

1.0 THE PLANNING PROCESS

To develop a multijurisdictional mitigation plan that reflects all of Wood County's unique hazards, risks, and vulnerabilities, the Wood County EMA utilized a comprehensive, whole community planning process. This process included significant direct participation from stakeholders and community members across the county, representing cities, villages, townships, county government departments, and community organizations. This section describes the process utilized to develop the plan and explains how stakeholders and the community were included throughout the plan development process.

1.1 PLAN DEVELOPMENT

Because of the stakeholder feedback necessary to develop a thorough and complete mitigation plan, the EMA intended for the mitigation planning process to take at least twelve months. This timeframe was necessary to research the county's hazards and risks, meet with jurisdiction representatives and stakeholders, develop mitigation strategies and actions, and develop the revised plan. Upon completion of the plan, the state and federal review process was anticipated to take several more months. The goal was to have a completed and adopted mitigation plan in place by the end of 2018. This section outlines each phase of the plan development process. Because the federal standards for mitigation plan development were revised since the county's last plan and because plans in 2018 must be much more inclusive and comprehensive, the decision was made to create a replacement plan instead of revising the current plan.

1.1.1 Pre-Update Planning Process

Wood County's most recent mitigation plan was adopted on December 14, 2011 and expired April 9, 2018. Because of the scope of work necessary to update the plan, the EMA determined it would be most efficient to hire a contractor to conduct the project. In August 2017, the county entered into a contract Resource Solutions Associates, LLC to coordinate the project, work with jurisdictions and stakeholders to collect information, and develop the new plan. In the fall of 2017, the EMA and Contractor developed a project timeline. The timeline began with an initial planning meeting in October 2017 and culminated with a completed plan submitted to Ohio EMA and FEMA for review in the summer of 2018. This timeline would allow Wood County to have an approved plan in place by the end of 2018.

1.1.2 Planning Team Meetings

The initial step in the planning process was development of a master list of stakeholders and community members. The Contractor developed the master list, with input and feedback from the EMA. The list included representatives from all jurisdictions (county, cities, villages, and townships) as well as broad range of community organizations and agencies that spanned community development, natural resources, business and industry, agriculture, and institutions. The complete list of invited stakeholders is included as table 1-3 later in this section. This whole community-based Hazard Mitigation Planning Team met multiple times throughout the planning process. These meetings were conducted in four distinct phases:

project introduction, hazard identification and risk assessment, mitigation strategy development, and plan review.

Work sessions were held in a variety of locations and at different times to achieve the necessary participation of countywide stakeholders in a county with over forty jurisdictions. To maintain consistency in the process and obtain comparable outcomes, worksheets that identified respondents and jurisdictions were used at all sessions and the Contractor followed the same line of discussion at all meetings. When relevant, information from one meeting was shared at another meeting for the purpose of obtaining the best input possible and to discuss how areas were inter-connected, collaborative, and common with one another.

City and county employees who participated on behalf of their employer required daytime workday meetings in or near their place of employment. Many employees were not realistically able to leave their jurisdiction, including fire and police chiefs, some administrators, and many department supervisors. Some villages with paid employees also required that meetings take place during the regular workday. In a few cases, volunteer officials who are retired preferred daytime meetings. With seventeen villages of less than 2,500 residents, most other elected and appointed officials required evening meetings because of conflicts with daytime employment at other jobs. Due to time constraints and the size of Wood County, these sessions were held with multiple jurisdictions represented at one meeting to limit travel time and inconvenience to the participants.

Project Kick Off

An initial countywide planning meeting was conducted October 24, 2017 at the Wood County Courthouse. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the project to stakeholders, ensure stakeholders' understanding of the scope of the plan, and their involvement in its development. The Contractor discussed the importance of hazard mitigation within emergency management and the process the EMA and Contractor would utilize work with jurisdictions and stakeholders to develop the plan. Jurisdictions were asked to identify a primary point-of-contact who would coordinate with the EMA to schedule jurisdiction work sessions. The fact that the hazard mitigation planning process is open to the public at all stages and the entire process is completely transparent was emphasized many times during this kick-off meeting.

Hazard and Risk Identification Work Sessions

The hazard and risk identification phase focused on research and information gathering. Jurisdiction-specific work sessions were conducted in November and December 2017; each session focused on the hazards, risks, vulnerabilities, and past disasters that impacted each jurisdiction. With 19 townships and 21 municipalities that all have unique concerns, the feasibility of a countywide risk assessment work session was low. On the other hand, by meeting in small work groups to discuss this, all those involved were able to focus on the detailed information about why and how specific hazards impact given areas. These sessions focused on identifying hazards and risks relevant to that area and analyzing the impact of incidents on each jurisdiction. Discussions covered vulnerabilities across the entire county as well as in the jurisdiction where the meeting was held, and looked at not only jurisdictional

damages, but damages across the entire county. Participants included mayors, administrators, city/village council members, trustees, fiscal officers, road/street department employees, law enforcement officials, fire service personnel, water and wastewater treatment facility staff, farmers, and other key jurisdiction employees. Local school districts, businesses, and residents were also invited to participate and provide feedback.

