Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional

Hazard Mitigation Plan

May 2016











Participants

The following Larimer County Jurisdictions, Special Districts, and Organizations have collaboratively participated in this Hazard Mitigation Planning Process.

Larimer County



Table of Contents

| 1 | Certification of Annual Plan Review Meetings8 | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| 2 | 2 Executive Summary9 | | | | | |
| 3 | The Planning Process | | | | | |
| | 3.1 | Background | 11 | | | |
| | 3.2 | Hazard Mitigation Planning | 13 | | | |
| | 3.3 | Local Methodology and Update Process | 13 | | | |
| | 3.4 | The Planning Team | 16 | | | |
| | 3.5 | Planning Meetings and Documentation | 18 | | | |
| | 3.6 | Public and Stakeholder Participation | 24 | | | |
| | 3.7 | Multi-Jurisdictional Planning and Participation | 33 | | | |
| | 3.8 | Existing Planning Mechanisms | | | | |
| 4 | Cou | nty Profile | | | | |
| | 4.1 | Demographics | | | | |
| | 4.2 | Social Vulnerability | | | | |
| | 4.3 | Housing Stock | 42 | | | |
| | 4.4 | Critical Facilities | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 4.5 | Future Development | | | | |
| 5 | 4.5 Risk | Future Development | 43 | | | |
| 5 | 4.5 Risk 5.1 | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary | 43 47 47 | | | |
| 5 | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards | 43 47 47 | | | |
| 5 | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles | 43 47 47 56 58 | | | |
| 5 | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 Mitt | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles | 43 47 47 56 58 231 | | | |
| 5 | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 Miti 6.1 | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles igation Strategy Introduction | 43 47 47 56 58 231 231 | | | |
| 5 | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 Miti 6.1 6.2 | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles igation Strategy Introduction Goals and Objectives Summary | 43 47 56 58 231 231 233 | | | |
| 5 | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 Mit 6.1 6.2 6.3 | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles igation Strategy Introduction Goals and Objectives Summary 2010 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report | 43 47 56 58 231 231 233 235 | | | |
| 5 | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 Miti 6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4 | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles igation Strategy Introduction Goals and Objectives Summary 2010 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report | 43 47 56 58 231 231 233 235 236 | | | |
| 5 | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 Miti 6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4 Plar | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles igation Strategy Introduction Goals and Objectives Summary 2010 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report Implementation and Maintenance | 43 47 47 56 58 231 231 233 235 236 251 | | | |
| 5 6 7 | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 Mitt 6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4 Plan 7.1 | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles igation Strategy Introduction Goals and Objectives Summary 2010 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report Implementation and Maintenance Implementation Action Plan | 43 47 47 56 58 231 231 233 235 236 231 235 236 251 | | | |
| 5 6 7 A | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 Miti 6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4 Plar 7.1 ppendiz | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles igation Strategy Introduction Goals and Objectives Summary 2010 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report Implementation and Maintenance Implementation Action Plan X A – Meeting Minutes & Sign-In Sheets | 43 47 47 56 58 231 231 233 235 235 236 251 251 254 | | | |
| 5 6 7 A | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 Miti 6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4 Plar 7.1 ppendiz | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles igation Strategy Introduction Goals and Objectives Summary 2010 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report Implementation and Maintenance Implementation Action Plan X A – Meeting Minutes & Sign-In Sheets X B – Community Profiles | 43 47 47 56 58 231 231 233 235 235 235 251 251 251 254 284 | | | |
| 5 6 7 A | 4.5 Risk 5.1 5.2 5.3 Miti 6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4 Plar 7.1 ppendiz ppendiz Town | Future Development Assessment Introduction and Update Summary Climate Change and Hazards Hazard Profiles igation Strategy Introduction Goals and Objectives Summary 2010 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report Implementation and Maintenance Implementation Action Plan X A – Meeting Minutes & Sign-In Sheets X B – Community Profiles of Berthoud | 43 47 47 56 58 231 231 233 235 235 251 251 251 254 284 285 | | | |





| Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Colorado State University (CSU) | |
| Town of Estes Park | |
| Estes Park Medical Center | |
| Estes Valley Fire Protection District | |
| Estes Valley Recreation and Park District | |
| City of Fort Collins | |
| Glacier View Fire Protection District | 532 |
| Town of Johnstown | 547 |
| Livermore Fire Protection District | 555 |
| City of Loveland | |
| Loveland Fire Rescue Authority | |
| Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District (Northern Water) | |
| Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District | 640 |
| Platte River Power Authority | |
| Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District | |
| Poudre Fire Authority | 678 |
| Thompson Valley EMS | |
| Town of Timnath | 724 |
| Upper Thompson Sanitation District | 739 |
| Town of Wellington | |
| Wellington Fire Protection District | |
| Town of Windsor | |
| Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | |
| Appendix C – Local Jurisdiction Mitigation Outreach | |
| Appendix D – Additional Fort Collins CRS Documentation | |
| Appendix E – Update on Mitigation Actions from the 2010 Northern Cold | orado Regional Hazard |
| Appendix E EEMA Approval Documents & Jurichisticaal Adoptions | |
| Appendix F - Feivia Approval Documents & Junsuictional Adoptions | |





Tables

| Table 1. 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Small Planning Team (HM SPT) | 16 |
|--|-----|
| Table 2. 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team (HM LPT) | 17 |
| Table 3. 2010 and 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Participation | 33 |
| Table 4. Population Forecasts for Larimer County, 2000-2040 | 37 |
| Table 5. Social Vulnerability Indicators – Larimer County, CO | 39 |
| Table 6. County and State Housing Snapshot | 42 |
| Table 7. Larimer County Critical Facilities | 43 |
| Table 8. Population Forecasts by Region and County (2000 – 2040) | 44 |
| Table 9. State Demographers Office Population Projections by Region and County (2010 – 2040) | 44 |
| Table 10. State/Region/County Plan Hazards Matrix | 48 |
| Table 11. Presidential Disaster and Emergency Declarations in Larimer County | 49 |
| Table 12. Risk Factor Criteria | 52 |
| Table 13. Risk Factor Results for Larimer County | 54 |
| Table 14. Hazard Risk Conclusions for Larimer County | 55 |
| Table 15. Summary of Vulnerability Analysis and Loss Estimation and Methodologies | 59 |
| Table 16. Hazard Vulnerability Summary by Jurisdiction | 64 |
| Table 17. Colorado Reportable Disease Statistics CDPHE, Larimer County | 69 |
| Table 18. Impacts to Subjects Impacted by Public Health Emergencies | 71 |
| Table 19. Total Workdays Lost (Pandemic Influenza) | 72 |
| Table 20. Biological Hazards / Contagion Vulnerability Factor Data | 74 |
| Table 21. Influenza Planning Resources and Guidelines | 75 |
| Table 22. Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale | 83 |
| Table 23. Notable Earthquake Events in Colorado (1870 – 2015) | 84 |
| Table 24. Economic Losses – Golden Fault Scenario (Losses in Millions of Dollars) | 92 |
| Table 25. Golden Fault Scenario – Expected Damage to Critical Facilities | 92 |
| Table 26. Historical Wildfires – Larimer County | 116 |
| Table 27. Wildfire Exposure Table – Emergency Services | 144 |
| Table 28. Wildfire Exposure Table – Community Services | 144 |
| Table 29. Dam Hazard Classification Levels | 150 |
| Table 30. Communities Participating in the FEMA NFIP | 151 |
| Table 31. CRS Premium Discounts | 151 |
| Table 32. Larimer County Historical Flood Events (1950 – 2015) | 154 |
| Table 33. Flood Prone Critical Facilities – City and County Facilities | 158 |
| Table 34. Flood Prone Critical Facilities – Emergency Services | 158 |
| Table 35. Flood Prone Critical Facilities – Community Services | 158 |
| Table 36. Economic Loss Estimates by Jurisdiction (Hazus 100-year Flood Scenario)* | 163 |
| Table 37. Hazardous Materials Classes and Descriptions | 167 |
| Table 38. Historical Thunderstorm Wind Events in Larimer County | 183 |
| Table 39. Lightning Strikes in Larimer County* | 186 |





