Questions & Responses April 25, 2017 Public Presentation

Questions and comments were gathered on index cards collected at the Public Presentation by the Maumee Watershed Conservancy District and Stantec on Tuesday, April 25, 2017 at Riverdale High School. Several of the questions and comments presented below were similar in nature and content. The following is a summary of the comments and questions that were asked at the meeting. Similar comments and questions have been grouped and summarized for ease of reference. Questions resulting in identical responses have likewise been consolidated.

The content of the information below is not verbatim text from the index cards collected, as some were illegible. Other comments were not included as they were not in good taste and unsuitable to share publicly.

(Note that the Maumee Watershed Conservancy District Board and Conservancy Court did not take any formal action regarding the concepts presented at the Public Presentation on April 25th at its Annual Meeting on May 5, 2017)

Geotechnical Information

- All old oil and water wells have to be plugged Oil wells will be 20,000 to 100,000. How much cost?
 - These items were considered during the preliminary opinion of probable cost review. The costs associated with addressing the abandoned oil wells in the area will be further refined during detailed design, if authorized to proceed.
- If the diversion was going through bedrock why can't we deepen the Blanchard bedrock in addition to bench, widening, bridges, retentions, etc.?
 - The alternative alignment of the Diversion Channel includes a change in the profile to reduce the volume of rock excavation that may be required. There is not enough slope to the river channel through Findlay to allow sufficient depth to carry the design flood flow. Also, rock excavation is very costly.
- Corps diversion route followed glacial groove to minimize bedrock removal/cost will your changes to straighten really save?
 - The USACE alignment for the Diversion Channel generally followed property lines, versus specific geological features. The alternative alignment of the Diversion Channel includes a change in the profile to reduce the volume of rock excavation that may be required and straightens many of the curves to shorten the overall length of the construction and reduce costs.

Facility Description & Maintenance

- What happens when the culverts are blocked? Where does the water go?
 - An auxiliary spillway is provided should the normal outlet structure become blocked. The water passing over the spillway would continue down the receiving stream similar to the flows through the normal outlet structure.
 - If authorized for construction, regular operation and maintenance efforts will be conducted by staff of the Maumee Watershed Conservancy District (MWCD).
- How are you going to keep the culvert open during flood with tree and other stuff flowing?
 - The proposed facilities would be regularly inspected and maintained by the MWCD staff. An auxiliary spillway is provided should the normal outlet structure become blocked.

- Culverts clogging = flood levels at 855 ft (spillway height). Curious to know how you're going to clear them during a flood event. If this doesn't concern you, you need to take a tour of the "wasteland" behind the dams.
 - The proposed facilities would be regularly inspected and maintained by the MWCD staff. An auxiliary spillway is provided should the normal outlet structure become blocked.
 - Operation and maintenance plans, including frequent inspections and removal of log-jams and other potential areas of accumulated debris, will be undertaken as part of the maintenance of the proposed facilities.
- Stantec refers to dams as high hazard dams in meetings. What are possible modes of failure that classifies them as high hazard: probable loss of human life.
- At the January meeting, you used the term "high hazard dams". Why isn't that term being used tonight?
 - The classification as a "High Hazard Dam" is a term defined by state and federal regulations and is a function of the overall height of the facility and total potential volume stored, when the impoundment is full. Such a classification provides requirements and intensive standards for design and construction, as well as regular inspection and maintenance of the facility to ensure the safe operation of the facility.
 - Note that this facility, would be normally dry and would not retain a wet pool behind it, except during wet weather events.
 - Reference to the proposed dams as "High Hazard Dams" did occur within discussions at this meeting.
- If outlet tile drains ground beyond basin (main tile line), what keeps pressure from holding pond keeping it from draining?
- You have taken no consideration on any tile drains, only surface flows. How do you deal with the tile drainage?
 - Known field tiles that may be beneath or upstream of the proposed dams will be identified to the extent possible and addressed during the detailed design phase, if authorized to proceed.
 - The runoff collected within the drainage tile upstream of the proposed dams would be retained upstream of the proposed flow control outlet for each dry storage facility.
- A lot of area being flooded involved wooded areas. What about all the debris that will be at them?
 - Operation and maintenance plans, including frequent inspections and removal of log-jams and other potential areas of accumulated debris, will be undertaken as part of the maintenance of the proposed facilities by the MWCD if the recommended program is implemented.
- When will the dams open?
 - The recommended facilities are not currently included within the Official Plan for the MWCD and will require authorization by local governments and the Conservancy Board and Court, therefore no schedule for the implementation of the recommended plan has currently been developed.
- What will happen to the farmland in the dry basin?
 - The use of the lands within the anticipated footprint of the dry storage basins is to be determined with extensive input from the project stakeholders. Options may include continued agricultural use.