Subject-focused countywide work sessions were also conducted with stakeholders representing specific groups or interests, including agriculture, regional planning, economic development, land use planning, regulation, engineering, infrastructure, and GIS. As a result of these sessions, the Contractor obtained detailed information from stakeholders with specific countywide knowledge in relevant technical areas. The sessions focused on gathering hazard and risk information and discussing the impact of disasters relative to each group's specific area of expertise. Each group was asked to rank vulnerabilities according to jurisdiction; that input was used to prioritize hazards for each area as required in federal plan guidance.

By conducting meetings at various locations and with the help of multiple jurisdiction officials, community awareness of the mitigation planning process was enhanced. Each township, village, or city had at least one worker who championed each meeting because they filled the role of primary contact with the EMA Deputy Director. They were asked to be actively involved in the process and received multiple contacts from the EMA Deputy Director during the process. These sessions also enabled the participants to easily show the Contractor a certain bridge, culvert, or building that played into discussions. The Contractor was able to see the local features that were part of the discussions. In several cases, stakeholders provided a local tour of the area, pointing out key parts of discussions. In other cases, the Contractor independently toured the area to view locations that were targeted in discussions to best understand the specific points expressed.

Participants signed into meetings as a representative of a jurisdiction, an employer, a department, or an institution. However, as is common in many communities, individuals in leadership positions wear many hats. It was common that a township trustee or local resident who attended an evening meeting was also a Wood County employee during the day. Those who work in areas of special expertise, such as OSU Extension or Northwest Water and Sewer District, also live in Wood County and fill roles as mayors and village council representatives. Some people work in one jurisdiction and live in another. The wearing of multiple hats facilitated broad-based discussions and provided a continual eye on the countywide perspective, even in the smallest of village meetings.

Mitigation Strategy Development Work Sessions

A second round of meetings was conducted in February and March 2018; these sessions addressed damage reduction and focused on developing countywide and jurisdiction-specific mitigation goals and strategies based on the hazards and risks identified during the previous sessions. The strategy development sessions included the same broad scope of invitees as the hazard and risk identification meetings and provided a forum for local officials and stakeholders to discuss specific actions to help reduce disaster risk in their community. Discussions focused

on methods to prevent or resolve disaster-related damages in all areas of the county. While there was a focus on those jurisdictions in attendance, discussions included strategies and actions across the county. The effect mitigation actions in one area might have on other areas of the county were included in discussion, as were actions taken elsewhere and that effect on the represented jurisdictions. Many vulnerabilities and the resulting strategies were consistent and countywide while others were very specific to one or two areas or took on unique characteristics due to a particular feature of a specific area. These sessions also included a review and progress assessment of the mitigation strategies identified in the county's 2011 plan; progress on the previously identified goals was documented for inclusion in the new plan and those strategies that were to be continued were incorporated into the revised new plan strategies.

Final Plan Review

Following the six-month collection of information from stakeholders across Wood County, the Contractor developed a draft plan for the planning team to review. All stakeholders were provided with digital access to the plan through the Contractor's website and were asked to provide comments and feedback. A printed copy of the draft plan was available at the Wood County EMA for anyone with limited computer access. Stakeholders were also invited to a countywide final plan review forum on June 21, 2018 to provide any final comments, ask questions, and learn about the EMA's plan implementation process.

During the final review phase of the planning period, from June 11 when the draft was made available to the planning committee through July 2 when open public review was complete, stakeholders were asked to provide input on countywide implementation of the plan. They were asked to read the plan components that directly applied to the area where they live or work and to read about other areas in the county that might contribute to, share, or be responsible for damage reduction for a vulnerability that affects them. Group discussions involved countywide implementation of strategies and considered how collaborative efforts between jurisdictions would be necessary to successfully complete many of the actions. Stakeholders reviewed how individual communities and areas worked together in the past to accomplish goals, and how cross-discipline and multi-jurisdiction efforts must support this plan as well. Conversations included a review of mitigation efforts at various levels of government, including local townships, municipalities, and the county as well as state and federal levels of involvement.

After the planning team's initial plan review, a two-week public review period was conducted. From June 18 – July 2, 2018, the plan was available on the Contractor's website and in print at the EMA for any member of the public to review and provide comment. The EMA posted review information on their website and social media sites. The public was invited to the countywide plan review forum on June 21, 2018. The public was notified of the plan review period through news releases to local media outlets, letters to jurisdictions, and posts on the EMA's website and social media accounts. The EMA also published a news article in *The Sentinel-Tribune* (Bowling Green) on June 25, 2018. All news releases and notices included

locations where the plan could be viewed digitally or in print as well as contact information for the Contractor and EMA staff.

Wood County EMA staff and the Contractor reviewed all comments and questions received from stakeholders and the public and recommended appropriate revisions for incorporation into the plan. Upon final revision, the plan was submitted to the Ohio EMA for state review before submission to FEMA for federal approval. Following federal approval, the formal adoption process began. This process is explained in section 4.0 Plan Adoption.

Table 1-1 includes a complete list of planning team meetings and work sessions conducted throughout the planning process.