| Table 40. Historic Hail Events reporting loss in Larimer County | 187 |
|--|-----|
| Table 41. Severe Wind Event History in Larimer County (1996 – 2014) | 190 |
| Table 42. Fujita Tornado Damage Scale | 200 |
| Table 43. Enhanced Fujita (EF) Scale | 202 |
| Table 44. Institutional Buildings | 203 |
| Table 45. Educational Institutions (Elementary Schools, High Schools) | 203 |
| Table 46. Metal Building Systems | 204 |
| Table 47. Electric Transmission Lines | 204 |
| Table 48. Tornado History in Larimer County (1954-2015) | 206 |
| Table 49. Historic Winter Storms- Larimer County | 213 |
| Table 50. Goals – 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan | 233 |
| Table 51. 2016 Larimer County Mitigation Strategy – Updated Goals and Objectives | 234 |
| Table 52. Processes for Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Other Planning Mechanisms | 253 |
| Table 53. Fort Collins' Integrated CRS and HMP Process | 464 |
| | |

Figures

| Figure 1. Larimer County Social Vulnerability Map | 41 |
|--|-----|
| Figure 2. Average Annual Percent Change in Population, Statewide | 45 |
| Figure 3. Projected Statewide Population Growth | 46 |
| Figure 4. Summary of Disaster Declaration Events, Colorado | 51 |
| Figure 5. Summary of Disaster Declaration Events, Larimer County | 51 |
| Figure 6. Climate Change: Projected Temperature Increases in the Southwestern U.S. | 57 |
| Figure 7. Hazus Earthquake Scenario – Larimer County | 87 |
| Figure 8. Historic Earthquake Epicenters – Larimer County | 89 |
| Figure 9. Peak Ground Acceleration – Larimer County | 90 |
| Figure 10. Earthquake Scenario Loss Estimation – Larimer County | 91 |
| Figure 11. Historically Undermined Areas – Larimer County | 97 |
| Figure 12. Geological Hazard Areas – Larimer County | 98 |
| Figure 13. Potential Subsidence Areas – Larimer County | 99 |
| Figure 14. Potential Collapsible Soils Areas – Larimer County | 100 |
| Figure 15. Potential Expansive Soils Areas – Larimer County | 101 |
| Figure 16. Geologic Hazard Exposure – Larimer County | 102 |
| Figure 17. Subsidence Exposure – Larimer County | 103 |
| Figure 18. Collapsible Soils Exposure – Larimer County | 104 |
| Figure 19. Expansive Soils Exposure – Larimer County | 105 |
| Figure 20. Wildfire Hazard Zone Map – Larimer County | 111 |
| Figure 21. Wildfire Risk Index Map – Larimer County | 112 |
| Figure 22. WUI Map – Larimer County | 114 |
| Figure 23. Historical Federal Wildfire Map – Larimer County | 116 |
| Figure 24. Parcels in the highest and 2 nd highest Wildfire Risk Index – Larimer County | 145 |





| Figure 25. Parcels in the highest and 2 nd highest WUI – Larimer County | 146 |
|--|-----|
| Figure 26. Special Flood Hazard Areas – Larimer County | 153 |
| Figure 27. 2013 Flood Inundation Area – Larimer County | 156 |
| Figure 28. 1% Annual Chance Flood Depth Grid – Larimer County | 160 |
| Figure 29. Flood Scenario Loss Estimation – Larimer County | 162 |
| Figure 30. Flood Exposure – Larimer County | 165 |
| Figure 31. Colorado Hazardous and Nuclear Materials Route Restrictions | 170 |
| Figure 32. Potential Landslide Areas – Larimer County | 175 |
| Figure 33. Potential Rockslide Areas – Larimer County | 176 |
| Figure 34. Parcels in Landslide Areas – Larimer County | 177 |
| Figure 35. Parcels in Rockslide Areas – Larimer County | 178 |
| Figure 36. Average Lightning Flash Density in the U.S. | 181 |
| Figure 37. Colorado Lightning Flash Density Map | 182 |
| Figure 38. Historical Hail Events (1955 – 2014) – Larimer County | 188 |
| Figure 39. Larimer County – Historical High Wind Events | 197 |
| Figure 40. Map of Tornado Events in Larimer County (1950 – 2013) | 207 |





