2011 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

Public Review Draft

December 2010

TETRA TECH

Engineering & Architecture Services
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 600, Seattle, WA 98101-2357
Tel 206.883.9300 Fax 206.883.9301 www.tetratech.com

City of Roseville
2011 MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

DECEMBER 2010

Prepared for:
City of Roseville
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

Prepared by:

TETRA TECH
Engineering & Architecture Services
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 600, Seattle, WA 98101-2357
Tel 206.883.9300 Fax 206.883.9301 www.tetratech.com

Project #135-12479-09001

City of Roseville
2011 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title *Page No.*

Acknowledgments xiii
City of Roseville xiii
Consultants xiii
Statkeholders xiii
Special Acknowledgments xiii

Executive Summary ES-1
Plan Update ES-1
Plan Update Methodology ES-2
Phase 1—Organize and Review ES-2
Phases 2 —Update the Risk Assessment ES-2
Phase 3—Engage the Public ES-2
Phase 4—Assemble the Updated Plan ES-3
Mitigation Goals and Objectives ES-3
Goals ES-3
Objectives ES-4
Mitigation Initiatives ES-5
Implementation ES-11

Chapter 1. Introduction to the Planning Process 1-1
1.1 Why Prepare This Plan? 1-1
1.1.1 The Big Picture 1-1
1.1.2 Roseville's Response to the DMA 1-1
1.1.3 Purposes for Planning 1-2
1.2 Who Will Benefit From This Plan? 1-2
1.3 How to Use This Plan 1-2

Chapter 2. Plan Update—What Has Changed 2-1
2.1 The Initial Plan 2-1
2.2 Mitigation Success Stories 2-1
2.3 Why Update? 2-2
2.4 The Updated Plan—What Is Different? 2-2

Chapter 3. Plan Update Methodology 3-1
3.1 Plan Updates 3-1
3.2 Planning Resource Organization 3-1
3.2.1 Grant Funding 3-1
3.2.2 Formation of the Planning Team 3-1
3.2.3 Confirming Political Support 3-2
3.2.4 The Steering Committee 3-2
3.2.5 Coordination with Other Agencies 3-2
3.2.6 Review of Existing Programs 3-4
3.3 Risk Assessment Update 3-4
3.4 Assemble the updated Plan 3-5

3.5 Plan Development Chronology/Milestones 3-5

Chapter 4. Public Involvement 4-1
4.1 Strategy 4-1
4.1.1 Steering Committee 4-1
4.1.2 Questionnaire 4-1
4.1.3 Public Meetings 4-2
4.1.4 Use of Media 4-3
4.2 Public Involvement Results 4-5

Chapter 5. Goals and Objectives 5-1
5.1 Background 5-1
5.2 Goals 5-1
5.3 Objectives 5-2

Chapter 6. Plan Adoption 6-1
6.1 Pre-Adoption Review 6-1
6.2 Adoption 6-1

Chapter 7. Plan Maintenance Strategy 7-1
7.1 Overview 7-1
7.2 Plan Implementation 7-1
7.3 Steering Committee 7-1
7.4 Annual Progress Report 7-2
7.5 Plan Update 7-2
7.6 Continuing Public Involvement 7-3
7.7 Incorporation into Other Planning Mechanisms 7-3

Chapter 8. Risk Assessment Methodology and General Concepts 8-1
8.1 Introduction 8-1
8.2 Methodology 8-1
8.3 Identification of Hazards of Concern 8-2
8.4 Risk Assessment Tools 8-2
8.4.1 Flood, Earthquake and Dam Failure—HAZUS-MH 8-2
8.4.2 Landslide, Severe Weather, and Wildfire 8-4
8.4.3 Drought 8-4
8.4.4 Human-Caused Hazards and Human Health Hazards 8-5
8.4.5 Limitations 8-5
8.5 Climate Change 8-5
8.6 Presidentially Declared Disasters 8-6
8.7 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 8-7

Chapter 9. City of Roseville Profile 9-1
9.1 Historical Overview 9-1
9.1.1 Pre-Development 9-1
9.1.2 Founding of the Community 9-1
9.1.3 Post-Incorporation Development 9-1
9.1.4 Current Conditions 9-2
9.2 The Planning Area 9-2
9.3 Demographics 9-4
9.3.1 Why Consider Demographics in Hazard Mitigation Plans? 9-4
9.3.2 Roseville Population Characteristics 9-4
9.3.3 Income 9-6

9.3.4 Age Distribution....9-6
9.3.5 Race, Ethnicity and Language....9-7
9.3.6 Disabled Populations....9-8
9.4 Development Profile....9-9
9.4.1 Land Use....9-9
9.4.2 Residential Development....9-11
9.4.3 Non-Residential Development....9-11
9.4.4 Open Space and Habitat....9-13
9.5 Existing Laws, Ordinances and Plans....9-15
9.5.1 Federal....9-15
9.5.2 State....9-17
9.5.3 City Plans and Programs....9-21

Chapter 10. Dam Failure....10-1
10.1 General Background....10-1
10.1.1 Causes of Dam Failure....10-1
10.1.2 Regulatory Oversight....10-2
10.2 Hazard Profile....10-3
10.2.1 Past Events....10-3
10.2.2 Location....10-4
10.2.3 Frequency....10-4
10.2.4 Severity....10-5
10.2.5 Warning Time....10-5
10.3 Folsom Dam Containment Dike Risk Assessment....10-6
10.4 Secondary Hazards....10-6
10.5 Climate Change Impacts....10-6
10.6 Exposure....10-7
10.6.1 Population....10-7
10.6.2 Property....10-7
10.6.3 Critical Facilities....10-8
10.6.4 Environment....10-8
10.7 Vulnerability....10-8
10.7.1 Population....10-8
10.7.2 Property....10-8
10.7.3 Critical Facilities....10-9
10.7.4 Environment....10-9
10.8 Future Trends in Development....10-9
10.9 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs and Plans....10-9
10.10 Scenario....10-9
10.11 Issues....10-10

Chapter 11. Drought....11-1
11.1 General Background....11-1
11.1.1 Water Supply Strategy....11-1
11.1.2 Water Supply Infrastructure....11-2
11.1.3 The Water Forum....11-2
11.1.4 Local Water Contracts—Definition of Drought....11-3
11.2 Hazard Profile....11-4
11.2.1 Past Events....11-4
11.2.2 Location....11-5
11.2.3 Frequency....11-8
11.2.4 Severity....11-8