Table 1-1: Planning Team Meetings

Date	Location	Purpose	Participating Stakeholders
10/24/17	Wood County Courthouse	Project Kick Off/Initial Planning Meeting	Countywide Meeting
11/27/17	Rossford City Building	Hazard Identification	Rossford
11/27/17	North Baltimore Administration Building	Hazard Identification	North Baltimore Liberty Township
11/28/17	Perrysburg City Police Department	Hazard Identification	Perrysburg
11/28/17	Perrysburg Township Administration Building	Hazard Identification	Perrysburg Township
11/28/17	Middleton Township Administration Building	Hazard Identification	Middleton Township Plain Township
12/04/17	Northwood Municipal Building	Hazard Identification	Northwood
12/04/17	Lake Township Administration Building	Hazard Identification	Lake Township Millbury
12/04/17	Wayne Fire Department	Hazard Identification	Bradner Wayne
12/05/17	Wood County EOC	Hazard Identification	Countywide Meeting Wood County Building Dept. Wood County GIS NW Water and Sewer District OSU Extension
12/05/17	Wood County Soil & Water Conservation District	Hazard Identification	Countywide Meeting SWCD USDA/FSA County Engineer's Office Montgomery Township
12/05/17	Bowling Green Municipal Building	Hazard Identification	Bowling Green BGSU Grand Rapids

Date	Location	Purpose	Participating Stakeholders
12/05/17	Bloomdale Community Center	Hazard Identification	Bloomdale Portage Township
12/06/17	Pemberville Opera House	Hazard Identification	Freedom Township Pemberville Portage Webster Township
01/29/18	Walbridge Administration Building	Hazard Identification	Walbridge
01/29/18	Wood County EOC	Hazard Identification	Countywide Meeting County Planning Commission County Engineer
01/30/18	Wood County EOC	Hazard Identification	Haskins Tontogany
01/30/18	Jackson Twp./Hoytville Fire Department	Hazard Identification	Henry Township Hoytville Jackson Township Montgomery Township Weston Township
01/31/18	Perry Twp./West Millgrove Fire Department	Hazard Identification	Perry Township Risingsun West Millgrove
02/26/2018	Rossford City Building	Strategy Development	Rossford
02/26/2018	Bloomdale Community Center	Strategy Development	Bloomdale West Millgrove Perry Township
02/27/2018	Perrysburg Municipal Building	Strategy Development	Perrysburg
02/27/2018	Perrysburg Township Administration Building	Strategy Development	Perrysburg Township
02/27/2018	Middleton Township Hall	Strategy Development	Grand Rapids Grand Rapids Township Middleton Township Plain Township
02/28/2018	Northwood Municipal Building	Strategy Development	Northwood
02/28/2018	Lake Township Administration Building	Strategy Development	Millbury Walbridge Lake Township
02/28/2018	Custar American Legion Hall	Hazard Identification and Strategy Development	Custar
02/28/2018	Wayne Fire Department	Strategy Development	Bradner Jerry City Portage Wayne

Date	Location	Purpose	Participating Stakeholders
03/21/2018	Wood County EOC	Strategy Development	Countywide Meeting Bloom Township County Engineer County GIS Montgomery Township Northwest Water and Sewer District
03/21/2018	Wood County Soil and Water Conservation District	Strategy Development	Countywide Meeting Wood County SWCD
03/21/2018	Jackson Twp./Hoytville Fire Department	Strategy Development	Jackson Township Henry Township Liberty Township
03/22/2018	Bowling Green State University	Strategy Development	Bowling Green Bowling Green State University County Sheriff
03/22/2018	North Baltimore Village Hall	Strategy Development	North Baltimore
03/22/2018	Pemberville Opera House	Strategy Development	Luckey Pemberville
03/28/2018	Weston Village Hall	Hazard Identification and Strategy Development	Weston EMS
03/30/2018	Wood County Fairgrounds – Township Trustees Association	Hazard Identification and Strategy Development	Countywide Meeting Center Township Montgomery Township Perrysburg Township
04/10/2018	Bairdstown Village Hall	Hazard Identification and Strategy Development	Bairdstown
04/19/2018	Wood County EOC	Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment	Milton Center
06/21/2018	Wood County Courthouse	Final Plan Review Forum	Countywide Meeting

1.2 STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

With four cities, twenty-one villages, nineteen townships and a county population of approximately 129,000, Wood County had a significant number of stakeholders to include in the mitigation planning process. The Hazard Mitigation Planning Team included broad participation from these identified stakeholders.

Throughout the project, the EMA used a whole community approach for the planning process. A broad, inclusive list of planning team members was developed with the intention of including all jurisdictions, organizations, and agencies with an interest or role in emergency management, and thus in disaster mitigation.

