

SUMMARY NOTES OF THE JUNE 22, 2010 MEETING OF THE KENOSHA COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION TASK FORCE

INTRODUCTION

The third meeting of the Kenosha County Hazard Mitigation Task Force was convened at the Kenosha County Center Public Hearing Room at 1:30 p.m. on June 22, 2010. The meeting was called to order by Kenosha County Division of Emergency Management Director Ben Schliesman. Attendance was taken by circulating a sign-in sheet.

In attendance at the meeting were the following individuals:

Ben Schliesman, Chairman	Director, Kenosha County Division of Emergency Management
Michael G. Hahn, Secretary	Chief Environmental Engineer, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Michael Boozer	Chief Executive Officer, ChemReport, Inc.
Joseph E. Boxhorn	Senior Planner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
John Burg	Village Administrator, Village of Paddock Lake
Michelle Eisenhauer	Central Services Manager, Kenosha County Department of Human Services
Patrick Finnemore	Director of Facilities, Kenosha Unified School District No. 1
William Glembocki	Chairperson, Town of Wheatland
Paul Guilbert, Jr.	Chief, Pleasant Prairie Fire and Rescue
Don Howland	Captain, City of Kenosha Fire Department
Mark Krueger	Lieutenant, Kenosha County Sheriff's Department
Eric Kuhart	Security Director, Carthage College
Lewis Lindquist	Captain, Kenosha Police Department
John Meland	Executive Director, Kenosha County Housing Authority; Chief Economic Development Planner, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
George E. Melcher	Director, Kenosha County Department of Planning and Development
Mark Melotik	Kenosha County Health Department
Edwin Morris	WE Energies
Aaron Owens	Research Analyst, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Peter Parker	Chief, Town of Bristol Fire Department
Mike Slover	Chief, Town of Salem Fire/Rescue
Linda Valentine	Chairperson, Town of Salem

Mr. Schliesman welcomed all those in attendance and thanked them for their interest and participation in this important program. Mr. Schliesman noted that attendance would be taken via a sign in sheet. He then asked each of those in attendance to introduce themselves and state the organization which they are representing. He also asked those in attendance to note that item number six on the agenda would be moved ahead of item number five.

REVIEW OF SUMMARY NOTES OF THE FEBRUARY 24, 2010 TASK FORCE MEETING

Mr. Schliesman introduced Joseph Boxhorn of the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) staff. At Mr. Schliesman's request, Mr. Boxhorn reviewed the summary notes of the February 24, 2010 Task Force meeting. Mr. Boxhorn reminded representatives of the municipalities in attendance that updates on the status of their Emergency Operation Plans are needed. He requested that any information regarding the adoption of plans, the date of adoption and any revisions be emailed to him. Any updates will then be added to Table II-13 of the Kenosha County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update report. He also pointed out that pages 7 and 8

of the summary notes describe revision that were made to Chapters I, II, and III in order to be consistent with revisions that the Wisconsin Division of Emergency Management (WEM) requested be made to the Racine County hazard mitigation plan update, which SEWRPC prepared prior to the Kenosha County plan update.

Mr. Boxhorn also noted that the summary notes included responses to written comments submitted by Timothy Popanda, Village of Paddock Lake Building and Zoning Administrator, in a March 1, 2010 letter to Michael Hahn of the SEWRPC staff.

No additions or corrections to the summary notes were offered. Ms. Valentine moved to approve the summary notes. Mr. Guilbert seconded the motion and the summary notes were approved.

At the request of Mr. Schliesman, Mr. Hahn discussed where the planning process is and what the next steps of the process will be. Mr. Hahn explained that July 31, 2010 is the deadline to send the plan to WEM. Any changes and revisions requested by WEM will be made by SEWRPC staff. The revised draft plan will then be made available on the SEWRPC website and Task Force comments will be solicited. Following this, a Public Hearing will be scheduled and notices sent out. Mr. Hahn noted that after a public hearing takes place, the plan will be revised to incorporate pertinent comments, Task Force comments will again be solicited, the plan will be submitted to WEM, and WEM will send the plan to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for review and approval. Mr. Schliesman added that each municipality will be asked to adopt the plan, and noted that adoption is required to be eligible for aid.