11.2.5 Warning Time 11-8
11.3 Secondary Hazards 11-8
11.4 Climate Change Impacts 11-9
11.5 Exposure 11-9
11.6 Vulnerability 11-9
11.6.1 Population 11-10
11.6.2 Property 11-11
11.6.3 Critical Facilities 11-11
11.6.4 Environment 11-11
11.6.5 Economic Impact 11-11
11.7 Future Trends in Development 11-11
11.8 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs and Plans 11-11
11.9 Scenario 11-13
11.10 Issues 11-13

Chapter 12. Earthquake 12-1
12.1 General Background 12-1
12.1.1 Damage from Earthquakes 12-1
12.1.2 Earthquake Classifications 12-1
12.1.3 Ground Motion 12-3
12.1.4 Effect of Soil Types 12-3
12.2 Hazard Profile 12-3
12.2.1 Past Events 12-3
12.2.2 Location 12-3
12.2.3 Frequency 12-7
12.2.4 Severity 12-7
12.2.5 Warning Time 12-8
12.3 Secondary Hazards 12-8
12.4 Climate Change Impacts 12-9
12.5 Exposure 12-9
12.5.1 Population 12-9
12.5.2 Property 12-9
12.5.3 Critical Facilities 12-12
12.5.4 Environment 12-13
12.6 Vulnerability 12-13
12.6.1 Population 12-13
12.6.2 Property 12-14
12.6.3 Critical Facilities 12-14
12.6.4 Environment 12-16
12.7 Future Trends in Development 12-16
12.8 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs and Plans 12-16
12.8.1 Uniform Building Codes 12-16
12.8.2 Improvement Standards 12-18
12.8.3 Geotechnical Studies 12-18
12.9 Scenario 12-18
12.10 Issues 12-18

Chapter 13. Flooding 13-1
13.1 General Background 13-1
13.1.1 Measuring Floods and Floodplains 13-1
13.1.2 Effects of Human Activities 13-1
13.1.3 Floodplain Ecosystems 13-2

13.1.4 Federal Flood Programs 13-2
13.2 Hazard Profile 13-4
13.2.1 Flooding Types 13-4
13.2.2 Past Events 13-4
13.2.3 Location 13-7
13.2.4 Frequency 13-9
13.2.5 Severity 13-9
11.2.6 Warning Time 13-9
13.3 Secondary Hazards 13-11
13.4 Climate Change Impacts 13-12
13.5 Exposure 13-12
13.5.1 Population 13-12
13.5.2 Property 13-13
13.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 13-14
13.5.4 Environment 13-15
13.6 Vulnerability 13-16
13.6.1 Population 13-16
13.6.2 Property 13-17
13.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 13-19
13.6.4 Environment 13-19
13.7 Future Trends in Development 13-20
13.8 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs, and Plans 13-20
13.8.1 Structural Mitigation 13-20
13.8.2 Non-Structural Mitigation 13-21
13.8.3 Regulations 13-21
13.8.4 Stormwater Management 13-24
13.8.5 Outreach and Public Education 13-26
13.9 Scenario 13-26
13.10 Issues 13-26

Chapter 14. Human-Caused Hazards 14-1
14.1 General Background 14-1
14.1.1 Terrorism and Weapons of Mass Destruction 14-1
14.1.2 Technological Hazards 14-6
14.1.3 Civil Disorder 14-9
14.2 Human-Caused Hazard Profile 14-9
14.2.1 Past Events 14-9
14.2.2 Location 14-13
14.2.3 Frequency 14-20
14.2.4 Severity 14-20
14.2.5 Warning Time 14-21
14.3 Secondary Hazards 14-21
14.4 Climate change Impacts 14-22
14.5 Exposure 14-22
14.5.1 Population 14-23
14.5.2 Property 14-24
14.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 14-24
14.5.4 Environment 14-25
14.6 Vulnerability 14-26
14.6.1 Population 14-26
14.6.2 Property 14-26

14.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 14-26
14.6.4 Environment 14-26
14.7 Future Trends in Development 14-27
14.8 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs, and Plans 14-28
14.8.1 City of Roseville Emergency Response Plan 14-28
14.8.2 City of Roseville Terrorism Contingency Plan 14-28
14.8.3 City of Roseville Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan 14-29
14.8.4 State of California Certified Unified Program Agency 14-29
14.8.5 Roseville Police Department 14-29
14.8.6 Roseville Public Safety Communications 14-30
14.8.7 Roseville Fire Department 14-30
14.9 Scenario 14-33
14.10 Issues 14-34

Chapter 15. Human Health Hazards 15-1
15.1 General Background 15-1
15.1.1 Influenza 15-1
15.1.2 Smallpox 15-2
15.1.3 Viral Hemorrhagic Fevers 15-3
15.1.4 Plague 15-3
15.1.5 Tularemia 15-4
15.1.6 Mosquito-Borne Disease 15-5
15.1.7 Lyme Disease 15-6
15.1.8 Anthrax 15-7
15.1.9 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome 15-7
15.1.9 Extreme Weather 15-8
15.2 Human Health Hazard Profile 15-10
15.2.1 Past Events 15-10
15.2.2 Location 15-10
15.2.3 Frequency 15-11
15.2.4 Severity 15-11
15.3 Secondary Hazards 15-11
15.4 Climate Change Impacts 15-11
15.5 Exposure 15-12
15.5.1 Population 15-12
15.5.2 Property 15-12
15.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 15-12
15.5.4 Environment 15-13
15.6 Vulnerability 15-13
15.6.1 Population 15-13
15.6.2 Property 15-13
15.6 3 Critical Facilities/Infrastructure 15-13
15.6.4 Environment 15-13
15.7 Future Trends in Development 15-13
15.8 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs and Plans 15-14
15.8.1 Hospital Expansions to Care for Growing Populations 15-14
15.8.2 Memorandums of Agreement 15-14
15.8.3 Integrated Emergency Response 15-14
15.9 Scenario 15-14
15.10 Issues 15-14

Chapter 16. Landslide 16-1
16.1 General Background 16-1
16.2 Hazard Profile 16-2
16.2.1 Past Events 16-2
16.2.2 Location 16-2
16.2.3 Frequency 16-3
16.2.4 Severity 16-3
16.2.5 Warning Time 16-3
16.3 Secondary Hazards 16-4
16.4 Climate Change Impacts 16-4
16.5 Exposure 16-4
16.5.1 Population 16-4
16.5.2 Property 16-4
16.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 16-5
16.5.4 Environment 16-5
16.6 Vulnerability 16-5
16.6.1 Population 16-5
16.6.2 Property 16-6
16.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 16-6
16.6.4 Environment 16-6
16.7 Future Trends in Development 16-6
16.8 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs, and Plans 16-6
16.9 Scenario 16-7
16.10 Issues 16-8