Invitations to participate in the Hazard Mitigation Planning Team were extended to the following officials, leaders, and stakeholders from Wood County and adjacent jurisdictions:

- Incorporated jurisdictions (county, city, and village officials)
- Township representatives (trustees, fiscal officers)
- Specialized disciplines, including fire service, law enforcement, engineering, utilities, public health, healthcare, hospitals, business and industry, education and academia, nonprofits, social agencies, and the general public
- Elected officials, including the county auditor, treasurer, engineer, and commissioners
- Appointed officials, including the county floodplain manager, GIS mapping specialist, conservation specialists, regional planning, building officials, development officials, fire chiefs, police chiefs, public health commissioners, extension agents
- Economic development organizations such as economic development corporations, chambers of commerce, and tourism and visitor's bureaus
- Emergency management officials from adjacent counties
- Non-government agencies and community action groups
- Special interest groups such as watershed coalitions, conservancy districts, federal partners, state agencies with facilities in the county, and others with a special interest in the well-being of Wood County
- Residents, businesses, and the general public

All of these primary contacts were advised that all planning activities would be open to the public and any constituent or resident was welcome to attend any session they wished to attend; they were also encouraged to add additional participants to the invitation list.

1.2.1 Jurisdiction Participation

All incorporated jurisdictions in Wood County elected to participate in the countywide hazard mitigation plan. The county and all incorporated jurisdictions (cities and villages) are expected to formally adopt the hazard mitigation plan. For the purposes of plan adoption and future grant administration, the county is authorized to act on behalf of the townships. While Wood County officials represent townships in plan adoption, all townships elected to participate in the planning work sessions and contributed significantly to the process. This broad participation ensured that all interests across the county, including rural and suburban areas, were represented. Because so many local individuals fill more than one leadership role in the county, there was much multi-jurisdictional consideration throughout the process, emphasizing the countywide focus of mitigation planning and implementation.

The officials identified in Table 1-2 served as the primary point of contact for each jurisdiction. The EMA coordinated with these individuals to schedule work sessions; the primary representatives then notified and invited other jurisdiction officials, stakeholders, and community members. A complete list of all individuals who participated in the mitigation planning process is provided in Appendix A: Mitigation Planning Team.

Table 1-2: Participating Jurisdictions and Primary Representatives

Jurisdiction	Position/Title	Representative
COUNTY		
Wood County	Deputy EMA Director	Jeff Klein
CITIES		
Bowling Green	Assistant Municipal Administrator	Joe Fawcett
Northwood	Fire Chief	Joel Whitmore
Perrysburg	Assistant Fire Chief	Tom Granata
Rossford	Police Chief	Glenn Goss
VILLAGES		
Bairdstown	Mayor	Chris Barringer
Bloomdale	Village Council Member	Bethany Vincent
Bradner	Mayor	Virgil Shull
Custar	Mayor	Renee Hartman
Cygnets	Mayor	Scott Gonyer
Grand Rapids	Mayor	John Berry
Haskins	Village Administrator/Police Chief	Colby Carrol
Hoytville	Firefighter	Bandon Connine
Jerry City	Mayor	Kyle Radish
Luckey	Village Council Member	Cory Panning
Millbury	Mayor	Michael Timmons
Milton Center	Mayor	Debra Plath
North Baltimore	Village Administrator	Allyson Murray
Pemberville	Mayor	Gordon Bowman
Portage	Mayor	Mark Wolford
Risingsun	Mayor	Rick Whetsal
Tontogany	Mayor	Todd Buehrer
Walbridge	Mayor	Edward Kolanko
Wayne	Mayor	Craig Everett
West Millgrove	Mayor	Ann Schreiner
Weston	Assistant EMS Chief	Tim Schroeder
TOWNSHIPS		
Bloom Township	Trustee	Terry Hummel
Center Township	Trustee	Richard Engle
Freedom Township	Trustee	Rick Rahe
Grand Rapids Township	Fire Chief	Eric Flora
Henry Township	Trustee	Jim Wymer
Jackson Township	Trustee	Brendan George
Lake Township	Fire Chief	Bruce Moritz
Liberty Township	Trustee	Rod Lucas
Middleton Township	Fire Chief	Steve Asmus
Milton Township	Trustee	Stanley Wilhelm
Montgomery Township	Trustee	Jerry Houtz
Perry Township	Trustee	Chad Wonderly

Jurisdiction	Position/Title	Representative
Perrysburg Township	Township Administrator	Walter Celley
Plain Township	Trustee	Jim Rosson
Portage Township	Trustee	Rodney Rhoden
Troy Township	Fire/EMS Chief	Randy Woodruff
Washington Township	Fire Chief	Todd Buehrer
Webster Township	Trustee	Isaac Bailey
Weston Township	Trustee	Randy Tolles

1.2.2 Hazard Mitigation Planning Team

Because Wood County's goal was to solicit broad countywide participation in the planning process, an expansive invitation list was developed for the project kick-off meeting. Using information from multiple sources, including EMA contact lists, jurisdiction and agency websites, the Board of Elections, and general online information, a master planning team of more than 150 people was developed. The master list identified the name, position, agency or jurisdiction, and contact information for each individual and included representation from business and industry, community services, economic and community development, education, government, infrastructure and engineering, natural resources and agriculture, and public safety. Emergency management officials from adjacent counties were also invited to participate.

Throughout the planning process, more than 140 people representing the identified jurisdictions and organizations contributed to the planning process. The complete list of participating stakeholders is provided in Appendix A: Hazard Mitigation Planning Team.