Hydraulics & Hydrology

- Have you considered cleaning and widening the Blanchard River as was previously suggested? Please explain in detail.
 - Analyses were performed for several options involving the hydraulic capacity of the Blanchard River. The recommended program incorporates some of these improvements in the form of floodplain bench widening, inline structure removals and modifications to bridges identified as flow constriction points. The recommended program includes cost-effective and environmentally "permittable" measures that would provide meaningful benefit in flood-risk reduction.
 - Widening and cleaning of the river can provide some nominal improvement for smaller flooding events that remain within the top of bank. Larger, overbank events that exceed the capacity of the stream are not generally caused by smaller obstructions within the streambed.
- Why is the dam at Riverside so important? Why not remove all aesthetic dams in Findlay?
 - The dam at Riverside Park is upstream of the confluence of Lye Creek and the Blanchard River.
 Because of this location, removal of this dam does not appreciably improve the hydraulic capacity within the channel. The water stored above the dam at Riverside Park is also utilized for recreational purposes.
- Why will flood walls in Findlay not work?
 - The construction of floodwalls of sufficient height and capacity to contain the flows during a 1% annual chance event (ACE) (100-year event) would result in increase in the water surface elevation (WSE) that would increase induced flooding elsewhere within and upstream of the City of Findlay.
- 2" rain will flood Potato Creek and you say it will clean out in 3 or 4 days.
- Review again the time needed to empty the storage areas after an OPF (official plan flood).
 - The basins will drain quicker further upstream, away from the embankment and store water for longer durations closer to each embankment. Based upon preliminary modeling, the following approximate durations of storage for the 1% ACE (100-year) event were observed:
 - Eagle Creek (3-5 days), Blanchard River (1-2 days) & Potato Run (4-5 days).
 - The duration of storage will be less for storms less than the 1% ACE (100-year) flood event. Additional efforts to reduce the extent and duration of inundation resulting from the proposed solutions, including potential adjustments to allow for a more rapid drawdown of the stored floodwaters, will be considered during the advancement of preliminary design concepts, if authorized.
- How far upstream would an OPF (official plan flood) inundate the floodway from the Blanchard River dry dam? Same question as above for the Potato Run dry dam?
 - We have developed graphics to show the anticipated inundation upstream of each recommended storage facility. The extents of the estimated induced flooding upstream of the dams can be seen on Slides 32 and 33 of the Public Presentation from April 25th.
 - A PDF image of the slides from the meeting on April 25th can be seen on the Program Webpage at <u>www.HancockCountyFlooding.com</u>.