**REVIEW OF THE REMAINDER OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHAPTER III,
“ANALYSIS OF HAZARD CONDITIONS”, OF SEWRPC COMMUNITY
ASSISTANCE PLANNING REPORT NO. 278 (CAPR NO. 278), 2ND EDITION,
*KENOSHA COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE: 2011-2015***

At Mr. Schliesman’s request, Mr. Boxhorn reviewed pages 16-28 of the preliminary draft of Chapter III, “Analysis of Hazard Conditions.” He noted that the rest of Chapter III had been reviewed at the February 24, 2010 Task Force meeting.

Mr. Boxhorn explained that the terminology for describing the 100-year floodplain had been changed throughout the plan from “100-year recurrence interval” flood hazard area to “one-percent-annual-probability” flood hazard area. Mr. Boxhorn noted that this more accurately reflects what is being described.

Mr. Boxhorn noted that although some critical community facilities appear to be within the one-percent-annual-probability flood hazard area at the scale shown on Map III-4, closer examination showed that none are actually in the floodplain.

Ms. Valentine commented that the Town of Salem contains three lake management districts, and that each lake has unique scenarios related to flooding. She suggested that lake districts be discussed in the plan update. Mr. Hahn noted that lake management plans do not generally deal specifically with stormwater drainage issues but are more focused on water quality. Mr. Hahn suggested adding a table listing lake management districts in the County.

[Secretary’s Note: A table listing the lake management districts was added to Chapter II. That table is attached herein as Exhibit A. The following sentences were added to the end of the first partial paragraph on page 6 of Chapter II:

“There are eight lake management districts in the County which have responsibilities related to the protection, rehabilitation, and management of 11 lakes. These special-purpose units of government are listed in Table II-6a.”]

There were no further comments or suggestions on Chapter III. Mr. Boxhorn noted that the comments page is still accessible on the SEWRPC website and any comments or suggestions can be submitted through the website or sent directly to him by e-mail.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHAPTER V, “HAZARD MITIGATION STRATEGIES”, OF SEWRPC COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PLANNING REPORT NO. 278 (CAPR NO. 278), 2ND EDITION, *KENOSHA COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE: 2011-2015*

At Mr. Schliesman’s request, Mr. Boxhorn reviewed Chapter V, “Hazard Mitigation Strategies.”

In reference to the subsection on stormwater drainage, Ms. Valentine expressed concerns regarding high water levels in lakes in the Town of Salem. She noted that Camp Lake was under a slow-no-wake rule through June 17th. She suggested that the cause of high lake levels could be due to obstructions to flow through wetlands south of CTH C. She also noted that there are no provisions in the plan for wetland maintenance. In response to a question from Mr. Hahn, she noted there is no structure flooding at this time.

Ms. Valentine also expressed concern regarding dam maintenance. She noted that the Town of Salem received letters from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) regarding two dams in the Town. She indicated that, in some cases, it is difficult to determine and locate dam owners. Ms. Valentine also noted that Center Lake Dam, Rock Lake Dam, and Cross Lake Dam may be candidates for removal. Mr. Hahn asked if it would be possible for Ms. Valentine to forward any correspondence with the WDNR regarding these dams. Ms. Valentine agreed to forward correspondence. Mr. Hahn asked the Task Force whether any other municipality has had similar correspondence with WDNR regarding dams. No other Task Force member noted any such correspondence.

[Secretary’s Note: On July 8, 2010, Ms. Valentine forwarded a June 22, 2009 electronic mail message that she sent to Tanya L. Meyer, WDNR Water Management Engineer, and an e-mail response from Ms. Meyer. Those messages referred to factors affecting the hydraulic capacity of the Center Lake outlet to Camp Lake and to issues related to ownership and abandonment of the Center Lake dam. On July 9, 2010, Ms. Valentine provided the SEWRPC staff with an April 8, 2010 letter from Ms. Meyer to Ms. Valentine and Raymond Arbet, Director of the Kenosha County Division of Public Works. That letter requested their assistance in identifying the owner of the Rock Lake dam, and mentioned the possibility of the Town, the County, or another party assuming ownership. While issues related to dam ownership and abandonment of dams are important considerations in managing dams and their associated impoundments, the effects of a potential dam failure are the most pertinent for consideration under a hazard mitigation plan such as this one.