The planning team's participation occurred over four phases of plan development: kick-off meeting, hazard identification and risk assessment, mitigation strategy development, and final plan review. The plan development schedule included four sets of meetings and work sessions with additional small group meetings scheduled throughout. Because achieving meaningful participation from a wide range of partners through these sessions was important to the EMA and Contractor, the meeting schedule was developed to provide multiple opportunities for stakeholder participation that considered a wide variety of schedule conflicts, work situations, and other issues.

The EMA worked with each jurisdiction's identified point of contact to schedule work sessions. Most invitations were sent to stakeholders and invited participants by e-mail as this was the quickest and most efficient method to communicate. When necessary, EMA staff reached out to stakeholders by phone or through other communication mechanisms to ensure delivery of the information. The EMA Deputy Director and Contractor worked together to establish and maintain a list of respondents so those who had not yet been involved could easily be identified. The Deputy Director then reached out to non-respondents individually to garner their attendance.

Participants were continually reminded that the mitigation planning process was open to the public. Meeting dates were announced to a wide audience and jurisdictions were encouraged to extend invitations to employees, community organizations, residents, and others who might have an interest in the project. Contact information for the EMA and Contractor was freely distributed to all participants so that all community members could ask questions, provide input, or otherwise become involved in the planning process.

1.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Comprehensive community participation in the mitigation plan was a goal of the EMA throughout the planning process. Utilizing FEMA's Whole Community Planning concept, the EMA reached out to a broad scope of community partners, jurisdiction officials, community partners, and stakeholders. These representatives were invited to participate and provide input through all phases of the planning process. The EMA and Contractor began by developing an inclusive planning team invitation list. A significant amount of time was dedicated to identifying contacts across all jurisdictions, subject-areas, and segments of the county and creating an accurate contact list of those individuals. Collectively, this list was referred to as the mitigation planning team. Some planning team work sessions focused on countywide issues while others allowed for discussion of specific jurisdictional concerns. Regardless of the individuals in attendance, all meetings were open to the public and any participants were welcome to attend any meeting that fit their schedule, regardless of the location. Stakeholders were encouraged to invite others from their jurisdiction or agency.

At the plan kick-off meeting, the EMA and Contractor informed attendees that all meetings were open to the public. The current hazard mitigation plan was made available for the planning team's review on the Contractor's website; participants were encouraged to review that document to facilitate discussions at work sessions. Attendees were also encouraged to share meeting invitations, plan documents, and all information with colleagues, community members, and others who may have an interest in participating in the project.

Once the initial draft plan was complete and had been released to the planning committee the week prior, it was posted on the Contractor's website for review by the public. This two-week public review was conducted June 18 – July 2, 2018. A final countywide plan review forum was conducted on June 21, 2018. This forum was open to the public and provided all stakeholders with the opportunity to view and comment on the plan. It also provided an opportunity to discuss multi-jurisdictional implementation, countywide ongoing participation, and annual review by all jurisdictions in the coming five years.

All jurisdictions and members of the planning team were notified of this review period and plan review forum by the same e-mail system used throughout the project. To notify the general public, the EMA placed a news release in *The Sentinel-Tribune* (Bowling Green) on June 25, 2018 and posted a notice on the agency's website and social media pages. Jurisdictions were encouraged to share the invitation on their website and social media pages.

All notifications included a link to view the plan online, the timeline for public review, and instructions for submitting comments and questions. A printed copy of the plan was available at the Wood County EMA during regular business hours for anyone who preferred to view a printed copy of the plan.

1.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

Extensive research was conducted during the planning process. This included reviews of existing data, plans, and reports and detailed discussions with stakeholders and subject-matter experts.

The county profile was developed through the study of various county and jurisdiction documents and plans. Information about community development, business and industry, land use regulations, and community life were researched; relevant findings were included as part of the countywide and jurisdiction profiles. Statistical information was provided by the U.S. Census Bureau and other government sources. Jurisdiction websites provided additional local information. Wood County's comprehensive community development and land use plan was consulted for information about individual communities, development goals, building and development restrictions and regulations, and countywide goals and objectives for community growth. The cities supported that information with their corresponding jurisdictional documents. County building officials and jurisdictional zoning officers provided information about construction standards, permit process and requirements, and occupancy rules. The floodplain manager provided information about community participation in NFIP and CRS, and communities provided jurisdictional documents and websites that confirmed and explained collaboration between the municipality and the county. Watershed plans and government discovery reports were consulted for information about rivers and streams. These were but a few of the documents that provided information, confirmation, detail, and data for the Wood County multi-jurisdictional mitigation planning efforts.

Because the county's most recent hazard mitigation plan was approved in 2011, hazard information and disaster data from 2011 through 2017 was identified to ensure that the new plan included current, relevant, and accurate hazard and risk information. This information was identified based on reports from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Storm Events Database. Additional hazard data was obtained from the Ohio EMA, FEMA, Tornado History Project, Stanford University Dam Program, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Toledo Metropolitan Council of Governments, and other federal, state, and private sources. Incidents prior to 2011 were reviewed for accuracy and any additional information was added; incidents occurring since 2011 were incorporated into the new plan. This information was shared with stakeholders during planning team work sessions so that local knowledge of the impact, consequences, and recovery efforts of incidents was incorporated into the county's hazard history. Appendix B: Hazard and Vulnerability Data includes a complete list of all recorded occurrences of each hazard, organized by type.