1 Certification of Annual Plan Review Meetings

The Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Small Planning Team (HM SPT) has agreed to review the contents of this Hazard Mitigation Plan annually. The following table hereby certifies this review.

| YEAR | DATE | SIGNATURE |
|------|------|-----------|
| 2016 | | |
| 2017 | | |
| 2018 | | |
| 2019 | | |
| 2020 | | |





2 Executive Summary

On behalf of all municipalities, county agencies, and Title 32 Special Districts throughout Larimer County, the Larimer Office of Emergency Management is submitting this Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) for review by the State of Colorado, Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency. This Plan is the result of the continued effort from stakeholders, partners and districts to complete a document that updates the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan. The updated Plan addresses natural and human-caused hazards throughout Larimer County with the expressed purpose of saving lives and reducing future losses in anticipation of future events.

Larimer's HMP has been completed with a high degree of public participation. A broad range of public and private stakeholders, including agencies, local businesses, nonprofits, and other interested parties were invited to participate in the development of the 2016 Plan. Twenty-seven different jurisdictions participated in the planning process, including Larimer County, all municipalities within the county, Colorado State University, and multiple Fire, EMS, Sanitation, Park, and Water Districts. Stakeholder involvement was encouraged through staff and planning team invitations to agencies and individuals to actively participate in local planning meetings and to interact with the planning materials and surveys posted on the project website. Public input was sought throughout the planning process by advertising open public meetings through local newspapers, email distribution lists, community bulletins, social media networks, and jurisdictional websites.

The Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) builds on available historical data from past hazard occurrences, establishes detailed profiles for each hazard, and culminates in a hazard risk ranking based on conclusions about the frequency of occurrence, spatial extent, and potential impact of each hazard. FEMA's HAZUS loss estimation methodology was also used in evaluating known hazard risks by their relative long-term cost in expected damages. In essence, the information generated through the risk assessment serves a critical function as communities seek to determine the most appropriate mitigation actions to pursue and implement — enabling communities to prioritize and focus their efforts on those hazards of greatest concern and those structures or planning areas facing the greatest risk(s). The hazards analyzed in detail in this plan include:

- Biological Hazards / Contagion
- Civil Disturbance
- Earthquake
- Erosion / Deposition
- Fire Wildland
- Flood Flash and Riverine

- Hazmat Fixed and Transport
- Landslide / Rockslide
- Spring / Summer Storms
- Tornado
- Utility Disruption
- Winter Storm (Blizzard, Heavy Snow)

The final, and arguably the most important step in updating the Mitigation Strategy was the creation of new Mitigation Actions. In preparing their Mitigation Actions, the County and each participating jurisdiction considered the 2016 planning goals and their individual hazard risks,





priorities, and capabilities to mitigate identified hazards. The mitigation actions represent the key outcome of the mitigation planning process.

While this plan is being reviewed by the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Larimer County jurisdictions will prepare for full adoption of the plan. This will be accomplished with the following actions:

- Larimer County jurisdictions will review and respond to comments provided by the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- Larimer County will make appropriate changes and will recommend the adoption of the Plan.
- All participating jurisdictions, upon receipt of the HMP with incorporated comments and recommendations, will adopt the plan.
- The Board of Commissioners, upon receipt of the Plan with addressed comments and recommendations, and by Resolution, will adopt the plan for Larimer County.

The Larimer Office of Emergency Management, and all participating jurisdictions, hereby submit this Hazard Mitigation Plan for consideration by the State of Colorado and Federal Emergency Management Agency.