At its February 24 and June 22, 2010 meetings, the Task Force reviewed Chapter III, “Analysis of Hazard Conditions,” including the “Dam Failure Flooding” subsection (page 7) of the “Hazard Identification” section and the “Vulnerability Assessment for Flooding and Associated Stormwater Drainage Problems” section. Dam failure flooding was not considered a significant enough hazard to be addressed in depth, but the “Vulnerability” sections does include a recommendation that consideration be given to “future evaluation of floodplain areas related to dam failure.”

In response to Ms. Valentine’s comments, Table III-7a, which is attached to these summary notes as Exhibit B, was added. That table summarizes information on existing dams for which hazard potentials have been established by WDNR. The information in the table is taken directly from the WDNR dam inventory. Also, the third sentence on page 17 of Chapter III was replaced with the following sentences:

“As indicated in Table III-7a, there are 13 existing dams in Kenosha County for which hazard ratings have been assigned by the WDNR. Two of those dams have been assigned high hazard ratings, three have been assigned significant hazard ratings, and the remaining eight have been assigned low hazard ratings.¹ Because of the presence of two high hazard and three significant hazard dams in the County, future evaluation of floodplain areas related to dam failure should be considered.”]

There were no other comments or suggestions on Chapter V. Mr. Boxhorn acknowledged the large amount of material reviewed and reiterated that Task Force members may submit questions or suggestions on the chapters via the comments page on the SEWRPC website or by e-mailing him directly.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT APPENDIX N, “HAZARD RISK ANALYSIS AND PRIORITIZATION: 2010”, OF SEWRPC COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PLANNING REPORT NO. 278 (CAPR NO. 278), 2ND EDITION, *KENOSHA COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE: 2011-2015*

At Mr. Schliesman’s request, Mr. Boxhorn reviewed the preliminary draft of Appendix N, “Hazard Risk Analysis and Prioritization: 2010.

In regards to Table N-1 and Table N-2, Mr. Boxhorn noted that the numbers are based on the best available data. Mr. Boxhorn acknowledged that most of the numbers in the tables are likely to represent underestimates due to underreporting of incidents.

There were no questions or comments on Appendix N.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHAPTER VI, “PLAN ADOPTION, IMPLEMENTATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REVISION”, OF SEWRPC COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PLANNING REPORT NO. 278 (CAPR NO. 278), 2ND EDITION, *KENOSHA COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE: 2011-2015*

At Mr. Schliesman’s request, Mr. Boxhorn reviewed the preliminary draft Chapter VI, “Plan Adoption Implementation, Maintenance, and Revision.”

Mr. Hahn suggested that the updating process for the Kenosha County Hazard Mitigation Plan begin at least two years prior to the plan’s expiration date. Regarding the expiration of the updated plan, Mr. Guilbert asked whether the plan would be valid through 2015. Mr. Hahn indicated that would be the case.

TIME AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Mr. Schliesman stated that SEWRPC staff would incorporate comments from this meeting and revise the draft plan. He presented two options to the task force moving forward. One option was to hold a final meeting on

¹Chapter NR 333, “Dam Design and Construction,” of the Wisconsin Administrative Code states that 1) a high hazard “rating must be assigned if loss of human life during failure or mis-operation of the dam is probable,” 2) a significant hazard rating would be assigned if “failure or mis-operation of the dam would result in no probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, or disruption of lifeline facilities,” and 3) a low hazard rating would be assigned if “failure or mis-operation of the dam would result in no probable loss of life, low economic losses (losses are principally limited to the owner’s property), low environmental damages, (and) no significant disruption of lifeline facilities.”

Friday July 16, 2010 to review any revisions to chapters reviewed in this meeting. The other option presented by Mr. Schliesman was to post revisions on the SEWRPC website, and allow a period of time for the Task Force to submit comments online or by e-mail. After discussion, it was agreed that the Task Force would review the chapters online.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at 2:30 p.m.