Chapter 17. Severe Weather 17-1
17.1 General Background 17-1
17.1.1 Tornadoes 17-2
17.1.2 Windstorms 17-2
17.1.3 Fog 17-4
17.1.4 Heavy Rains, Thunderstorms and Lightning 17-5
17.2 Hazard Profile 17-6
17.2.1 Past Events 17-6
17.2.2 Location 17-6
17.2.3 Frequency 17-6
17.2.4 Severity 17-8
17.2.5 Warning Time 17-8
17.3 Secondary Hazards 17-8
17.4 Climate Change Impacts 17-8
17.5 Exposure 17-9
17.5.1 Population 17-9
17.5.2 Property 17-9
17.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 17-10
17.5.4 Environment 17-10
17.6 Vulnerability 17-10
17.6.1 Population 17-10
17.6.2 Property 17-10
17.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 17-11
17.6.4 Environment 17-11
17.7 Future Trends in Development 17-11
17.8 Review of Existing Ordinances, Programs, and Policies 17-12

17.9 Scenario 17-12
17.10 Issues 17-12

Chapter 18. Wildfire 18-1
18.1 General Background 18-1
18.1.1 Contributing Factors 18-1
18.1.2 Local Conditions Related to Wildfire Hazard 18-2
18.1.3 Fire-Fighting and Fire Prevention 18-3
18.2 Hazard Profile 18-4
18.2.1 Past Events 18-4
18.2.2 Location 18-5
18.2.3 Frequency 18-9
18.2.4 Severity 18-9
18.2.5 Warning Time 18-10
18.3 Secondary Hazards 18-10
18.4 Climate Change Impacts 18-10
18.5 Exposure 18-11
18.5.1 Population 18-11
18.5.2 Property 18-11
18.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 18-11
18.5.4 Environment 18-12
18.6 Vulnerability 18-12
18.6.1 Population 18-12
18.6.2 Property 18-13
18.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure 18-13
18.7 Future Trends in Development 18-14
18.8 Review of Existing Programs, Plans and Ordinances 18-14
18.8.1 Fire Prevention Programs and Standards 18-14
18.8.2 Adopted Service Levels for Response Time 18-15
18.8.3 Annual Monitoring of Fire Department Service Levels 18-16
18.4.4 Personnel Training 18-17
18.8.5 Fire Investigation 18-17
18.8.6 Provide Comprehensive Emergency Medical Services 18-17
18.8.7 Accreditation Recommendation 18-18
18.9 Scenario 18-18
18.10 Issues 18-19

Chapter 19. Planning Area Risk Ranking 19-1
19.1 Hazard Risk Rating 19-1
19.2 Probability of Occurrence 19-1
19.3 Impact 19-1
19.4 Risk Rating 19-2
19.5 Risk Ranking 19-4

Chapter 20. Mitigation Alternatives 20-1

Chapter 21. Mitigation Initiatives 21-1
21.1 Introduction 21-1
21.2 Capability Assessment 21-1
21.3 Prioritization 21-1
21.4 Benefit/Cost review 21-2
21.5 Mitigation Strategy Matrices 21-3

21.6 Analysis of Mitigation Actions 21-3
21.7 2004 Action Plan Status 21-4

References R-1

Appendices

A. Acronyms and Definitions
B. Public Involvement Questionnaire Results
C. Public Meetings Documentation
D. Progress Reports on Initial Hazard Mitigation Plan
E. Folsom Dam Containment Dike Failure Risk Assessment Project

LIST OF FIGURES

No.	*Title*	*Page No.*
4-1	Planning Team Presentation	4-2
4-2	Community Emergency Response Team Information Table	4-2
4-3	HAZUS-MH Work Station	4-2
4-4	Sample Printout from Work Station	4-2
4-5	Sample Page from Hazard Mitigation Plan Web Site	4-4
4-6	Focus Show on Hazard Mitigation	4-5
6-1	Resolution Adopting the Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan	6-2
9-1	Roseville Planning Area	9-3
9-2	Roseville Population Trends	9-5
9-3	Roseville Age Distribution	9-7
9-4	Roseville Race Distribution	9-8
9-5	Land Use Balance in Roseville	9-10
10-1	Historical Causes of Dam Failure	10-2
11-1	Palmer Z Index Short-Term Drought Conditions (July 2010)	11-6
11-2	Palmer Drought Severity Index Long-Term Drought Conditions (July 2010)	11-7
11-3	Palmer Hydrological Drought Index Long-Term Hydrologic Conditions (July 2010)	11-7
11-4	24-Month Standardized Precipitation Index (August 2008 – July 2010)	11-8
12-1	Age of Construction of Structures in Roseville	12-11
13-1	CRS Communities by Class as of May 1, 2010	13-3
13-2	Dry Creek Flooding, January 1995	13-7
13-3	Riverside Flooding, February 1998	13-8
13-4	Example of Stream Gauge Graphic Display	13-11
13-5	Floodplain Designation Cross-Sections for Infill Areas	13-22
13-6	Floodplain Designation Cross-Sections for Areas Other Than Infill Areas	13-23
14-1	February 12, 2006 Aircraft Crash into Residence	14-12
14-2	October 21, 2010 Arson Fire at Galleria Mall	14-12
14-3	The J.R. Davis Yard in Roseville, the Largest Train Yard West of the Mississippi	14-17
14-4	Roseville Truck Routes with High Potential for Hazardous Materials Incidents	14-18
14-5	Kinder Morgan National Pipeline Map	14-19

14-6 Roseville Civic Center 14-26

15-1 Areas with Confirmed H5N1 2003-2010 15-2
15-2 Distribution of Plague from 1970-1998 15-4
15-3 Distribution of West Nile Virus by State, 2010 15-6
15-4 Environmental Changes and Health impacts 15-12

16-1 Typical Debris Avalanche Scar and Track 16-1

17-1 Roseville Regional Surface Elevation 17-2
17-2 Potential Impact and Damage from a Tornado 17-3
17-3 Tornado Risk Areas in the Coterminous United States 17-3
17-4 Severe Weather Probabilities in Warmer Climates 17-9

18-1 CAL FIRE FRAP Map for Placer County 18-6
18-2 View of Ravine, Tree Canopy and Stoneridge Development 18-7
18-3 Stoneridge Specific Plan Wildfire Threat Areas 18-8
18-4 City of Roseville Fire Training Center 18-17

