated directly from local governmental funding sources (taxes, bonds, budget lines, etc...), Governmental Program Funds which are funds granted to the local entity from State and/or Federal funding sources, Private Funding which comes from grants, loans or donations secured by the local entity for the purposes of the mitigation process.
- Evaluation: The determining event that provides validation that the objective is met, started, ongoing or otherwise functional.
- Hazard(s): Lists the identified local hazards associated with the Action Item or Objective.

Prioritization of Mitigation Projects and Goals

Many variables must be taken into account when prioritizing Mitigation Projects and Goals. Some of the most important are:

- **Benefit-Cost Review** – takes into account the monetary and non-monetary costs and benefits associated with each action. (Example: A tornado safe room may be more expensive than another goal, but it likely affects more people.)
- **Ease of implementation** – takes into account the ease of completing a goal in a short time and at little financial cost, but still reaching a large number of people. (Example: Conducting community hazard education through the media.)
- **Multi-objective actions** – takes into account that some mitigation projects might achieve more than one community goal. (Example: A flood buyout of a property will ensure that there will be no more cost associated with damage to that property, but it could also allow the city to build a park or greenspace in its place.)
- **Time** – takes into account that some projects could be completed quickly, whereas others may take years to finish. (Example: Community education on in-place sheltering during tornadoes could be completed much more quickly than building of a safe room.)
- **Post-disaster mitigation** – Takes into account that funding, political and social considerations may change considerably following a disaster. (Example: Funding becoming available for flood buy-outs following a large rainstorm causing flooding and damage to property.)

Due to the fact that the Greene County Hazard Mitigation Plan is a multijurisdictional document (with 26 jurisdictions involved); each jurisdiction followed these actions in prioritizing their projects and goals. The Springfield-Greene County Office of Emergency Management held a workshop during the planning process to explain mitigation projects and goals so each jurisdiction could learn to complete these steps within their own jurisdiction.

Once Each Jurisdiction brainstormed and came up with their list of mitigation projects and goals, they were asked to rank them by their importance and also by the time they would like to have them finished. As mentioned above, the Priority Rank and Priority Timeline in each table reflect this data.

Obviously the Benefit-Cost Review was a very important step in the prioritization of mitigation projects and goals. Each jurisdiction was required to look very carefully at each mitigation goal they wrote and answer a few questions:

- How many people will be affected by the Hazard?
- How big of an area might be affected?
- How much property damage might occur (in \$)?
- How many properties or physical assets might have loss of use?
- How many people might lose their life?
- How many people might be injured?

These questions needed to be answered assuming the mitigation project had not been completed, and again assuming the mitigation project would be completed. Once they had done that, they would have to come up with the difference between the two. That difference was the

information used to prioritize their mitigation projects. Once jurisdictions had prioritized the projects using the Benefit-Cost Review, they then had to take into account the other variables mentioned above.

The Mitigation Projects and Goals in the revised Greene County Hazard Mitigation Plan were heavily influenced by post-disaster mitigation. During the time in which the jurisdictions were brainstorming and prioritizing their mitigation projects and goals, the County experienced an outbreak of very severe weather including tornadoes and extremely high winds. The storm caused very extensive damage in many of the jurisdictions, including many cities, schools and even a fire station. One of the schools, Fair Grove, actually had students trapped for a short time when the roof of the hallway they were in collapsed on top of them. This outbreak of storms caused widespread damage in the County, but also opened many doors for funding and political backing for jurisdictions to bring up the mitigation projects and goals they were working on, especially ones dealing with severe weather, such as tornado safe rooms. As a result, many jurisdictions wrote projects to install a safe room and some have already been able to find funding to use for their match. This is just one example of how the jurisdictions looked carefully at all of their ideas to decide on the ones best suited for their communities.

Mitigation Best Practices

Listed as part of some mitigation goals is a section titled “Best Practices”. Best practices are programs or campaigns already on-going to promote the Goal, Actions or Objectives. These lists are not meant to be all-inclusive.

Incorporating Mitigation Strategy

The information in the 2009 Greene County Multijurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan will not stand alone, but will be incorporated into other planning processes. Each Jurisdiction in the Mitigation Plan has a planning committee that strives to plan for the safety of their community. These planning committees will review the information in the Mitigation Plan and apply it where applicable (e.g emergency plans, SOPs, EOPs, etc)