- Don't the dams depend on rainfall coming from the south as well?
 - The recommended storage areas would detain the runoff generated by storm events that occur within the southerly portions of the watershed and provide time for runoff collected farther to the north to be transported by the stream.
- Why not develop a water pipeline to move the water?
 - The estimated flow rate generated during a 1% ACE (100-year) event would be over 14,000 cubic feet per second (CFS). A goal of this Program is to reduce the flow rate at critical points on the river to about 9,000 CFS. A conduit sized to carry 5,000 CFS at 10 feet per second (FPS) would be at least 25 feet in diameter and would not be physically or economically feasible.
 - A 200-foot wide and 15-foot deep open channel, such as the diversion channel alternative recommended by USACE can convey this flow more readily, but would remain significantly more costly than the recommended storage basins.
- Once water level is raised at Mt. Blanchard, what is stopping it from seeking lower ground south of TR 150 and to US RT 30?
 - Further refinement of the available water surface modeling and topography of the area will be required if the program is authorized to move forward. Adjustments can be implemented to the storage spillway to lower the overall height of the water retained, if authorized.
- Why not divert water into Lake Cascades?
 - The available volume within Lake Cascades is not sufficient to store the flooding from the watershed.
- What was the high water elevation in Mt. Blanchard during the 07 flood?
 - River gage data at Mt. Blanchard was not available during the 2007 event. Based upon anecdotal information provided, available surface elevations and modeling of the system, the water surface may have reached an elevation of approximately 830 feet at the southerly end of the Village.
- Would a 100,000 CF storage basin immediately east of Findlay have any significant benefit?
 - No. The volumes required for storage of the 1% ACE (100-year) event on the Blanchard River far exceed 100,000 cubic feet. Based upon estimates of required flow rate reductions, 100,000 CF impoundment would fill in under one (1) minute under 1% ACE (100-year) event.
 - As a point of comparison, the estimated total flood storage in the three (3) recommended detention basins, if constructed, would be:
 - Eagle Creek Basin 326,700,000 cubic feet (7,500 ac-ft)
 - Blanchard River Basin 239,600,000 cubic feet (5,500 ac-ft)
 - Potato Run Basin 130,700,000 cubic feet (3,000 ac-ft)
- What will happen to the Blanchard and Potato Run south of where is shown?
 - The existing channels beyond the limits of the recommended dams would remain in their current natural state.
- The elevation of the football field is 854'; how won't that be effected if your project model shows 855'?
 - The areas of induced flooding shown were developed based upon aerial imagery available publicly, but are limited to 2-foot contours. The elevation of the football field at Riverdale High School is identified as a point of concern that will be avoided as a design refinement, if the program is authorized to progress forward.

- Please note that the crest elevation of the auxiliary spillway for the recommended facility was modeled at elevation 854.0 for detaining the 1% ACE (100-year) flood event. The design of the facility would require that the spillway have hydraulic capacity to convey the probable maximum flood (PMF) that would far exceed the 1% ACE (100-year) event and would result in a water surface elevation of 855.0.
- How accurate are the proposed "induced" maps?
 - The areas of induced flood shown are conceptual and were developed based upon aerial imagery available publicly, but are limited to 2-foot contours. Additional refinement of induced flooding areas would be required if the recommended plan were to be authorized to proceed beyond the conceptual design phase.
- Are the dry storage basins going to do anything if the 10 14in rain fall is east and north of all dams?
- What if rain hits north of the dam?
 - Rain north and east of the dams would not create storage within the recommended facilities.
 The storage facilities would not be utilized if the entire rain event occurred entirely north of the recommended facilities. The proposed hydraulic improvements on the Blanchard River would yield benefit to flood risk reduction.
 - The purpose of the technically feasible program of improvements is not to eliminate flooding, but to reduce the risk of potential impacts related to flooding. All parties associated with the recommended Flood Risk Reduction Program acknowledge that the suite of improvements will not prevent flooding resulting from all possible rainfall events within the watershed, but will reduce the water surface elevation (WSE) under most events and reduce the risks for flood-related damages that may occur.
- What geo cell produced the water shed products?
 - The boundaries of the watershed are based upon publicly available digital elevation models (DEMs) and data provided by USACE from prior modeling efforts. This data is acceptable for developing the conceptual planning.
 - Additional light digitizing and ranging, or LiDAR, data generated from aerial photography of the watershed is being developed for continued refinement of the modeling and will be utilized if the recommended plan is authorized to proceed beyond the conceptual design phase.
- What study has been done for the spillway at Eagle Creek?
 - All efforts regarding design of the storage facilities are conceptual in nature and will require further refinement if the recommended plan is authorized to proceed beyond the conceptual design phase.
 - For the conceptual design, the spillway was preliminarily sized to be able to pass 100% of the assumed Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) event, as outlined in the Ohio Department of Natural Resources Guidelines.
- Your flood scale scare tactic of more floods recently that are worse does <u>not</u> mention increase of impermeable surfaces post WWII – why is that <u>our</u> issue?
 - There are several factors that may be contributing to the increased frequency of flood events including runoff from impermeable surfaces (rooftops, parking lots, streets, etc.), modified agricultural practices, climate change and encroachment of development and/or new structures along the rivers.