LIST OF TABLES

No. *Title* *Page No.*

2-1 Plan Changes Crosswalk 2-3

3-1 Steering Committee Members 3-3
3-2 Plan Development Chronology/Milestones 3-6

4-1 Summary of Public Meetings 4-6

5-1 Objectives for 2011 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan 5-2

8-1 Presidential Disaster Declarations 8-6

9-1 General Plan Projections of Residential Units and Population by Specific Plan Area 9-5
9-2 Population Under the Poverty Level 9-6
9-3 Disability Status of Non-Institutionalized Population 9-9
9-4 Non-Residential Land Uses 9-12
9-5 Non-Residential Development Profile as of June 30, 2007 9-13

10-1 Dams in Placer County With Potential to Impact Roseville 10-4
10-2 Hazard Potential Classification 10-5
10-3 Value of Property Exposed to Dam Failure 10-7
10-4 Critical Facilities in Dam Failure Inundation Areas in Roseville 10-8
10-5 Loss Estimates for Dam Failure 10-9

11-1 City of Roseville Water Supply Contracts 11-2
11-2 Dry Year Flows into Folsom Lake 11-3
11-3 Driest Year Flows of the American River in the Folsom Lake vicinity 11-4
11-4 Water Supply Reliability at Buildout 11-10
11-5 City of Roseville Past, Current, and Projected Water Use 11-12

12-1 Earthquake Magnitude Classes 12-2
12-2 Earthquake Magnitude and Intensity 12-2
12-3 Mercalli Scale and Peak Ground Acceleration Comparison 12-4

12-4 NEHRP Soil Classification System 12-4
12-5 Recent Earthquakes Magnitude 5.0 or Larger Within 100-mile radius 12-5
12-6 Significant Known Faults Within 100 Miles 12-5
12-7 Age of Structures in the City of Roseville 12-10
12-8 Building Type 12-12
12-9 Critical Facilities Exposed to the Earthquake Hazard 12-13
12-10 Critical Infrastructure Exposed to the Earthquake Hazard 12-13
12-11 Building Loss Potential—100-Year and 500-Year Earthquake 12-15
12-12 Building Loss Potential—6.5-Magnitude Green Valley Earthquake 12-15
12-13 Vulnerability of Critical Facilities from a 100-Year Earthquake Event 12-15
12-14 Vulnerability of Critical Facilities from a 500-Year Earthquake Event 12-16
12-15 Functionality of Critical Facilities, 100-Year earthquake 12-17
12-16 Functionality of Critical Facilities, 500-Year earthquake 12-17

13-1 Reported Damage from Major Flooding in Roseville (1973 to 2009) 13-5
13-2 Observed Characteristics of Flooding 13-10
13-3 Structures Within the SFHA and the Roseville Regulatory Floodplain 13-13
13-4 Value of Exposed Buildings Within the Roseville Regulatory Floodplain 13-13
13-5 Critical Facilities Within the City of Roseville Floodplain 13-14
13-6 Critical Infrastructure Within the City of Roseville Floodplain 13-15
13-7 Flood Insurance Statistics for the City of Roseville 13-17
13-8 Estimated Flood Loss for the 100-Year and 500-Year Flood Events 13-18

14-1 Event Profiles for Terrorism 14-4
14-2 Accidents Responded to by McClellan Fire Department, 1950-1980s 14-11
14-3 Traffic Accident Counts—2004 to 2009 14-13
14-4 Fires Involving Mobile Vehicles—2005 to 2009 14-14
14-5 Hazardous Conditions Incident (No Fire) Counts—2001 to 2004 14-14
14-6 Criticality Factors 14-22
14-7 Vulnerability Criteria 14-23
14-8 Residential Dwelling Units in the City of Roseville as of 2007 14-24

16-1 Loss Estimates for Buildings Vulnerable to Landslide Hazard 16-6

17-1 Monthly Wind Records for Sacramento, California 17-4
17-2 Monthly Dense Fog Occurrence 17-4
17-3 Frequency of Thunderstorms in Sacramento, California 17-5
17-4 Severe Weather Events in Placer County since 1958 (NOAA 2010) 17-7
17-5 Roseville Buildings Vulnerable to Severe Weather Hazard 17-11

18-1 Sacramento Valley Climate 18-3
18-2 Wildfire Incident Counts—2000 to 2004 18-9
18-3 Critical Facilities Adjacent to Potential Wildfire Areas 18-12
18-4 Roseville Buildings Vulnerable to wildfire Hazard 18-13

19-1 Probability of Hazards 19-1
19-2 Impact on People from Hazards 19-3
19-3 Impact on Property from Hazards 19-3
19-4 Impact on Economy from Hazards 19-4
19-5 Risk Rating 19-4
19-6 Hazard Risk Ranking 19-5

20-1 Catalog of Mitigation Alternatives—Dam Failure 20-2
20-2 Catalog of Mitigation Alternatives—Drought 20-3

20-3 Catalog of Mitigation Alternatives—Earthquake 20-4
20-4 Catalog of Mitigation Alternatives—Flood 20-5
20-5 Catalog of Mitigation Alternatives—Human-Caused 20-7
20-6 Catalog of Mitigation Alternatives—Human Health 20-8
20-7 Catalog of Mitigation Alternatives—Landslide 20-9
20-8 Catalog of Mitigation Alternatives—Severe Weather 20-10
20-9 Catalog of Mitigation Alternatives—Wildfire 20-11

21-1 Legal and Regulatory Capability 21-5
21-2 Administrative and Technical Capability 21-7
21-3 Fiscal Capability 21-7
21-4 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan Matrix 21-8
21-5 Action Plan Prioritization 21-19
21-6 Analysis of Mitigation Actions 21-21
21-7 2005 Action Plan Status 21-22

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

City of Roseville

- Julia Burrows, Deputy City Manager
- Dean Grundy, Roseville Fire Department
- Rita Brohman, Roseville Police department
- Mike Isom, Senior Planner
- Carl Walker, Senior Civil Engineer
- Garth Gaylord, Senior Civil Engineer

Consultants

- Rob Flaner, CFM, Lead Project Planner, Tetra Tech, Inc.
- Ed Whitford, HAZUS/GIS lead, Tetra Tech, Inc.
- Cara Murphy, Mapping/Cartographer, Tetra Tech, Inc.
- Laura Hendrix, Planner, Tetra Tech, Inc

Stakeholders

- Erik Angle, Sutter Roseville Medical Center
- Barbara Todd, Sutter Roseville Medical Center
- Chris Wooden, Sure West Communications
- Rui Cuhna, Placer county Office of Emergency Services

Special Acknowledgments

The development of this plan would not have been possible without the dedication and commitment to this process by the Roseville Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee. The dedication of this volunteer committee to allocate their time to this process is greatly appreciated. Also, the citizens of Roseville are commended for their participation in the outreach strategy identified by the Steering Committee. This outreach success will set the course to the successful implementation of this plan during its next performance period.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA; Public Law 106-390) is the latest federal legislation enacted to encourage and promote proactive, pre-disaster planning as a condition of receiving financial assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Act. The DMA emphasizes planning for disasters before they occur. Under the DMA, a pre-disaster hazard mitigation program and new requirements for the national post-disaster hazard mitigation grant program were established.

