

SULTAN CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

ITEM NO: D-3
DATE: June 10, 2010
SUBJECT: Hazard Mitigation Plan Update
CONTACT PERSON: Deborah Knight, City Administrator

ISSUE:

Review the information submitted by the city to Snohomish County Department of Emergency Management (DEM) to update the Hazard Mitigation Plan as required by the Disaster Mitigation Act.

Snohomish County DEM is in the process of compiling information submitted by partner agencies such as the city and Snohomish County Fire District 5 to update the county Hazard Mitigation Plan. City staff anticipate the council will need to take formal action to approve the Plan within the next 60 days.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Review the information submitted to Snohomish County DEM to update the Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (NHMP) adopted by the City in 2004. Direct staff to areas of concern.

SUMMARY:

Snohomish County Department of Emergency Management is in the process of updating the regional Hazard Mitigation Plan (Plan). The city council reviewed the process to update the Plan on June 11, 2009 and directed staff to participate in the update process.

The Snohomish County Department of Emergency Management received a grant to assist with consultant time to review existing plans and make necessary changes. The city has taken the opportunity to review its adopted Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan (NHMP) and make updates based on new information and changed conditions.

The public works director and police chief worked together with Snohomish County and Fire District 5 to review and update the City's NHMP. Fire Chief Merlin Halverson is a member of the County's NHMP Steering Committee. Police Chief, Jeff Brand, and Public Works Director, Connie Dunn have attend many of the planning meetings.

BACKGROUND:

Disaster Mitigation Act Overview

The Disaster Mitigation Act (PL 106-390, 10/30/2000) establishes a pre-disaster hazard mitigation program and new requirements of the national post-disaster Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP).

The Act encourages local governments to establish plans to reduce or eliminate long-term risk and vulnerability to natural hazards, as a prerequisite for receiving funds through the post-disaster Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. Mitigation plans support emergency management, as the plans set a course for responsive recovery.

New requirements redefine local government to include a broader group beyond traditional municipalities, counties and tribes; and this broader group includes all entities such as fire and library districts with taxing authority.

Plan Update Requirements

The original plan adopted by the county and Snohomish cities in 2004 expired in April 2010. The cities and County have been working together for the last 12 months to complete the update. The update should be complete within the next 60 days.

The plan helps the county and its' planning partners qualify for federal aid and also supports the National Flood Insurance Program's Community Rating System, that provides a discount on flood insurance premiums.

A key task is to complete a new risk assessment. The county's consultants have been working on this new risk assessment, known as the Hazard Inventory Vulnerability Assessment (HIVA.) Snohomish County currently has a stand-alone HIVA, developed over five years ago by the University of Washington.

The new risk assessment will require a new public process, to show how the new flood losses and recent wind and snow events are factored into the new plan. Also, the county needs to re-evaluate risk of tsunamis now that the state mapping is available.

The City must carefully consider changes to the plan to ensure eligibility for future grants and support for public safety improvements such as siren warning systems and evacuation routes.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This is a planning level effort using in house staff and resources. No additional funding is necessary. There may be future grant funding available through FEMA for hazard mitigation recommendations listed in the Plan.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Review the information submitted to Snohomish County DEM to update the Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (NHMP) adopted by the City in 2004. Direct staff to areas of concern.

ATTACHMENTS:

A – Sultan Hazard Mitigation Annex Submittal to DEM

COUNCIL ACTION:

DATE:

CHAPTER X. SULTAN ANNEX

X.1 HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN POINT OF CONTACT

Primary Point of Contact

Connie Dunn, Public Works Director
319 Main Street
Sultan, WA 98294
Telephone: 360-793-2231
e-mail Address: connie.dunn@ci.sultan.wa.us

Alternate Point of Contact

Jeff Brand
515 Main Street
Sultan, WA 98294
Telephone: 425-754-2360
e-mail Address: jeff.brand@snoco.org

X.2 JURISDICTION PROFILE

The following is a summary of key information about the jurisdiction and its history:

- **Date of Incorporation**—June 10, 1905
- **Current Population**—4,555 as of 2009

Population Growth— Sultan was incorporated as a municipal jurisdiction in 1905 with a resident population of 576 persons. The resident population increased on a gradual basis averaging 1.5 to 1.8% per year from 1910 to 1940. The population declined by 1.6% between 1940-1950 and increased 0.1% from 1950-1960. The resident population increased at a rate considerably higher than the surrounding county between 1960 and 2000 as corporate boundaries expanded. The population grew an average of 3.1 to 4.1% per year from 1960-2000. In 2000, 3,695 persons resided within the Sultan UGA of which 3,344 persons resided within the city limits.¹

The Puget Sound Regional Council expects the Skykomish Valley, east of Monroe will eventually support 17,026 persons by the year 2010, 20,549 persons by the year 2020, and 23,977 persons by the year 2030. The projected Sultan population of 11,119 in 2025 would represent about half of these residents.