- Why plan for a 500 year flood now if only 2 (1913 and 2007) 100 year floods have happened?
- The 100 yr & 500 yr terms seem to be used as convenient. Is intended design to protect against greater than 100 yr event?
 - The terms "500-year flood" and "100-year flood" are misnomers and can be confusing. The correct terminology is "1% annual chance exceedance event," or 1% ACE event, for the 100-year event. This refers to the statistical probability of an event happening in a single year. A 1% ACE event has a 1-in-100 chance of occurring in any year and could theoretically occur multiple times in a single year. Likewise, a "500-year flood" is a 0.2% ACE event and has a 1-in-500 chance of occurring in any year and could theoretically occur multiple times in a single year.
 - The purpose of the technically feasible program of improvements is not to eliminate flooding, but to reduce the risk of potential impacts related to flooding. All parties associated with the recommended Flood Risk Reduction Program acknowledge that the suite of improvements will not prevent flooding resulting from all possible rainfall events within the watershed, but will reduce the water surface elevation (WSE) under most events and reduce the risks for flood-related damages that may occur.
 - While the recommended facilities would provide some benefit during a 0.2% ACE (500-year) event, the storage basins were preliminarily sized for the 1% ACE (100-year) event.
- Fast run offs 4 lane highway, St Rt 30 11.5 miles; St Rt 15 Over 16 miles. Focus on north of 15 would relieve Eagle Creek, Lye and Blanchard River. What's the water going to do with the new addition on I-75? Co. Rd. 140 bridge is a bottleneck. Fix the west side of Findlay.
 - State Route 30 is located in the most upstream reaches of the Blanchard River watershed and would have minimal impact on flooding across Hancock County.
 - Runoff generated from SR15 is not appreciable in comparison to the area of the entire watershed.
 - Analyses were performed for several options involving the hydraulics of the Blanchard River, including analyses related to the bridges and embankments at CR140 and CR139. While removing the embankment of these bridges would reduce the water surface elevation for several hundred feet immediately upstream of each, the benefit is reduced to less than 0.1 feet where major flooding along the Blanchard River occurs.
 - The recommended program incorporates improvements in the form of floodplain bench widening, inline structure removals and modifications to a bridge identified as a flow constriction within the City of Findlay. The recommended program includes cost-effective and environmentally "permittable" measures that would provide meaningful benefit in flood-risk reduction.
- The recent increase in the severe flooding frequency certainly seems to coincide with the completion of the new 4-lan US 30. I believe you need to do a complete reset of historic modeling from that point forward to ensure that any project is extensive enough.
 - State Route 30 is located in the most upstream reaches of the Blanchard River watershed and would have minimal impact on flooding across Hancock County.
 - The drainage included within the ODOT design for the recent realignment of US-30 was reviewed in detail prior to construction. The facilities completed as part of that work did not introduce significant additional uncontrolled runoff to the watershed.

Floodplain Management

- What limits need to be placed on Findlay's expansion of buildings, parking lots, storm drainage, etc. going forward?
 - Both Findlay and Hancock County regulations require any new developments or re-developed properties
 to limit the stormwater flow from their site to no more than the capacity of the receiving pipe or
 stream. These situations are also required to provide stormwater detention for the volume of flow from
 their site that could be expected from a 1% ACE (100-year) event.

- What is the plan to handle the road you flood and cause land property when plan is installed?
 - Preliminary modeling for development of the recommended alternative indicates that some roads may be closed due to induced flooding. Additional efforts to reduce the extent and duration of potential inundation resulting from the proposed solutions will be considered during the advancement of preliminary design concepts, if authorized.
- Why do the gluttons in Findlay continue to build in the floodplain knowing what the consequences will be for others?
 - Both Findlay and Hancock County have identical flood plain regulations. Findlay adopted these regulations in 1978, Hancock County adopted them in 1992. The purpose of the regulations are to maintain flood plain capacity and minimize flood damage to commercial and residential structures.
 - There are two components to a flood plain, the floodway and flood fringe. The floodway
 is the area immediately adjacent to a river or creek where the largest volume of water
 and highest velocity occurs during flooding. No structures are permitted to be
 constructed in the floodway.
 - The flood fringe is the area within the flood plain that is not within the floodway. The regulations permit construction of new structures within the flood fringe as long as the structure does not reduce flood plain capacity and the 1st floor of the structure is placed at or above the elevation of the water surface during a 1% ACE (100 year) event, also called the Base Flood Elevation (BFE). Fill material is not permitted to be brought onto a site from outside the flood plain. However, the soil on a site in the flood fringe can be regraded to provide a building pad that is above the BFE.