The DMA encourages state and local authorities to work together on pre-disaster planning, and it promotes sustainability as a strategy for disaster resistance. "Sustainable hazard mitigation" includes the sound management of natural resources, local economic and social resiliency, and the recognition that hazards and mitigation must be understood in the largest possible social and economic context. The enhanced planning network called for by the DMA helps local government's articulate accurate needs for mitigation, resulting in faster allocation of funding and more cost-effective risk reduction projects.

Using this initiative as a foundation for proactive planning, the City of Roseville has developed and maintained a hazard mitigation plan in an effort to reduce future loss of life and property resulting from disasters. It is impossible to predict exactly when and where disasters will occur or the extent to which they will impact the City. However, with careful planning and collaboration among public agencies, stakeholders, and citizens, it is possible to minimize losses that can occur from disasters.

Hazard mitigation is a way to reduce or alleviate the loss of life, personal injury, and property damage that can result from a disaster through long- and short-term strategies. It involves strategies such as planning, policy changes, programs, projects, and other activities that can mitigate the impacts of hazards on the City of Roseville. The responsibility for hazard mitigation lies with many, including private property owners; business and industry; and local, state, and federal government.

PLAN UPDATE

Federal regulations stipulate that hazard mitigation plans must describe the method and schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the plan. Prescribing an update schedule establishes an opportunity to reevaluate recommendations, monitor the impacts of actions that have been accomplished, and determine if there is a need to change the focus of mitigation strategies. DMA compliance is contingent on meeting the plan update requirement. A jurisdiction covered by a plan that has expired is not able to pursue elements of federal funding afforded under the Robert T. Stafford Act for which a current hazard mitigation plan is a prerequisite.

The City of Roseville used the plan update process to comprehensively revise its initial hazard mitigation plan, which was adopted in 2005. Due to the success of the initial plan, no major changes were made to the plan's approach and function. The 2011 plan has been enhanced using recent best available data and technology, especially in the risk assessment. The format of the 2011 plan has been enhanced so that there is consistency of discussion points on each hazard of concern. Additionally, the format has been changed to address required elements for plan updates. Based on recommendations from FEMA Region IX during the review of the initial plan, a new hazard of concern—dam failure—has been assessed in this update (the initial plan discussed dam failure as a subset of the flood hazard). With funding from a FEMA planning grant, the City completed a comprehensive assessment of the risk associated with the dam failure hazard. The plan update followed the same basic planning process as was followed under the initial effort. A Steering Committee was once again the critical planning component in the process.

PLAN UPDATE METHODOLOGY

Development of the hazard mitigation plan included five phases:

- Phase 1—Organize and review
- Phase 2—Update the risk assessment
- Phase 3—Engage the public
- Phase 4—Assemble the updated plan
- Phase 5—Plan adoption

Phase 1—Organize and Review

The City hired Tetra Tech, Inc. as a consultant to assist with development and implementation of the 2011 plan. The Tetra Tech project manager assumed the role of the lead project planner and reported directly to a City project manager. Once the technical assistance was secured, a planning team was formed to lead the planning effort. The Steering Committee that oversaw the development of the initial plan remained intact during the initial performance period of the plan and then provided oversight for the 2011 plan. For the update process, some new members were added while some previous members left the committee. The planning team facilitated each Steering Committee meeting, which addressed a set of objectives based on the work plan established for the update. The Steering Committee met eight times from August 2009 through September 2010. Coordination with other local, state and federal agencies involved in hazard mitigation in the region helped to ensure a consistent platform with other ongoing efforts.

One of the Steering Committee's first action items was to review the State of California Hazard Mitigation Plan and all of the progress reports completed during the performance period for the initial plan. The Steering Committee identified hazards listed in the state plan to which Roseville area is susceptible, in order to determine if there was a need to expand the scope of the risk assessment. Each annual progress report for the initial plan contains a section that recommends changes or enhancements to the plan or plan development process. These reports effectively completed a key step of the plan update process before the update process began—identifying needs for changes or enhancements.

Phases 2 —Update the Risk Assessment

FEMA planning guidance specifies comprehensive updates to the risk assessment portion of local hazard mitigation plans if there have been new technical data pertaining to a hazard developed by a creditable source since the plan's initial development. Updated risk assessment efforts for the 2011 plan included the following:

- Following the recommendation from FEMA Region IX, the dam failure hazard was added to the list of hazards of concern due to the exposure potential from Folsom Dam.
- New technology was used to enhance the risk assessments for the earthquake and flood hazards using FEMA's HAZUS-MH risk assessment platform.
- All hazards of concern were updated with new relevant data.

Phase 3—Engage the Public

The Steering Committee drafted a comprehensive public involvement strategy for this update using multiple media sources. This strategy was built upon the Steering Committee's perception of what was effective during development of the initial plan. The planning team identified stakeholders to target through the multi-disciplinary public involvement strategy.

