The hazard mitigation plan committee met for the second time on March 27, 2018 to continue the plan update process. Committee members were engaged and presented new ideas throughout the meeting.

First, the committee reviewed the goals they had set forth in the previous meeting and approved them. They recognized the potential to include several hazards and mitigation projects under each goal in different ways. This allowed the committee members to begin thinking about different projects they would like to include in this update cycle.

The main focus of the meeting was discussing and working through hazards. Initially, the consultant presented the list of hazards that were in the previous plan (dam failure, drought, earthquake, flooding, hazardous materials, landslide, land subsidence, severe thunderstorm and hail, severe wind and tornado, severe winter storm, terrorism, and wildfire) and the committee members verified that all these hazards were still relevant to the county. Members then began to express concerns about other hazards not included on the list. After some discussion and specific examples, the committee added public health crisis (including pandemics, epidemics, and substance abuse), infestation, extreme temperatures (hot and cold), civil disturbance (active shooter, protests, and bomb threats) and urban fires. The list of hazards for this plan update includes the following, listed alphabetically.

- Civil disturbance
- Dam failure
- Drought
- Earthquake
- Extreme temperatures
• Flood
• Hazardous materials
• Infestation
• Landslide
• Land subsidence
• Public health crisis
• Severe thunderstorm and hail
• Severe wind and tornado
• Severe winter storm
• Terrorism
• Wildland and urban fire

The committee decided to rank the hazards by risk (low, medium-low, medium, medium-high, and high). If more than one hazard is listed under one category, they will then be listed alphabetically under the risk category.

Meeting attendees completed two activities relating to the hazards that they agreed upon. The first was completing a narrative of three to five instances of different hazards that they had experienced in the past five years, more if so needed. The second activity consisted of ranking all the hazards in a risk assessment matrix where the committee members listed the hazards under their perceived probability and severity. After the activity, the committee members compared their results and noted that some hazard rankings were similar in risk such as earthquakes, but others were ranked in three different risk categories, such as severe wind and tornado.

Members of the committee mentioned that they have maps and reports available in different formats for the locations of each hazard. They offered to provide them to the consultant for inclusion in the plan.

The consultant presented a summary of the results of the online public survey thus far; the committee members agreed with the public about the results. Generally, the public and the committee members had similar perspectives of the hazards in the county, giving validity to both the public opinion and the opinion of the committee members.

Being aware of and analyzing future development and development since the last plan update in the county is critical to the success of mitigation. The committee discussed specific locations of recent and future development such as residential buildings, road expansions, and industrial parks that will be included in the plan and will be analyzed against the list of hazards.
The reason for mitigation is to reduce risk and vulnerability to the county through projects. The consultant presented a brief overview of new projects; these will be addressed in the next meeting. The questions to be thinking about in the meantime include:

- What solutions do you propose that address issues you have regarding your hazards?
- How will implementing these projects reduce your vulnerability or risk?

Finally, the consultant reviewed the different surveys and provided information on the jurisdictions that had completed them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Who should complete it?</th>
<th>Why it is important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NFIP survey (paper and digital version)</td>
<td>All incorporated jurisdictions. Completed: none</td>
<td>Jefferson County is a CRS community. FEMA requires information on NFIP activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional capabilities survey <a href="http://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Jefferson-HMP-Capabilities">www.surveymonkey.com/r/Jefferson-HMP-Capabilities</a></td>
<td>All incorporated jurisdictions. Completed: Ranson</td>
<td>This survey informs the type of capabilities each jurisdiction has. This is a requirement for the hazard mitigation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public survey #1 <a href="http://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JC-HMP-Public1">www.surveymonkey.com/r/JC-HMP-Public1</a></td>
<td>The public and all committee members. Completed: 159 responses</td>
<td>Public participation and involvement is required for this plan. Post the link on your social media or agency webpage. This survey focuses on hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public survey #2 <a href="http://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JC-HMP-Public2">www.surveymonkey.com/r/JC-HMP-Public2</a></td>
<td>The public and all committee members.</td>
<td>Public participation and involvement is required for this plan. Post the link on your social media or agency webpage. This survey focuses on mitigation activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee decided upon the next two meeting dates.

- Tuesday, April 17, 2018 (due to scheduling conflicts with room availability, Jefferson County HSEM has changed this meeting to **Wednesday, April 18, 2018 at 11:00 a.m.**)
- Tuesday, May 1, 2018 at 11:00 a.m.

The consultant will provide sections of the plan for the committee to review and approve throughout the remainder of the process to allow sufficient time for all committee members to have input. The final meeting will focus on reviewing the final plan and approve it for submission to the state and FEMA.