The vulnerability assessment and risk analysis is based on multiple data sources. HAZUS projections helped establish potential losses in flood and earthquake incidents. Wood County

property values were provided by the County Auditor and the GIS department provided mapping support. Because the 2011 mitigation plan contained information that still reflected countywide risks, vulnerabilities, and conditions, that information was retained and included in the revised plan. FEMA records provided additional loss data based on federal disaster assistance provided in the county. The State of Ohio Enhanced Multi-hazard Mitigation Plan (2014) also provided some data and explanation.

A variety of sources were used to examine county's issues with water and drainage. These includes watershed reports published by ODNR, US EPA documents, reports developed by local government agencies and watershed coalitions, and others as identified in Table 1-4. This information was combined with discussions with stakeholders and subject-matter experts to develop the mitigation plan. Local Soil and Water Conservation District, Ohio State University Extension Service, and the Natural Resource Conservation District office provided information. The USDA agricultural statistics system supplied data regarding agriculture and production.

Table 1-4 provides a list of the sources utilized in the research phase of this project.

Table 1-4: Studies, Reports, and References

Document	Author/Agency	Date
2010 United States Census	US Census Bureau	2010
Bowling Green Community Action Plan	City of Bowling Green	2017
Bowling Green Comprehensive Plan	City of Bowling Green	2015
Bowling Green Improvement Plan	City of Bowling Green	2014
Community Relations Plan for the Luckey Site Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	US Army Corps of Engineers	2016
Federal Disaster Declaration Statistics	FEMA	2018
Ground Water Pollution Potential of Wood County, Ohio	Ohio Department of Natural Resources	1994
HAZUS Earthquake and Flood data	Ohio EMA	2012
Northwood Comprehensive Plan	City of Northwood	2004
Ohio Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan	Ohio EMA	2014
Perrysburg Comprehensive Plan	City of Perrysburg	2008
Perrysburg Township Community Master Plan	Perrysburg Township	2010
Portage River Watershed Plan	Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments, Portage River Basin Council	2013
Soil Survey of Wood County, Ohio	US Department of Agriculture	2000
Storm Events Database	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	2018
Wood County Flood Damage Reduction Regulations	Wood County Commissioners	2011
Wood County Future Land Use Plan	Wood County Planning Commission	2017
Wood County Profile	Ohio Department of Development, Office of Research	2017

1.5 PLAN MAINTENANCE

Plan maintenance is a critical element of the hazard mitigation plan. Ongoing plan maintenance establishes hazard mitigation as part of regular community development activities, provides a mechanism for the EMA to continually engage stakeholders in issues related to disaster risk reduction, and lays a solid groundwork for the required five-year update. By reviewing disaster occurrences annually and assessing the county's progress on mitigation activities, a five-year mitigation plan update can be a quick and efficient process. Wood County intends to follow a regular plan maintenance schedule. The EMA will lead this effort and involve stakeholders, jurisdictions, and the community, laying a solid foundation for the plan update in 2023.

1.5.1 Plan Maintenance Methodology

One of the biggest challenges in plan maintenance is obtaining and maintaining stakeholder participation. Plan review meetings can be poorly attended, leading to limited feedback and discussion of ongoing mitigation issues. Many stakeholders have competing demands on their time as they fill multiple roles in the community. In Wood County, countywide meetings are often difficult because there are so many jurisdictions, ranging from large, suburban cities with full-time employees to small, rural villages with part-time or volunteer officials. In consideration of this issue, Wood County will adopt a plan maintenance methodology that incorporates multiple engagement and communication methods to meet the needs of such a diverse group of community leaders. When conducting plan maintenance, the EMA will include the varied activities identified below, selecting the specific activities they believe will elicit the best participation from stakeholders as necessary.

- Jurisdiction-based meetings in local villages and townships
- Countywide meetings at central locations
- Written or electronic surveys/questionnaires
- Webinars/conference calls
- Post-incident review when a significantly damaging incident takes place
- Individual

These activities are utilized frequently in today's business environment and will be accessible and acceptable to most stakeholders. As with any planning activity, documentation of participation, copies of surveys, and other communication surrounding these events will be maintained. The EMA Director will maintain this documentation.

1.5.2 Annual Plan Review

The Hazard Mitigation Planning Team will be called upon to review, evaluate, and discuss the plan annually, beginning approximately one year after the final approval of the plan, and continuing through years two, three and four of the plan validity period. These annual plan maintenance discussions may be conducted through traditional in-person meetings or webinars, surveys, questionnaires, or other forms of communication. The specific methodology will be determined by the EMA Director based on what best meets the needs of stakeholders and is appropriate at that specific time. If a year has been riddled with incidents, a face-to-face session should be held after post-incident response critiques are held. A comprehensive review

may involve varied methods of consideration for different groups. For example, county employees may be gathered to discuss the incident, while municipalities and townships may be sent written materials and asked to submit completed documents after review at their local meetings.