By the year 2012, the County's Buildable Lands Report (BLR) expects approximately 7,300 persons will reside in the Sultan Urban Growth Area (UGA) of which 90% will reside in the city limits. The BLR further expects the current UGA will eventually support a population of 11,119 persons at build-out in 2025. It is assumed that the entire UGA will be incorporated into the City by that time. This is an official population estimate and is used by the City for its growth and capital facilities planning

Location and Description—The City of Sultan is located within Snohomish County in the western part of Washington State in the Skykomish River valley. This area is a semi-rural part of Snohomish County at the foot of the Cascade Mountains. The city is xx miles northeast of Seattle and xx miles east of Everett on US 2.

Brief History—Sultan was formed at the confluence of the Sultan and Skykomish Rivers by European settlers in the 1880's when gold was found nearby. The city's location is historically important to the community, first as an Indian village and then as a logging community. The town was named after the local Indian Chief Tseul-ted, but settler quickly mispronounced the name as "Sultan". By 1891, Sultan City played an important role in the building of the Burlington Northern Railroad which runs east from Everett adjacent to the Skykomish River. During the railroad construction, Sultan was as a supply station employing (at times) over 800 men. This boom brought many new

¹ Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division, June 2007 and "Snohomish County Buildable Lands Report, 2007.

businesses to the area and in 1905 Sultan incorporated. For most of the 20th century, the Sultan economy was driven by its proximity to logging, mining, agricultural resources. As the production and availability of natural resources declined in the late 20th century, the City of Sultan has struggled to maintain its economic prosperity and redefine itself for the 21st century. Currently, the city is focused on building eco-tourism opportunities, capturing recreation and business travelers on US 2, and serving as the cultural and commercial center for local residents. Sultan still provides manufacturing and commercial services to the surrounding rural area including lumber production, foundry services, and light manufacturing of various products such as kayaks and _____.

Climate—The annual precipitation around the City of Sultan averages 66 inches per year.

Governing Body Format—Strong Mayor with seven council members elected at large.

Development Trends—[Insert Summary Description of Development]

X.3 JURISDICTION-SPECIFIC NATURAL HAZARD EVENT HISTORY

Table X-1 lists all past occurrences of natural hazards within the jurisdiction. Repetitive loss records are as follows:

Number of FEMA Identified Repetitive Flood Loss Properties: **[13.3 NATURAL HAZARD EVENT**

HISTORY SPECIFIC TO THE CITY

REPETITIVE LOSS PROPERTIES IN CITY OF SULTAN

<u>Address Building</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Mitigated Property</u>	<u>Losses</u>	<u>Insured</u>
100 Cedar St	\$118,500	No	2	Yes
1010 Dyer Rd	\$141,200	Yes	3	Yes
102 2nd St	\$81,200	No	3	Yes
103 3rd St	\$127,500	No	2	No
105 3rd St	\$127,500	No	2	Yes
201 4th St	\$178,000	No	2	No
203 Main St	\$105,000	No	3	Yes
207 Skywall Dr	\$73,800	Yes	2	Yes
207 SR 2	\$569,400	No	3	Yes
208 Skywall Dr	\$81,500	No	4	No
211 Skywall Dr	\$95,600	Yes	8	No
215 Main St	\$123,500	No	2	Yes
309 Alder	\$60,100	No	2	No
408 Birch St	\$75,300	No	2	Yes

Address of Building	Value	Mitigated Property	Losses	Insured
516 E Stevens Pass Hwy	\$223,100	No	3	No
800 Dyer Rd	\$113,600	No	3	Yes
805 Main St	\$108,400	No	2	No
111 Main St.	\$68,100	No	4	No
1309 Skywall Dr.	\$241,400	Yes	4	Yes
205 Skywall Dr.	\$83,200	No	2	No

Number of Repetitive Flood Loss Properties that have been mitigated:

Address of Building	Value	Mitigated Property	Losses	Insured
105 Alder	\$83,300	yes	3	Yes
604 Stevens Ave	\$112,500	yes	2	No

•

X.4 HAZARD RISK RANKING

Table X-2 presents the ranking of the hazards of concern.