Phase 4—Assemble the Updated Plan

The base format of the initial plan was maintained in the 2011 plan. However, enhancements were made to include the following components:

- The update describes the process used to review and analyze each section of the plan.
- The update provides a discussion on how the public was kept apprised of the plan's actions during the initial performance period.
- The update describes the need for changes to the risk assessment and what changes were made in comparison to the initial plan.
- The update describes any changes to risk exposure due to either of the following:
  - Successful mitigation projects
  - Changes in land use due to annexation or new development.
- The update describes any changes to the action plan and the reasons for them.
- The update identifies the completed, deleted, or deferred actions or activities from the previously approved plan as a benchmark for progress. Further, the 2011 plan includes in its evaluation and prioritization any new mitigation actions identified since the previous plan
- To be compliant with California Assembly Bill 2140, the 2011 plan includes linkage with the City's general Plan. The bill encourages cities and counties, through the incentive of increased reimbursement of state public assistance project costs, to create local hazard mitigation plans and to adopt them as part of the safety element of their general plans.
- A linkage has been established between the City's recently completed emergency operations Plan and the 2011 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Phase 5—Plan Adoption/Implementation

This plan includes a plan implementation and maintenance section that details the formal process for ensuring that the plan remains an active and relevant document. The plan maintenance process includes a schedule for monitoring and evaluating the plan's progress annually and producing a plan revision every 5 years. This process seeks to keep a steering body that meets the criteria of the original steering committee intact to perform this annual review. This phase includes strategies for continued public involvement and incorporation of the recommendations of this plan into other planning mechanisms of the City, such as the comprehensive plan, capital improvement plan, building code, and development design guidelines.

MITIGATION GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goals

The Steering Committee established the following goals for the plan update:

- G-1: Protect lives and reduce injury.
- G-2: Promote hazard mitigation as an integrated policy.
- G-3: Protect the continuity of local government to ensure no significant disruption of services during or due to a disaster.
- G-4: Improve community emergency management preparedness, collaboration and outreach.

- G-5: Minimize or reduce damage to property, including critical facilities.
- G-6: Develop and implement mitigation strategies that optimize public funds in an efficient and cost-effective way.
- G-7: Maintain, enhance, and restore the natural environment's capacity to deal with the impacts of natural hazards, taking into account the potential impacts of global climate change.

Objectives

Plan objectives were developed via a facilitated exercise that focused on finding objectives that meet multiple goals. The objectives are listed in Table ES-1.

TABLE ES-1.
OBJECTIVES FOR 2011 MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

Objective Number	Objective Statement	Goals for which it can be applied
O-1	Consider the impacts of hazards on future land uses in the City of Roseville by coordinating with other planning mechanisms such as the general plan and land-use code development.	1, 2, 5, 7
O-2	Protect and sustain reliable local emergency operations and communication facilities during and after disasters.	1, 3, 4
O-3	Develop new or enhance existing early warning response systems and plans.	1, 3, 4, 5
O-4	Seek to enhance emergency response capabilities through improvements to infrastructure and City programs.	1, 4, 5
O-5	Enhance the understanding of all hazards that impact the City of Roseville and the risk they pose.	1, 3, 4, 5, 7
O-6	Seek mitigation projects that provide the highest degree of hazard protection at the least cost.	1, 5, 6
O-7	Seek to update information on natural, environmental, and human-caused hazards, vulnerabilities, and mitigation measures by coordinating planning efforts and creating partnerships with appropriate local, county, state, and federal agencies.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7
O-8	Seek to implement codes, standards, and policies that will protect life and property, including natural habitat, from the impacts of hazards within the City of Roseville.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
O-9	Educate the public on preparedness for and mitigation of potential impacts of hazards on the City of Roseville.	1, 2, 4
O-10	Retrofit, purchase, or relocate structures in high hazard areas, including those known to be repetitively damaged.	3, 5, 6

MITIGATION INITIATIVES

The hazard mitigation action plan is a key element of this plan. It is through the implementation of this action plan that the City of Roseville can strive to become disaster-resilient through sustainable hazard mitigation. This action plan includes an assessment of the capabilities of the City to implement hazard mitigation initiatives, a review of alternatives, a prioritization schedule, and a mitigation strategy matrix that identifies the following:

- Initiative by hazard addressed
- Objectives addressed
- Lead implementation agency (or agencies)
- Estimated benefits
- Estimated costs
- Timeline for implementation
- Funding sources
- Timeline

For the purposes of this document, mitigation initiatives are defined as activities designed to reduce or eliminate losses resulting from the impacts of natural hazards of concern. A summary of the hazard mitigation initiatives identified by this plan update is presented in Table ES-2.

TABLE ES-2.
HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN MATRIX

Initiative Number and Description	Timeline
DAM FAILURE	
DF-1—Create a dam failure element for the City's emergency response plan that includes a phased warning protocol in response to the findings of the Folsom Dam Containment Dike Risk Assessment.	Short-term
DROUGHT	
D-1—Perform a groundwater recharge feasibility study to determine the most cost-effective way to replenish groundwater resources within Roseville.	Ongoing
D-2—Implement aquifer storage and recovery program that uses direct injection technique in areas identified as appropriate.	Ongoing
D-3—Continue to implement the Environmental Utility Department's recycled water program and seek all opportunities to expand its coverage, focusing first on the Sunset Industrial area. The City pumps recycled water through a system of purple pipes completely separate from potable (drinking water) pipes. The City pumps the recycled water to customers such as streetscapes, golf courses and parks, where it irrigates turf and shrubs. Using recycled water for uses such as landscape irrigation reduces demand on the potable water system, creating a more reliable water supply for the entire City. Recycled water is not subject to the effects of drought.	Ongoing
D-4—Promote active water conservation techniques and strategies to private property owners through Roseville-sponsored outreach projects such as printed media and the City's website.	Ongoing

TABLE ES-2 (continued).
HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN MATRIX

Initiative Number and Description	Timeline
EARTHQUAKE	
EQ-1—Perform building-specific, structural seismic vulnerability assessment of City-owned critical facilities constructed prior to 1980 (including infrastructure). Included in this assessment will be recommended mitigation alternatives that meet goals and objectives of this plan.	Short-term; Ongoing
EQ-2—Incorporate earthquake mitigation measures for private property into existing City-sponsored outreach programs such as printed media and the City's website.	Short-term
EQ-3—Reassess the overall vulnerability to the earthquake hazard using the best available science and technology as it becomes available. State-sponsored programs, Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, and future FEMA-sponsored initiatives are anticipated to create a wealth of knowledge regarding this hazard that did not exist during the preparation of this plan update	Short-term; Ongoing
FLOOD	
F-1—The City shall designate all areas identified as the 100-year floodplain. The boundaries of the 100-year floodplain shall be as specified in the floodplain designations section of this component of the city's general plan. Floodplain areas shall be preserved as specified in the open space and conservation element. Such preservation may include required dedication to the City. If needed, modify the City's ordinances to include floodplain use regulations consistent with the goals, policies, and implementation measures of the safety, land use, open space and conservation, and parks and recreation elements of the City's general plan.	Ongoing
F-2—Refer any development proposal that has a direct or indirect impact on flood protection to Public Works for comment. In addition, forward such proposals to other agencies as applicable, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Reclamation Board, FEMA, California Department of Fish and Game, Placer County Resource Conservation District, and Placer County Flood Control District. Consider the comments of the agencies during the development review process.	Ongoing
F 3—Continue City participation in the National Flood Insurance Program and the Community Rating System (CRS). Maintain the city's current CRS status as the nation's only Class 1 CRS community.	Ongoing
F 4—Maintain Roseville's compliance and good standing under the National Flood Insurance program (NFIP)	Ongoing
F 5—Continue the City's outreach program to flood-prone property owners and the citizens of Roseville to program is to help make them aware of the flood threat and how best to deal with them.	Ongoing
F 6—Continue to pursue a regional approach to flood issues by remaining actively involved in the Placer Co Flood Control District. This involvement includes cooperation in the development of a comprehensive regional database. Continue to participate in regional flooding studies, including the Auburn Creek/Coon Creek/Pleasant Grove Creek flood mitigation plan and the Dry Creek watershed flood control plan.	Ongoing
F 7—Continue City coordination with other agencies on issues of flood control. Coordination between the City and adjacent jurisdictions occurs through several mechanisms, including distribution of development proposals for review and comment. Continue City cooperation with federal, state, and local agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Reclamation Board, FEMA, California Department of Fish and Game, Placer County Resource Conservation District, and Placer County Flood Control District.	Ongoing