Regardless of the specific method, the annual plan maintenance discussion will include an assessment of the past years' disaster incidents and a summary of the resulting damages, costs, and recovery efforts. It will define any shortages, gaps in capabilities, and ineffective loss prevention actions. It will identify any mitigation projects that would have reduced losses or eliminated costs. Status reports on in-progress mitigation projects and updates on the mitigation strategies and actions developed by each jurisdiction will also be included. The EMA Director will maintain records of these annual discussions and will develop an annual list of strategy modifications, including to continue, modify, defer, or eliminate any particular strategy or action from mitigation efforts in the future. The report will identify any reduction in losses due to a successful mitigation strategy, action, or project implementation.

As part of the review process, jurisdictions will be asked to conduct an internal analysis of mitigation strategies and actions underway in their jurisdiction, or to identify strategies that should be added, modified, or deferred. They will provide the EMA with a brief report of their findings. The report will include an assessment of disaster incidents that occurred during the year, a summary of damages and recovery efforts, and a status report on the adopted mitigation strategies as a result of those incidents. If a strategy has been completed, the jurisdiction will evaluate its effectiveness in reducing losses. This information will be shared with the countywide planning team during the annual countywide review process. The EMA will maintain a summary of these reports and findings.

The EMA will convene a planning team meeting after any significant disaster or large-scale emergency to review and document any changes, additions, or deletions that should be considered at the five-year update while the incident is fresh in the planning team's mind. If the incident involved jurisdictions, resources, or departments from outside Wood County, those entities should be included in the meeting. The EMA will maintain records of these meetings and findings.

Along with these review activities, the EMA will conduct an annual review of the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment and note any necessary changes. Loss estimates will be evaluated for ongoing accuracy and any progress in development, change in regulation, or other significant differences will be noted. Additional topics of review should identify any significant changes in property valuations across the county, additions or deletions of significant capital equipment, businesses or industries, service centers, institutions or facilities; significant changes in agricultural practices, conservation practices, or livestock operations; initiation or completion of community, residential, commercial or industrial growth and development; changes in development regulations including zoning, building codes, or other regulations; modifications of NFIP or CRS participation; changes to floodplain or flood maps; major projects underway or completed including cleaning of rivers, ditches, and streams, installation of

structurally engineered projects or devices, creation of natural habitat or runoff detention areas; changes in warning and notification equipment or procedures; and changes in any first responder capability or capacity. The EMA Director will also annually review the process of mitigation inclusion in community development and will make recommendations for changes to the county process that will insure that mitigation strategies are included in the implementation of growth in the countywide community. The EMA Director may add other information at his/her discretion.

1.5.3 Community Participation

While the EMA is responsible for leading the plan maintenance effort, that process only works if stakeholders are engaged. Ongoing consideration of hazard mitigation strategies is critical to creating a resilient and sustainable community and it is the goal of the EMA to make mitigation part of daily operations. It is the EMA's intention that the broad group of stakeholders representing the municipalities, jurisdictions, agencies, and organizations involved in plan development continue to participate in ongoing plan maintenance. Without their involvement, ongoing input will not be comprehensive or accurate. Therefore, all parties involved in developing this plan must perceive the annual review process as critical to the pre- and post-disaster welfare of the county. This was stressed to stakeholders during the plan development process.

Public involvement is an important component of ongoing mitigation efforts. As with all plan development meetings, annual update meetings will be open to the public and community input will be encouraged. Public notices of annual plan review activities will be published through local media and appropriate websites and social media accounts of participating jurisdictions and agencies. Meeting announcements will include the date, time, and location of the session and adequate notice so that people have reasonable time to plan their attendance. If surveys and other electronic tools are utilized to collect feedback from stakeholders, these documents will also be made available to the community and instructions provided on how to utilize these tools. Any feedback submitted by the public will be reviewed by the EMA and planning team; documentation of public participation will be maintained by the EMA. The public should have open access to any findings in annual reports, as well as any recommendations for future projects, initiatives, and actions.

1.5.4 Integration with Community Planning Mechanisms

Wood County's mitigation concerns are embedded into daily operations across the entire county. As departments, agencies, and jurisdictions work with and beside one another to help the community grow and prosper, they will consider the effects disasters and storms would have on new ventures and facilities. This community development participation in mitigation activities is a major factor in the achievement of goals as well as the assessment of new and additional mitigation efforts. This participation occurs during purposeful plan review and during daily operations within each department or jurisdiction that guide the growth and development of specific communities in the first place.

The EMA Director plays an important daily role in community development planning and execution. He is part of various committees and boards within county, municipal, and township government. He works to maintain community focus on development regulations and mitigation projects, as well as speaking for generalized operational efforts to reduce damages due to disasters. The EMA Director is an active participant in the Local Emergency Planning Commission (chair), Wood County Mayor's Association, Wood County Township Trustee's Association, Wood County Emergency Preparedness Committee (co-chair), Wood County United Way Board, Wood County Safety Committee, Wood County Safe Communities Committee, and Wood County Land Use Plan Update Committee. He also participates in several public safety and educational facility advisory boards and committees.