X.5 CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

The assessment of the jurisdiction's legal and regulatory capabilities is presented in Table X-3. The assessment of the jurisdiction's administrative and technical capabilities is presented in Table X-4. The assessment of the jurisdiction's fiscal capabilities is presented in Table X-5. Classifications under various community mitigation programs are presented in Table X-6.

X.6 HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN AND EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDED INITIATIVES

Table X-7 lists the initiatives that make up the jurisdiction's hazard mitigation plan. Table X-8 identifies the priority for each initiative. Table X-9 summarizes the mitigation initiatives by hazard of concern and the six mitigation types.

X.7 STATUS OF PREVIOUS PLAN INITIATIVES

Table X-10 summarizes the initiatives that were recommended in the previous version of the hazard mitigation plan and their implementation status at the time this update was prepared.

X.8 FUTURE NEEDS TO BETTER UNDERSTAND RISK/ VULNERABILITY

[Insert text, if any]

X.9 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

[Insert text, if any]

**TABLE X-1.
515 MANATURAL HAZARD EVENTS**

Type of Event	FEMA Disaster # (if applicable)	Date	Preliminary Damage Assessment
Severe Storm	1817	01/09	
Severe Storm	1825	12/08	
Severe Storm/Flooding	1734	12/07	
Severe Storm	1682	12/06	
Flooding	1671	11/06	
Severe Storm/Flooding	1641	01/06	
Severe Storm/ Flooding	1499	10/03	
Earthquake	1361	02/01	
Flooding/Landslide	1172	03/97	
Earthquake	n/a	96	
Severe Storm	1159	12/96	
Flooding	1100	01/96	
Flooding	1079	11/95	
Severe Weather	981	01/93	
Flooding	896	12/90	
Flooding	883	11/90	
Flooding	784	11/86	
Volcano	823	05/80	
Flooding	612	12/79	
Flooding/Landslide	545	12/77	
Flooding	492	12/75	
Earthquake	196	05/65	
Flooding	185	12/64	
Flooding/ Wind	137	10/62	

TABLE X-2. HAZARD RISK RANKING		
Rank	Hazard Type	Risk Rating Score (Probability x Impact)
1	Earthquake	54
2	Severe Storm	45
3	Flood	36
4	Dam Failure	18
5	Landslide	18
6	Wildland Fire	12
7	Drought	4
8	Avalanche	0
9	Tsunami	0
10	Volcano/Lahar	0

**TABLE X-3.
LEGAL AND REGULATORY CAPABILITY**

	Local Authority	State or Federal Prohibitions	Other Jurisdictional Authority	State Mandated	Comments
Codes, Ordinances & Requirements					
Building Code	Y	N	N	Y	International Building Code
Zonings	Y	N	N	Y	Title 16, Municipal Code
Subdivisions	Y	N	N	Y	Title 16, Municipal Code
Stormwater Management	Y	N	Y	Y	W WA Stormwater Management manual and Utility, adopted 2008
Post Disaster Recovery	N	N	N	N	
Real Estate Disclosure	N	Y	N	Y	
Growth Management	Y	Y	Y	Y	Growth Management Act, 2008 GMA Compliant
Site Plan Review	Y	N	N	Y	Zoning Code/Flood Mgmt. Code
Special Purpose (flood management, critical areas)	Y	Y	N	Y	Flood Mgmt. Code/Critical Areas Ordinance
Planning Documents					
General or Comprehensive Plan	Y	Y	Y	Y	State-mandated GMA Plan
Floodplain or Basin Plan	Y	Y	N	Y	Water Resource Inventory Area
Stormwater Plan	Y	N	N	Y	Storm Water Utility/Code
Capital Improvement Plan	Y	N	N	Y	Elements of Comprehensive Plan
Habitat Conservation Plan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Critical Areas Ordinance
Economic Development Plan	Y	N	N	Y	Elements of Comprehensive Plan
Emergency Response Plan					
Shoreline Management Plan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Shoreline Master Program
Post Disaster Recovery Plan					
Other					
Other					