Additional Outreach & Engagement

- At what point in time will proposed project funding plans be made public knowledge? How is this project going to be paid for? Where will the money come from? Who is going to pay for this? Who will be paying for the project? Will it go on all property taxes including home owners in the City of Findlay?
 - A portion of the project may be paid for by the existing flood mitigation funds, generated by the 2009 local sales tax. Several alternative options for funding exist for the recommended program; however, the overall funding strategy cannot be developed until several administrative steps, as outlined within Section 6101 of the Ohio Revised Code related to Conservancy Districts, have been completed. Additional information related to project funding will be provided in the future.

Community Benefit

- MB has minimal flooding NOW. Why do you want to flood us NOW. Clean the river in Findlay. Don't make Findlay's problem our problem.
- How do you feel the project will benefit Arlington, Mt. Blanchard, Wharton Village and rural communities along with Arlington & Riverdale schools?
- What benefit does this have to our community (i.e. Southern Hancock County)?
- You keep saying "best for the community". Why not say what you mean and say "best for Findlay".
- 30 yr flood maps expanded. More people are covered. Flood happens and flood insurance covers losses. People with issue are covered.
- Still flooding and not fixing problem. Protecting Findlay but hurting Mt. Blanchard.
- The only community that benefits from this is Findlay!
 - Several major arterial roadways throughout the County are impacted by significant flooding events, including limiting access for emergency services related to safety-services/mutual aid and Blanchard Valley Hospital. Additional inconvenience can occur by limiting resources for daily and weekly needs such as access to places of employment and shopping throughout the area.

- Long-term adverse impacts caused by flooding may create an environment that is not conducive for job and business retention or creation within Hancock County. The effect of losing employment and/or businesses within the County would impact everyone within Hancock County, including all levels of government, schools, townships and villages, all of whom rely on the income and property tax base for operating and capital improvement funding.
- What does this plan do to Ottawa?
 - Dry storage basins would reduce the peak flow rates downstream into Putnam County along the Blanchard River for events that occur in the upstream portions of the watershed within Hancock, Hardin and Wyandot Counties. The floodplain areas west of the City of Findlay would likely remain the same and could potentially be reduced during certain events.
- What is going to happen in Hardin County if this goes through?
 - o The recommended program would not directly impact Hardin County.

Real Estate Impacts

- Your estimated value of lost use of farmland is based upon what values?
 - For purposes of conceptual estimating, property values were determined by review of the public information available through the Hancock County Auditor's Office, as well as information from local real estate transactions. The conceptual estimate assumes that agricultural and/or residential property, if acquired, would be purchased at or above current market value.
 - Opportunities and protections will be afforded for impacted property owners, as outlined within Section 6101 of the Ohio Revised Code related to Conservancy Districts. Purchase of lands required to implement the final recommended program will be negotiated with individual property owners as further development of the detailed designs progress. There are several options under consideration, including continued agricultural use. Decisions related to property purchase negotiations would be made following detailed design.
- I live in the proposed Eagle Creek dry basin. I view the proposal as a black mark to my property even if not approved by the Conservancy District. How am I to move forward with property improvements or even sell at market value ever in the event it does not happen? Timing?
 - Opportunities and protections will be afforded for impacted property owners, as outlined within Section 6101 of the Ohio Revised Code related to Conservancy Districts. Purchase of lands required to implement the final recommended program will be negotiated with individual property owners as further development of the detailed designs progress. Decisions related to property purchase negotiations would be made following detailed design.
 - Timing of the recommended program is to be determined. Continued refinement of the conceptual design of the full flood-risk reduction program cannot advance until after there is concurrence by the MWCD Board of Directors and Conservancy Court judges.
- Is it the understanding that the entity behind this project figures on paying an easement to property owners because that is not going to work for us. Our property of 40 ac. Is under water except the house of 1.5 ac. And our barn is flooded.
 - Opportunities and protections will be afforded for impacted property owners, as outlined within Section 6101 of the Ohio Revised Code related to Conservancy Districts. Purchase of lands required to implement the final recommended program will be negotiated with individual property owners as further development of the detailed designs progress. Decisions related to property purchase negotiations would be made following detailed design.