Other key organizations also participate in EMA activities, giving the communication loop a dual pathway to help insure implementation of risk reduction efforts. Land use planning, economic development, and regulation enforcement are all two-way efforts to recognize disaster risk, identify risk reduction strategies, and implement planning and development that increases resiliency in a sustainable manner.

One very recent example stands out that illustrates how this two-way communication occurs in the county. The Wood County Planning Commission spearheaded development of a countywide future land use plan in 2017. The steering committee included community development professionals and departments as well as natural resources and parks directors, Wood County Soil and Water Conservation, Northwest Water and Sewer District, and the EMA Director. Along with all villages, cities, and townships, this vast array of representation helped create a visionary plan to guide the county for the next decade as development occurs. Issues like flooding, smart development, storm water management, and disaster mitigation were included in the planning effort at the hand of all these professionals. These individuals also participate in the Wood County All-Hazards Multijurisdictional Mitigation Plan development and annual reviews.

Some communities have worked to incorporate countywide efforts in their jurisdiction to a greater detail. The cities of Perrysburg, Northwood, and Bowling Green have comprehensive citywide planning documents that are consistent with the countywide plan. The individuals who developed and maintain those plans were included in the mitigation plan development and will be included in annual review activities, and the EMA Director is consulted as they develop their internal plans for growth.

All Wood County jurisdictions adhere to development and construction standards enforced by local officials, and this enhances the effectiveness of mitigation strategies that support these efforts. Residential and commercial building codes, including the associated permitting process for construction, renovation, and occupancy, are granted and managed by the Wood County Building Department. The permit process includes all construction activities from site development through occupancy. The county uses the Ohio Building Code and the International Fire Code as the regulation of choice.

Fire departments in Rossford, Perrysburg, Perrysburg Township, Northwood, Bowling Green, and Lake Township complete fire code inspections in their jurisdictions.

The entire county is zoned, with the exception of Jackson, Milton, and Montgomery Townships and the eastern and southern periphery of Perrysburg Township. All villages except Milton Center, Wayne and West Millgrove are zoned; Wayne is in the process of considering zoning. All four cities are zoned. This results in enforcement of permitting for use of properties according to pre-established rules. There are currently some concerns about development of businesses using hazardous materials and performing some mining operations in the unzoned area of Perrysburg Township. The township trustees are pursuing a zoning vote in an upcoming election to minimize future issues.

Wood County's Regional Planning Director serves as the county Floodplain Manager. He ensures that development in the floodplain, if done at all, is completed in a no-net-loss fashion. Subdivision regulations in floodplains are extremely tough, requiring they need a 200-year flood base elevation requirement. Four communities in the county do not currently participate in NFIP: Northwood (never joined in 1976), West Millgrove (has floodplain designation since 2012 only), Hoytville (has no floodplain), Tontogany (never joined in 1976), and Luckey (had no floodplain before 2012). These communities are all interested in joining NFIP and will work with the Regional Planning Director to develop floodplain regulations and with the EMA Director to resolve the sanctions currently in effect.

Wood County Soil and Water Conservation supports the county ditch maintenance program by working with landowners to identify the best method of maintaining waterways, whether that is through the ditch maintenance program, grants and other programs, or by privately completing the work. The Wood County Engineer is responsible for cleaning, construction and repair of county ditches on the ditch maintenance program. He is also responsible for the monitoring and maintenance of three county-owned detention ponds, four pump stations and twelve village storm sewer systems, as well as approval of any watershed maintenance programs in the county. The Engineer approves field tiling plans and Wood County Health Department approves septic systems. Both departments work with homeowners and farmers to make sure drainage is running effectively and the proper maintenance is done. They work with farmers and businesses to address drainage issues that can be attributed to poor soils, debris-filled ditches, and inconsistent tiling of farm fields. Both are part of the Regional Planning steering committee for economic and community development, and represents mitigation concerns along with the EMA Director.

1.5.5 Documentation of Plan Maintenance

The EMA will be responsible for maintaining documentation of all plan maintenance activities. This documentation should include attendance records for review meetings, contact lists for any parties invited to complete digital or on-site reviews where the EMA staff is not physically present, meeting notes and summaries, and recommendations from stakeholders for changes, additions, or deletions to the plan. Results from surveys and questionnaires, annual jurisdiction reports, and comments submitted by the public should also be maintained. All reports,

documents, and files can be saved digitally so they are more accessible and less cumbersome to maintain. These records should be part of the data shared with the author of the next update to the mitigation plan.

1.5.6 Plan Update Cycle

The newly approved Wood County All-Hazard Multijurisdictional Mitigation Plan will expire in 2023. With annual plan maintenance activities, the county should be positioned to submit an updated plan before the current plan's expiration date. To ensure the appropriate timeline is met, formal efforts to update the plan will begin in mid-2021. The EMA Director will ensure that the appropriate and necessary steps are taken to complete this process.