TABLE X-4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL CAPABILITY		
Staff/Personnel Resources	Available?	Department/Agency/Position
Planners or engineers with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Y	City Community Development Director City Public Works Director
Engineers or professionals trained in building or infrastructure construction practices	Y	City Community Development Director w/ contract to Snohomish County Building Division
Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards	Y	City Community Development Director, City Public Works Director w/ consultation to Snohomish County D.E.M.
Staff with training in benefit/cost analysis	Y	City Administrator's office
Floodplain manager	Y	Community Development Director
Surveyors	N	Private contract
Personnel skilled or trained in GIS applications	N	
Scientist familiar with natural hazards in local area	N	
Emergency manager	Y	City Public Works Director
Grant writers	Y	City Economic Development Department

TABLE X-5. FISCAL CAPABILITY	
Financial Resources	Accessible or Eligible to Use?
Community Development Block Grants	Eligible
Capital Improvements Project Funding	Capital Imp. Plan
Authority to Levy Taxes for Specific Purposes	Eligible
User Fees for Water, Sewer, Gas or Electric Service	Full Service Utility
Incur Debt through General Obligation Bonds	Eligible
Incur Debt through Special Tax Bonds	Eligible
Incur Debt through Private Activity Bonds	
Withhold Public Expenditures in Hazard-Prone Areas	Yes
State Sponsored Grant Programs	Eligible
Development Impact Fees for Homebuyers or Developers	Yes
Other	

TABLE X-6. COMMUNITY CLASSIFICATIONS			
	Participating?	Classification	Date Classified
Community Rating System	Yes	7	11/9/09
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule	Yes	3	3/2010
Public Protection	yes	6/9	6/1/2004
Storm Ready			
Firewise			
Tsunami Ready			

TABLE X-7. HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN MATRIX							
Applies to new or existing assets	Hazards Mitigated	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline	Included in Previous Plan?
Initiative #—Description							
1. Implement policies and recommendations identified in the City of Sultan Comprehensive Floodplain Management and Repetitive Flood Loss Plan	Flood	1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9	Community Development		General Fund CIP Possible grant funding	Short Term Ongoing	Yes
Initiative #—Description							
2. Provide citizens of Sultan access to web-based information on natural hazards	All Natural Hazards	9,10,11,14	Community Development Administration		Annual Budget	On-going	Yes
Initiative #—Description							
3. Acquire, relocate or retrofit identified repetitive flood loss properties	Flood	7, 11, 14	Community Development		Grant Funding, REET	On going	Yes
Initiative #—Description							

4. Update, enhance and adopt the City's Emergency response plan based on the most current information and include identification of multi-hazard evacuation routes	All Natural Hazards	1,4,5,8,9,10	Community Development Department, Public Works Dept. Snohomish Co. DEM	General Fund, possible grant funding	On going	Yes
Initiative #—Description						
5. Create additional evacuation routes out of the Sultan Bowl	All natural Hazards	1,2,4,11	Community Development Public Works Dept. Administration	Grant, Developer Fees REET	Long Term	Yes
Initiative #—Description						
6. Promote flood insurance, reducing flood insurance rating by providing certified elevation data on all structures in the floodplain	Flood	10,11,12	Community Development Dept. Snohomish County	Grant Funding Impact Fees	Long Term	Yes
Initiative #—Description						
7. Enhanced Outreach programs to promote preparedness and mitigate hazards that impact Sultan	All Natural Hazards	9,10,11,14	Community Development Dept. Administration	General Fund, Grants, Snohomish County DEM	Ongoing	Yes
8. Promote mitigation of private property w/in Sultan by providing incentive and alternative ways to fund mitigation in Sultan	All Natural Hazards	10,11,12	Community Development	General Fund Permit and Impact Fees	Ongoing	Yes
Initiative #—Description						
9. Seismic retrofit of vulnerable water mains within Sultan	Earthquake	1,2,4,11,14	Public Works Engineering	Water CIP	Long Term	Yes

**TABLE X-8.
MITIGATION STRATEGY PRIORITY SCHEDULE**

Initiative #	# of Objectives Met	Benefits	Costs	Do Benefits Equal or Exceed Costs?	Is Project Grant-Eligible?	Can Project Be Funded Under Existing Programs/ Budgets?	Priority ^a
1		High	High	Yes		no	High
2		high	medium	Yes		Yes	High
3		High	High	Yes	Yes	No	High
4		High	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	High
5		Medium	High	Yes	Yes	No	Low
6		High	Low	Yes	No	No	High
7		High	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium
8		Low	High	Yes	Yes	No	Low