- Will any homes be flooded on Twp Rd 187 or CR 17?
 - Based upon preliminary modeling for development of the recommended conceptual alternative, four (4) or five (5) homes along TR 187 will be subject to induced flooding and, for the purposes of conceptual planning and estimating, are anticipated to be purchased. However, additional efforts to reduce the extent and duration of potential inundation resulting from the proposed solutions will be considered during the advancement of preliminary design concepts, if authorized.
 - o Homes along CR17 are not included within the areas of anticipated induced flooding.
- Where are the 5 homes from the Blanchard River Dam at 187?
 - The homes along TR187 that are estimated to be subject to induced flooding are not shown on the graphics. These homes were assumed to be purchased as part of the recommended program of improvements.
- What are plans for homes between the 100 yr -ACE and maximum probable flood level? I don't count 14 homes in the Eagle basin proposed area.
- Will the county be providing free flood insurance for homes impacted by the dry basins?
 - Opportunities and protections will be afforded for impacted property owners, as outlined within Section 6101 of the Ohio Revised Code related to Conservancy Districts. Purchase of lands required to implement the final recommended program will be negotiated with individual property owners as further development of the detailed designs progress. Decisions related to property purchase negotiations would be made following detailed design.
 - Following each stage of implementation, a conditional letter of map revision (CLOMR) will be filed with FEMA to indicated changes within the 1% ACE floodplain. A final letter of map revision (LOMR) will be filed following completion of all stages of the program.

Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)

- Timeframe used for cost benefit. Does cost include long-term property value next to flood retention area?
 - The time period for the BCR analysis was 50 years.
 - Costs for purchase of properties directly impacted by the recommended plan were included within the conceptual estimate for the program. Parcels not directly impacted by the recommended improvement were assumed to retain existing property values.
- The dam plan is based on the 2007 flood event, a 500 year event with a 0.2% occurrence. With 13 miles between Findlay and Mt. Blanchard, that means that the true value of the dam is effective for 0.006% event only if the heavy rain stays south of the dam. How does spending \$140 million on an event of 0.006% change seem justifiable?
 - The economic analysis completed for this effort factors the impacts that could be seen from eight (8) different potential flood events: 50% ACE (2-year), 20% ACE (5-year), 10% ACE (10-year), 4% ACE (25-year), 2% ACE (50-year), 1% ACE (100-year), 0.4% ACE (250-year) and 0.2% ACE (500-year).
 - Each of the above ACE events may occur multiple times during the life of the recommended facilities and would result in damages and costs incurred each time. The estimated cumulative cost impacts that may occur over a 50-year period are compared to the conceptual cost estimates to result in a benefit to cost ratio (BCR) greater than 1.0.
- Dry Basin BCR?
- Since these are public funds we request the number used to generate the 1.1 Benefit to Cost Ratio of just the basins. Repeat the required cost/benefit for the Conservancy.

- The cost-benefit ratio for the hydraulic improvements alone was very good ... The ratio for the complete plan was much less. What is the ratio if the hydraulic improvements are removed? Is the rest of the project worth the cost/risk?
- It seems like the same problems you identified with the Army Corps Plan you have failed to address with your basins: (1) Where is the benefit to cost ratio? Pretty low? (2) The basins won't work all the time (i.e. a rainfall north of Mt. Blanchard).
 - The proposed suite of improvements was developed to provide flood-risk reduction for as much
 of the watershed as possible and to work as a system. For events that are widely spread across
 the County, a single improvement will not significantly reduce the risk of flooding.
 - The total watershed tributary to the Blanchard River upstream of I-75 is about 355 square miles (SM). Approximately 65%, or 226 SM, are located south of SR15, with about 110 SM located south of SR103/37 at Mt. Blanchard.
 - Rainfall that occurs outside of the respective watersheds upstream of the recommended storage basins would impact less than 50% of the total watershed and has a greater opportunity of passing through the downstream improvements at a lower risk of damage to the affected parcels, including the agricultural lands upstream of Findlay.
- What amount of cost increase over the \$140 million estimate would ensure Findlay would never flood?
 - The purpose of the technically feasible program of improvements is not to eliminate flooding, but to reduce the risk of potential impacts related to flooding. All parties associated with the recommended Flood Risk Reduction Program acknowledge that the suite of improvements will not prevent flooding resulting from all possible rainfall events within the watershed, but will reduce the water surface elevation (WSE) under most events and reduce the risks for flood-related damages that may occur.