3 The Planning Process

This section of the Plan describes the mitigation planning process undertaken by Larimer County and participating municipalities in the preparation of this Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. This chapter consists of the following subsections:

- Background
- Hazard Mitigation Planning
- Local Methodology and Update Process
- The Planning Team
- Planning Meetings and Documentation
- Public and Stakeholder Participation
- Multi-Jurisdictional Planning and Participation
- Existing Planning Mechanisms

3.1 Background

Emergency Management is the practice of identifying, managing, and reducing risks. It is a discipline that involves preparing for a disaster before it occurs, supporting those affected by the disaster, as well as rebuilding after the natural or human-caused disaster event. Emergency Management is an ever-changing process by which all individuals, groups, and communities attempt to manage hazards in an effort to avoid or reduce the impact of disasters. One method for proactively managing hazard risks is Hazard Mitigation Planning. Hazard Mitigation Planning includes the identification of policies, capabilities, activities, and tools necessary to implement successful and sustainable risk reduction actions.

Why is Larimer County creating a hazard mitigation plan? Mitigation planning offers many benefits, including:

- Saving lives and property
- Saving money
- Ensuring quick and effective recovery following disasters
- Reducing future vulnerability through wise development and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction
- Enhancing coordination within and across participating jurisdictions,
- Expediting the receipt of pre-disaster and post-disaster grant funding, and
- Demonstrating a firm commitment to improving community health and safety

Mitigation planning has great potential to produce long-term and recurring benefits by breaking the repetitive cycle of disaster loss. A core assumption of hazard mitigation is that pre-disaster investments will significantly reduce the demand for post-disaster assistance by lessening the need for emergency response, repair, recovery, and reconstruction. Furthermore, mitigation practices enable local residents, businesses, and industries to re-establish themselves in the wake of a disaster, getting the community economy back on track sooner and with less interruption.

The benefits of mitigation planning go beyond reducing hazard vulnerability. Measures such as the acquisition or regulation of land in known hazard areas can help achieve multiple community goals, such as preserving open space, improving water quality, maintaining environmental health, and enhancing





recreational opportunities. Thus, it is vitally important that any local mitigation planning process be integrated with existing local planning efforts, and any proposed mitigation strategies must take into account broader community goals. Larimer County and its municipalities have embraced this approach, identifying multiple opportunities to link the Plan with pre-existing programs, policies, plans, and resilience-building initiatives.

During the last two decades, the emergency management cycle has evolved considerably. A renewed emphasis has been placed on planning for disasters before they occur as a complement to effective response and recovery. As a result, hazard mitigation has gained increasing prominence as a critical part of emergency management. By mitigating hazards through sustained action taken to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk to human life and property from hazards, risks can be proactively combated in a systematic manner, rather than being reacted to once they occur.

This 2016 Plan is the result of continuing work by the citizens of the county to update a regional predisaster multi-hazard mitigation plan that will not only continue to guide the county towards greater disaster resistance, but will also respect the character and needs of the community.

PURPOSE

Larimer County adopted the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan (NCRHMP) in July of 2010. The 2010 Plan provided momentum for making homes, businesses, and communities as safe as possible against the impacts of floods, tornadoes, winter weather, and other natural hazards.

Larimer County has remained dedicated in continuing the work started in the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan and has elected to develop a county-scale hazard mitigation plan. The purposes of the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan are:

- To protect life and property by reducing the potential for future damages and economic losses that result from natural hazards;
- To qualify for additional grant funding, in both the pre-disaster and post-disaster environment;
- To provide quick recovery and redevelopment following future disasters;
- To integrate other existing and associated local planning documents;
- To demonstrate a firm local commitment to hazard mitigation principles; and
- To comply with state and federal legislative requirements tied to local hazard mitigation planning.

SCOPE

This Plan has been prepared to meet requirements set forth by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Colorado Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (DHSEM) in order for Larimer County to be eligible for funding and technical assistance from state and federal hazard mitigation programs. It will continue to be updated and maintained to continually address those natural hazards determined to be of high and moderate risk as defined by the updated results of the local hazard, risk, and vulnerability summary. Other natural hazards will continue to be evaluated during future updates of the Plan in order to determine if they warrant additional attention, including the development of specific mitigation measures intended to reduce their impact. This Plan will be updated and FEMA-approved within its five-year expiration date.





AUTHORITY

This Hazard Mitigation Plan has been adopted by Larimer County and its participating jurisdictions in accordance with the authority granted to counties by the State of Colorado.