- a. Explanation of priorities
- High Priority: Project meets multiple plan objectives, benefits exceed cost, funding is secured under existing programs, or is grant eligible, and project can be completed in 1 to 5 years (i.e., short term project) once funded.
 - Medium Priority: Project meets at least 1 plan objective, benefits exceed costs, requires special funding authorization under existing programs, grant eligibility is questionable, and project can be completed in 1 to 5 years once funded.
 - Low Priority: Project will mitigate the risk of a hazard, benefits exceed costs, funding has not been secured, project is not grant eligible, and time line for completion is long term (5 to 10 years).

**TABLE X-9.
ANALYSIS OF MITIGATION INITIATIVES**

Initiative Addressing Hazard, by Mitigation Type						
Hazard Type	1. Prevention	2. Property Protection	3. Public Education and Awareness	4. Natural Resource Protection	5. Emergency Services	6. Structural Projects
Earthquake	Planning, zoning, building codes, Capital Improv.	Structural retrofit shatter-resistant glass	Out reach projects Block Watch Community Education		Emergency response	Set back requirements, critical area ordinances
Sever storm	NA	Open Spaces Vegetation Manintenance	Out reach projects Block Watch Student and Adult Education	Forest and Vegetation Mangement	Protection of critical facilities emergency response services	None
Flood	Planning and zoning, floodplain regulations open space preservation, stormwater management regulations	Elevation Certificates, relocation, zoning, building regulations	Real estate disclosure, school-age and adult educations, evacuation drills	Sediment and erosion control, stream corridor restoration, watershed management, wetland restoration and preservation	Emergency Response, protection of critical facilities, warning system	Critical area zoning
Dam Failure	Relocation, Evacuation Routes	Planing and zoning codes, relocation	Hazard information cneters, school-age and adult education, outreach projects	NA	Warning sytem Emergency response services	Relocation
Landslide	critical areas mapping, and regulations	Relocation Planning and building codes	Outreach projects, real estate disclosure, preservation of open areas,	Sediment and erosion control, watershed management, forest and vegetation management, wetland management	Emergency response services,	Building set backs, building codes
Wild Land Fire	Planning and zoning, open space preservation	Structural retrofit	Outreach projects, hazard information centers	Watershed management, forest and vegetation management, wetland restoration and preservation	Emergency response services, protection of essential facilities	
Drought	Open space preservation	Water use efficiency, water restriction ordinances	Outreach projects, consumer confidence reports, web-based information	Forest and vegetation management, stream corridor restortation, preserve the functions of natural systems	Emergency response services, web-based media, news media	NA
Avalanche	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tsunami	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Volcano/Lahar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**TABLE X-9.
ANALYSIS OF MITIGATION INITIATIVES**

Hazard Type	Initiative Addressing Hazard, by Mitigation Type					
	1. Prevention	2. Property Protection	3. Public Education and Awareness	4. Natural Resource Protection	5. Emergency Services	6. Structural Projects

Notes:

1. Prevention: Government, administrative or regulatory actions that influence the way land and buildings are developed to reduce hazard losses. Includes planning and zoning, floodplain laws, capital improvement programs, open space preservation, and stormwater management regulations.
2. Property Protection: Modification of buildings or structures to protect them from a hazard or removal of structures from a hazard area. Includes acquisition, elevation, relocation, structural retrofit, storm shutters, and shatter-resistant glass.
3. Public Education and Awareness: Actions to inform citizens and elected officials about hazards and ways to mitigate them. Includes outreach projects, real estate disclosure, hazard information centers, and school-age and adult education.
4. Natural Resource Protection: Actions that minimize hazard loss and preserve or restore the functions of natural systems. Includes sediment and erosion control, stream corridor restoration, watershed management, forest and vegetation management, and wetland restoration and preservation.
5. Emergency Services: Actions that protect people and property during and immediately after a hazard event. Includes warning systems, emergency response services, and the protection of essential facilities.
6. Structural Projects: Actions that involve the construction of structures to reduce the impact of a hazard. Includes dams, setback levees, floodwalls, retaining walls, and safe rooms.