COMMENTS FROM LINDA VALENTINE, SALEM TOWN CHAIR, FOLLOWING THE MEETING

Following the meeting, Ms. Valentine spoke with Mr. Boxhorn regarding issues in the Town related to dams and stormwater management. On July 8, 2010 she followed up with e-mail messages elaborating on those issues. Ms. Valentine's comments relate to localized stormwater drainage issues, the stormwater drainage effects of new development on narrow lake-frontage lots, stormwater management planning for existing development, and shoreland/wetland zoning issues.

The subsection on "Multi-Jurisdictional Flooding and Stormwater Management Risk Assessment," on page 28 of Chapter III of SEWRPC CAPR No. 278, 2nd Edition, alludes to stormwater problems that require special consideration, with the special considerations being listed in Table III-11.

[Secretary's Note: Ms. Valentine's comments regarding localized stormwater drainage issues, the stormwater drainage effects of new development on narrow lake-frontage lots, and stormwater management planning for existing development have been addressed by revising the portion of Table III-11 that relates to the Town of Salem (see Exhibit C).]

The "Stormwater Management Element" subsection (pages 16 through 18) of the "Hazard Mitigation Plan Component for Flooding and Related Stormwater Drainage Problems" section in Chapter V cites a recommendation from the 2003 SEWRPC Des Plaines River watershed study which calls for preparation of stormwater management plans for several subwatersheds, including the Salem Branch of Brighton Creek subwatershed in the Villages of Bristol and Paddock Lake and the Town of Salem. That recommendation addresses the identified need for stormwater management planning in a portion of the Town of Salem.

[Secretary's Note: In addition, the Town of Salem recently adopted a stormwater management plan which should provide the framework for addressing issues of the type raised by Ms. Valentine. The following paragraph was inserted after the third paragraph on page 17 of Chapter V:

"The Town of Salem adopted a Storm Water Management Plan in June 2010. The plan includes recommendations related to flooding and drainage, water quality, public information, implementation, and financing. The plan includes projects to address seven priority flooding and drainage problems at a total estimated construction cost of \$3.1 million dollars. The plan also proposes to utilize more stringent post-development runoff release rates for all new development in the Fox River Watershed. The recommended release rates of 0.04 cfs/acre for the 50-percent-annual-probability (2-year recurrence interval) event and 0.30 cfs/acre for the one-percent-annual-probability (100-year recurrence interval) event match the rates currently applied in the Des Plaines River watershed portion of the Town. The Town of Salem created a storm water utility in 2008, and the utility will be the primary funding source for the implementation of this plan, including construction of recommended projects, facility maintenance, and water quality programs. The total plan cost is estimated at \$6.2 million dollars for 2010-2020."]

As noted on page 18 of Chapter V, both Kenosha County and the Town of Salem have adopted stormwater management ordinances.

[Secretary's Note: The following sentence was inserted at the end of the "Stormwater-Related Regulations" subsection on page 18 of Chapter V:

"The County ordinance applies to all unincorporated areas. In those Towns that also have a stormwater management ordinance, it is recommended that the County and the Towns work to ensure that the objectives of each ordinance are met in a coordinated manner."]

The shoreland/wetland zoning issues identified by Ms. Valentine, while important considerations, are not directly related to the hazard mitigation plan update, and, therefore, they will not be specifically addressed in the plan.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael G. Hahn
Secretary

* * *

#152188 V1 - CAPR-278-2ED SUMMARY NOTES 06/22/10
330-3022
MGH/JEB/AWO/pk
07/20/10

Exhibit A

Table II-6a

LAKE MANAGEMENT DISTRICTS IN KENOSHA COUNTY: 2010

Name	Lakes	Municipalities
Benedict-Tombeau Lakes Management District	Benedict Lake Tombeau Lake	Town of Randall, Town of Bloomfield ^a
Camp/Center Lake Rehabilitation District	Camp Lake Center Lake	Town of Salem
George Lake Preservation and Rehabilitation District	George Lake	Village of Bristol
Hooker Lake Management District	Hooker Lake	Village of Paddock Lake Town of Salem
Lilly Lake Preservation and Rehabilitation District	Lilly Lake	Town of Wheatland
Paddock Lake Preservation and Rehabilitation District	Paddock Lake	Village of Paddock Lake
Twin Lakes Preservation and Rehabilitation District	Elizabeth Lake Mary Lake	Village of Twin Lakes
Voltz Lake Management District	Voltz Lake	Town of Salem

^aLocated in Walworth County.