Transportation Impacts

- What about the passage of emergency response vehicles and passage of vehicles in the rural areas south of Mt. Blanchard? What happens when there is a record amount of rainfall north of the dry basins?
 - Based upon preliminary modeling for development of the recommended alternative, some roadways may be closed for larger events. Additional efforts to reduce the extent and duration of potential inundation resulting from the proposed solutions will be considered during the advancement of preliminary design concepts, if authorized.
 - A cost-benefit analysis will be completed to determine if modifications to the roadway should be undertaken to mitigate the potential for flooding of the roadways.
 - The purpose of the technically feasible program of improvements is not to eliminate flooding, but to reduce the risk of potential impacts related to flooding. All parties associated with the recommended Flood Risk Reduction Program acknowledge that the suite of improvements will not prevent flooding resulting from all possible rainfall events within the watershed, but will reduce the water surface elevation (WSE) under most events and reduce the risks for flood-related damages that may occur.
- Can fire department get through any road with our trucks or need different trucks and who pays for it?
- I work in Findlay at the hospital and live south of all of these dams/basins. I could not get to work in 2007 without the basins. How am I to get to work if there is induced additional flooding? (You say people in Findlay need to get to work!) How are our children to get to school if the campus will essentially be surrounded by water? How are emergency vehicles to get around the township you are concerned about Findlay what about us? Using your words "community benefit" what are the benefits for this area?
 - Based upon preliminary modeling for development of the recommended alternative, some roadways may be temporarily closed for larger events. Additional efforts to reduce the extent and duration of potential inundation resulting from the proposed solutions will be considered during the advancement of preliminary design concepts, if authorized.

 A cost-benefit analysis will be completed to determine if modifications to the roadway should be undertaken to mitigate the potential for flooding of the roadways.

Proof of Concept Final Report

- Why no maps available of area south of CR 150?
 - The areas of induced flood shown are conceptual and were developed based upon aerial imagery available publicly, but are limited to 2-foot contours. Additional refinement of existing and induced flooding areas would be required if the recommended plan were to be authorized to proceed beyond the conceptual design phase.
- It was indicated tonight that River benching/widening would increase flow by 200 CFS, Proof of Concept indicates 98 CFS which is correct?
 - The number stated within the presentation was a miss-stated approximation of the anticipated change in flow rates within the channel after completion of the Hydraulic Improvements in downtown Findlay and during the peak of the runoff event and should have been noted as approximately 100 CFS, not 200 CFS.
 - The Proof of Concept Report shows modeled flowrates at Main Street on the Blanchard River.
 The modeling indicates a reduction of flow (during the peak of the event) of 98 cfs due to the storage volume created by the Hydraulic Improvements.
- Will there be a peer review of the plan? When? By who?
- Who shall perform gap analysis of Stantec?
 - o Stantec's internal process require extensive internal QA/QC reviews and independent technical reviews.
 - Modeling and data files have been provided in response to a request presented. No questions or comments from the external review have been provided to-date.
- Will this stop Findlay's flooding? What about our emergency vehicles? Where is the new Findlay flood map?
 - The purpose of the technically feasible program of improvements is not to eliminate flooding, but to reduce the risk of potential impacts related to flooding. All parties associated with the recommended Flood Risk Reduction Program acknowledge that the suite of improvements will not prevent flooding resulting from all possible rainfall events within the watershed, but will reduce the water surface elevation (WSE) under most events and reduce the risks for flood-related damages that may occur.
 - The areas of reduced flood shown are conceptual and were developed based upon aerial imagery available publicly, but are limited to 2-foot contours. Additional refinement of reduced flooding areas would be required if the recommended plan were to be authorized to proceed beyond the conceptual design phase.
 - We have developed graphics to show the anticipated reductions to the 1% ACE (100-year) floodplain downstream of each recommended storage facility and within the City of Findlay. The extents of the estimated reduced flooding can be seen on Slides 47 thru 49 of the Public Presentation from April 25th.
 - A PDF image of the slides from the meeting on April 25th can be seen on the Program Webpage at www.HancockCountyFlooding.com.
- Where can the constituents of the Opinion of Probable Costs be reviewed? Please post/indicate the alternatives reviewed and the correspondence C/BA.
 - Information pertaining to the conceptual cost estimating, including the alternatives analyzed for the recommended program, are included within the Final Proof of Concept Report and available for review online at www.HancockCountyFlooding.com or a hard copy may be reviewed upon request by contacting the MWCD.