TABLE ES-2 (continued).
HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN MATRIX

Initiative Number and Description	Timeline
FLOOD (continued)	
F 8—Continue to develop, implement, and expand the Flood Alert and Early Warning Program systems and integrate the systems with other local jurisdictions to form a regional warning program.	Ongoing
F 9—Ensure that future specific plans and specific plan amendments are consistent with the goals and policies of the general plan. The specific plans shall include the designation and preservation of floodplain areas and adjacent habitat. Provisions shall be incorporated to ensure that public infrastructure, utilities, and emergency services remain functional during flood conditions. Such infrastructure and facilities include water, sewer and gas mains, telephone and electric lines, streets and bridges, hospitals, and fire and police stations. Financing mechanisms shall be explored to fund necessary flood protection improvements and maintenance. Development agreements may be used to secure implementation and funding provisions. (Specific plans have 100% cost recovery by developers).	Short -term
F 10—Monitor and regularly update City flood studies, modeling, and associated land use, zoning, and other development regulations at a minimum of every 5 years or whenever information becomes available that would significantly modify previous data. New information could include new studies, change in City policy, consideration of a major development project or specific plan, or implementation of a flood control project.	Short-Term; Ongoing
F 11-Require a master drainage plan as part of the approval process for all specific plans and large development projects as determined by the Public Works director. The master drainage plan should consider cumulative regional drainage and flooding mitigation. The plan's intent is to ensure that the overall rate of runoff from a project does not exceed predevelopment levels. If necessary, this objective shall be achieved by incorporating run-off control measures to minimize peak flows and/or assistance in financing or otherwise implementing comprehensive drainage plans.	Short-term
F-12—Continue the Parks and Recreation Department's regular creek maintenance program within the City's creeks and floodplain areas. This program clears and removes debris that could contribute to blockage and flooding and may include the removal of silt. This is only done in areas of high risk to flood damage or where property or facilities are threatened by flooding.	Ongoing
F 13—Continue annual inspection and maintenance program of City storm drain systems. Review after every major storm system function and performance. This program removes debris that could contribute to blockage of the storm drain system.	Ongoing
F 14—Complete the final two phases of the Cirby/Linda/Dry Creek flood control project (Phase 1 and 2). Five of the seven phases of this project have been completed at a cost of about $18,000,000. The basis for determining viability of this project will be a benefit /cost analysis to determine if project meets federal grant eligibility requirements.	Long-term
F 15—Analyze alternative improvements to the Cirby/Linda/Dry Creek flood control project that may be cost effective in the flood-prone areas of Roseville: • Dry Creek from Darling Way to Riverside Avenue • Area on Dry Creek upstream of Folsom Road in the Columbia Avenue/Marilyn Avenue/Bonita Street area • Linda Creek near Samoa Way/Hurst Way area • Cirby Creek in the Trimble Way/Zien Court area	Long – term; depends on funding

TABLE ES-2 (continued).
HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN MATRIX

Initiative Number and Description	Timeline
FLOOD (continued)	
F 16—Replace the Huntington Drive/Cirby Creek culvert with a bridge to protect Queens Court/Huntington Drive area. This project is overseen by Public Works department.	Long-term; depends on funding
F 17—Divert the main drainage storm drain system down Crestmont Avenue to Cirby Way and then into Dry Creek so that the existing system will not exceed capacity. If system capacity is exceeded, the intersection on Cirby Way and Crestmont Avenue and nearby homes will flood during major flood events.	Short-term
F 18—Continue to promote and sponsor programs to buy out, relocate, and flood-proof existing flood-prone structures within Roseville.	Long-term; depends on funding
F-19—Set back and raise the sewer ponds levees at the Dry Creek Sewer Plant so raw sewage will not enter Dry Creek.	Short-term, ongoing
F-20—Implement recommendation of Downtown Roseville Specific Plan to relocate the Public safety Building.	Long-term
F-21—Retrofit the city's Downtown library by sealing the exterior and installing a flood door to protect against flood damage should Dry Creek overspill the existing floodwall.	Short-term; Ongoing
F-22—Continue the Tree Mitigation Fund program administered by the Open Space Division in conjunction with non-profit organizations. The planting of oak trees in the open spaces adjacent to riparian zones increases infiltration and slows storm water surges.	Ongoing
F-23—Manage beaver dam sites for flood control protection and habitat restoration after dam removal. One primary issue is impacts to floodwater capacity of creeks. Part of the desired comprehensive approach to beaver management includes establishment of quantitative and qualitative "carrying capacity," including acre-feet of flood capacity lost. Implement a standard monitoring and reporting process to track beaver dam locations, population, and impacts. Gain regulatory approval for beaver management techniques such as biological control and habitat manipulation using the most benign options first.	Ongoing
HUMAN-CAUSED	
HC 1-Commit support to Sacramento Urban Area Security Initiative; continue to seek funding from other federal sources to fund its initiatives	Short-term
HC-2—Enhance emergency response capability of City by contingency planning for specific events based on identified vulnerabilities.	Short-term, ongoing
HC-3—Seek to establish appropriate staffing levels of public safety personnel to address vulnerabilities identified within the capabilities of the City.	Short Term; depends on funding
HC-4—Prepare a site-specific vulnerability assessment of City-owned critical facilities that use the best available science and technology with regards human-caused hazards.	Long-term
HC-5—Address vulnerabilities identified in vulnerability assessment of water facilities performed by EUD in response to EPA initiative.	Long-term
HC 6-Maintain compliance with California Energy Commission license conditions for the operations of the Roseville Energy Park with respect to Hazardous Material Management	Ongoing