Source: University of Wisconsin-Extension, and SEWRPC.

Exhibit B

Table III-7a

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES DAM INVENTORY INFORMATION: 2010

Number on Map II-6	WDNR Dam Sequence Number	Dam Name		Owner	Township	WDNR Field File Number	Size	Hydraulic Height (feet)	Structural Height (feet)	Impoundment Surface Area (acres)	Maximum Impoundment Storage (acre-feet)	Hazard Potential
		Official	Local									
1	147	Lake Shangri La	--	Town of Bristol	Bristol	30.08	Large	12.0	16.0	172.0	1,200.0	High
2	264	Rock Lake	--	--	Salem	30.10	Large	4.0	8.0	44.0	350.0	Low
3	1034	Bong Recreation Area 8	Wolf Lake Dam	WDNR - Richard Bong Team	Brighton	30.15	Large	8.0	10.0	158.0	900.0	Low
6	1269	Hooker Lake	Carl Bryzek	Carl Bryzek Farm, LLC	Salem	30.02	Small	1.0	3.0	87.0	180.0	Low
7	1270	Camp Lake	Camp Lake	Kenosha County DPW	Salem	30.03	Large	0.3	7.2	461.0	1,500.0	Low
8	1271	Paddock Lake 3	--	Vince Paddock	Salem	30.04	Small	2.0	3.0	130.0	300.0	Low
9	1272	Silver Lake	Jack Erb	Brian Sullivan	Salem	30.05	Small	1.0	2.0	464.0	920.0	Low
10	1273	Cross Lake	B.J. Corbin	Harbhajan Singh Samra	Salem	30.07	Small	3.0	4.0	87.0	270.0	Significant
11	1274	Lake George	John Haterlein	George Wronowski	Bristol	30.09	Small	4.0	6.0	59.0	290.0	Low
12	1275	Voltz Lake	--	Unknown	Salem	30.11	Small	3.0	5.0	52.0	200.0	Significant
13	1276	Center Lake 2	Center Lake Conservation & Sport Club	Center Lake Cons-Sports	Salem	30.12	Small	1.0	3.0	129.0	390.0	Low
14	1277	Dyer Lake	--	Kenosha Boy Scouts of America	Wheatland	30.13	Small	3.0	6.0	52.0	200.0	Significant

Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and SEWRPC.

Exhibit C

Table III-11

COMMUNITIES IN KENOSHA COUNTY WITH SPECIAL FLOOD AND RELATED STORMWATER DRAINAGE CONSIDERATIONS

Community	Reason for Special Consideration
City of Kenosha	15 structures estimated to be in flood hazard area
Village of Bristol	Nine structures estimated to be in flood hazard area
Village of Paddock Lake	27 structures estimated to be in flood hazard area
Village of Pleasant Prairie	30 structures estimated to be in flood hazard area
Village of Silver Lake	47 structures estimated to be in flood hazard area
Village of Twin Lakes	Two structures estimated to be in flood hazard area
Town of Bristol ^a	Three structures estimated to be in flood hazard area. Substantial agricultural flood damages
Town of Paris	Substantial agricultural flood damages
Town of Randall	Six structures estimated to be in flood hazard area
Town of Salem	136 structures estimated to be in flood hazard area, localized stormwater drainage problems related to new development on narrow lake-frontage lots, and need for stormwater management planning to address existing and planned development
Town of Somers	38 structures estimated to be in flood hazard area
Town of Wheatland	46 structures estimated to be in flood hazard area

NOTE: See Maps III-2 and III-3.

^aOn July 4, 2010, the Village of Bristol annexed the Town of Bristol.

Source: SEWRPC.