- What about the Fishers. You're making a fish trap at Mt. Blanchard. Decaying fish is a negative to the community. The EPA will not approve.
 - The recommended plan would retain open passage for fish as part of the detailed design efforts if authorized to proceed. Extensive engagement of regulatory agencies, including the Ohio EPA, ODNR, US Fish & Wildlife, among others, would occur as part of the process.

Other Questions & Comments

- There is an Indian Mound on our property that has been there for 1000's of years and should not be tampered with?
 - Cultural resource surveys, including archaeological surveys for items such as Native American artifacts, and coordination with the Ohio Historic Protection Office (OHPO) will be required if additional efforts related to the recommended improvements are authorized.
- Who is really spearheading this project? Marathon? City of Findlay? County Commissioners? All of the above. Pick one.
 - The Hancock County Commissioners and MWCD are leading the efforts for the proposed flood-risk reduction efforts.
- Is your firm with U.N. Agenda #21?
 - U.N. Agenda #21 is not part of the considerations for the selection of technically feasible alternatives for flood risk reduction within Hancock County.
- What happed at Lake St. Mary's? Isn't this a similar proposal?
- How underestimated is this? Same model as Lake St. Mary's?
 - The modeling utilized for the conceptual level planning is considered a "conservative design" and represents an SCS Type II rainfall distribution that assumes an even distribution of 5.26" of rainfall over the entire watershed during the 1% ACE (100-year) event.
 - Stantec has not been engaged in design work relative to improvements at Grand Lake St. Mary's.
 Rather, Stantec staff were retained as an expert witness on behalf of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) for an analysis of work completed by another firm at Grand Lake St. Mary's.
- Who do you sue once infrastructure goes bad (culverts, roads, wells, sewage system)?
 - This is not a question we can answer.
- Why did Findlay hire Stantec? Will Findlay still flood? Community is everyone, not just Findlay.
 - Stantec's services were retained by Hancock County and the MWCD based upon qualifications based selection process in accordance with the Ohio Revised Code (ORC).
 - The purpose of the technically feasible program of improvements is not to eliminate flooding, but to reduce the risk of potential impacts related to flooding. All parties associated with the recommended Flood Risk Reduction Program acknowledge that the suite of improvements will not prevent flooding resulting from all possible rainfall events within the watershed, but will reduce the water surface elevation (WSE) under most events and reduce the risks for flood-related damages that may occur.
- What is the involvement of Marathon Oil in the project?
 - Marathon Oil has had no direct engagement with the development of the recommended flood-risk reduction program.

- Why no open microphone this comes across as one-way exchange.
 - The card format was chosen due to the large number of questions and comments anticipated by meeting attendees. Answers to all questions received are provided on the Program Webpage at www.HancockCountyFlooding.com. Any other questions may be directed to 419.424.5050.
- This is a dumb costly plan!
 - Thank you for your input. We understand that this proposed plan poses significant decisions for Hancock County and the MWCD. We welcome further discussion with residents to answer any questions to the best of our ability at this stage of the process.
- Have any of these Stantec people ever traveled these roads other than coming here tonight?
 - o Yes.