TABLE ES-2 (continued).
HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN MATRIX

Initiative Number and Description	Timeline
HUMAN-CAUSED (continued)	
HC 7-Establish and maintain compliance with state and local laws and regulations for the operation of the Roseville Combustion Turbines upon transfer of ownership from Northern CA Power Agency to City.	Ongoing
HC-8-Maintain compliance with North American Electric Reliability Corporation mandatory reliability standards related to plant operation, sabotage reporting and critical infrastructure protection (cyber security.	Ongoing
HC 9—Protect the city's data, technology infrastructure and staff against Cyber terrorism such as but not limited to: • Identity Theft • Virus/Malware/Spyware/Spam • Network and system attacks • Web site hacking	Short Term; depends on funding
HUMAN HEALTH	
HH-1—Continue to collaborate with the Placer County Health Department to ensure the health and welfare of the community	Ongoing
HH-2—Support the public education efforts of the Placer County Health Department and the Placer Mosquito Abatement District	Ongoing
HH-3—Collaborate with the Placer County Mosquito Abatement District to review resource protection policies that conflict with human health protection in the City of Roseville and work to resolve these policy issues	Short-term; Ongoing
LANDSLIDE	
LS-1—Once California Geological Survey completes soils mapping for the Roseville vicinity under the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, reassess landslide hazard using best available data to gauge the true vulnerability to this hazard.	Long-term
LS-2—Continue to implement policies adopted by the general plan that promote open space land uses within identified steep slope areas of Roseville. The City of Roseville Northeast Roseville Specific Plan and Stoneridge Specific Plans include the identified steep slope areas within Roseville. Both plan areas have continuing development. When individual projects are submitted,	Ongoing
SEVERE WEATHER	
SW-1—Continue ongoing program of conversion of overhead utilities to underground service.	Ongoing
SW-2—Continue the Shade Tree Program, an energy conservation rebate program provided by Roseville Electric	Ongoing
SW-3—Continue ongoing line clearing and weed abatement of electrical utilities to reduce exposure to severe weather hazards.	Ongoing
SW-4—Continue education/outreach programs to improve winter preparedness and minimize loss of life or injury.	Short-term, ongoing
SW-5—Enhance and implement strategies for debris management and removal during severe weather events.	Ongoing

TABLE ES-2 (continued).
HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN MATRIX

Initiative Number and Description	Timeline
SEVERE WEATHER (continued)	
SW 6-Continue to operate the Roseville Energy Park to support the City's electrical requirements and maintain service continuity during severe weather events.	Ongoing
SW 7-Take over ownership and operation of the Roseville Combustion Turbines from Northern CA Power Agency to support the City's electrical requirements and maintain service continuity during severe weather events.	Ongoing
WILDFIRE	
WF-1—Continue ongoing line clearing and weed abatement of electrical utilities to reduce exposure to fire and severe weather hazards.	Ongoing
WF-2—Continue "Goat Grazing" program for removal of grassland in areas of Roseville potentially vulnerable to wildfire. Implement goat grazing in City open space and preserve areas for fire and invasive plant species management and native plant restoration.	Ongoing
WF-3—Enhance existing City public outreach programs to include information on fire safety, defensible spaces, and areas of concern.	Short-term; Ongoing
MULTIPLE HAZARDS	
MH-1—Continue to maintain OES certification of all City inspectors for post-disaster damage assessment.	Ongoing
MH-2—Continue to maintain the hazard mitigation page on City website that provides following types of information: • The Hazard Management Plan and its progress reports • Hazard-specific information • Mitigation information by hazard, with specific emphasis on private property • Emergency response and warning information • Links to county, state, and federal related agencies	Ongoing
MH-3—Establish/maintain a post-disaster action plan to be part of the City Emergency operations plan that will include following elements: • Procedures for public information • Post-disaster damage assessment • Grant writing • Code enforcement • Redundant operations	Ongoing
MH-4—Implement an "Adopt an Open Space" program in coordination with the open space management program. Develop "adoption contracts" with neighborhoods, organizations, businesses, etc., describing the level of stewardship and the terms of the "adoption." Publicize these activities through online resource directory and other media to encourage participation.	Long--term
MH-5—Develop and disseminate best practices information to private property owners whose land is adjacent to open space areas describing stewardship opportunities and owners' role in preserving beneficial uses of open space areas (including vernal pool grassland and creek or riparian uses). Offer classes to provide in-depth information, such as demonstration projects, techniques for ecologically friendly weed abatement and vegetation control, and creating a backyard habitat compatible with open space areas.	Short-term; Ongoing

TABLE ES-2 (continued).
HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN MATRIX

Initiative Number and Description	Timeline
MULTIPLE HAZARDS (continued)	
MH-6—Work with the Roseville City School District, local high school districts, and non-profit organizations to promote ecology-oriented curricula and stewardship activities. Identify resource and administrative barriers that may be limiting schools' abilities to more actively participate in stewardship, and work collaboratively to identify solutions.	Short-term; Ongoing
MH 7—Strive to maintain high availability of essential communication services	Ongoing
MH 8-Secure the city's physical locations that contain technology infrastructure	Ongoing

IMPLEMENTATION

Full implementation of the recommendations of this plan will require time and resources. This plan reflects an adaptive management approach in that specific recommendations and plan review protocols are provided to evaluate changes in vulnerability and action plan prioritization after the plan is adopted. The true measure of the plan's success will be its ability to adapt to the ever-changing climate of hazard mitigation.

Funding resources are always evolving, as are programmatic changes based on new state or federal mandates. Roseville has a long-standing tradition of progressive, proactive response to issues that may impact its citizens. This tradition is reflected in the development of this plan. The Roseville City Council will assume responsibility for adopting the recommendations of this plan and committing City resources toward its implementation. The City's track record in the mitigation of hazards impacting its citizens is exemplary. The framework established by this plan will help maintain this tradition in that it identifies a strategy that maximizes the potential for implementation based on available and potential resources. It commits the City to pursue initiatives when the benefits of a project exceed its costs. Most important, the City developed this plan with extensive public input. These techniques will set the stage for successful implementation of the recommendations in this plan.