This Plan was developed in accordance with current state and federal rules and regulations governing local hazard mitigation plans. The Plan shall be monitored and updated on a routine basis to maintain compliance with the following legislation and guidance:

 Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, 42 U.S.C., Section 322, Mitigation Planning, as enacted by Section 104 of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-390) and by FEMA's Interim Final Rule published in the Federal Register on February 26, 2002, at 44 CFR Part 201

The following Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) guides and reference documents were used to prepare this document:

- FEMA. 386-1: Getting Started. September 2002.
- FEMA. 386-2: Understanding Your Risks: Identifying Hazards and Estimating Losses. August 2001.
- FEMA. 386-3: Developing the Mitigation Plan. April 2003.
- FEMA. 386-4: Bringing the Plan to Life. August 2003.
- FEMA. 386-5: Using Benefit-Cost Review in Mitigation Planning. May 2007.
- FEMA. 386-6: Integrating Historic Property and Cultural Resource Considerations into Hazard Mitigation Planning. May 2005.
- FEMA. 386-7: Integrating Manmade Hazards into Mitigation Planning. September 2003.
- FEMA. 386-8: Multi-Municipality Mitigation Planning. August 2006.
- FEMA. Coordinators Manual, National Flood Insurance Program Community Rating System. 2007.
- FEMA. 386-9: Using the Hazard Mitigation Plan to Prepare Successful Mitigation Projects. August 2008.
- FEMA. Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide. October 1, 2011
- FEMA. Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Handbook. March, 2013.

3.2 Hazard Mitigation Planning

Local hazard mitigation planning is the process of organizing community resources, identifying and assessing hazard risks, and determining how to best minimize or manage those risks. This process results in a hazard mitigation plan that identifies specific mitigation actions, each designed to achieve both short term planning objectives and a long-term community vision. To ensure the functionality of each mitigation action, responsibility is assigned to a specific individual, department, or agency along with a schedule for its implementation. Plan maintenance procedures are established to help implement, evaluate, and enhance the Plan as necessary. Developing clear plan maintenance procedures ensures that Larimer County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan remains a current, dynamic, and effective planning document over time.

3.3 Local Methodology and Update Process

This Plan contains a narrative description of the process followed to prepare it. All incorporated towns and Title 32 Special Districts were notified of the requirement relating to the update process and the





formation of the Hazard Mitigation Planning Team, consisting of a Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team (HM LPT) and Hazard Mitigation Small Planning Team (HM SPT). Subsequent meetings were held to ensure the accuracy of the information included in the plan, and that input provided by participating agencies, organizations, and the public was included as presented. Throughout the planning process, the Larimer County HM LPT & HM SMP reviewed and analyzed each section of the plan. In preparing the updated Plan, documentation indicates that the planning teams utilized a multi-jurisdictional planning process consistent with the one recommended by FEMA (Publication Series 386).

The first Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan (NCRHMP) was adopted by Larimer County, the City of Fort Collins, and the City of Loveland in 2005. The updated NCRHMP was adopted by those jurisdictions, in addition to the cities of Berthoud, Estes Park, and Wellington in 2010.

The following documents were reviewed and incorporated into the 2016 planning process:

- 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan
- 2013 Colorado Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan
- Larimer County and Local Jurisdiction Master Plans and Specific Area Plans
- Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs)
- 2015 Larimer County Open Lands Master Plan
- 2014 Larimer County Office on Aging, Community Assessment Survey for Older Adults (CASOA)
- 2007 Larimer County Parks Master Plan
- 2014 Colorado Action Plan for Disaster Recovery
- City of Fort Collins Drainage Basin Master Plans
- City of Fort Collins Floodplain Management Public Information Committee: A Program for Public Information

In addition to the plans listed above, data and goals from various plans and initiatives currently in place in participating jurisdictions were utilized during the revision of the Plan. A key focus of the 2016 Plan was the integration of hazard mitigation with ongoing land use and community development activities.

The 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan addressed twenty (20) hazards including man-made hazards terrorism and hazardous material spills. The risk of each hazard was assessed by its historical frequency, potential magnitude, speed of onset, and geographic extent.

The planning process used for the 2016 Plan update was based on Section 322 of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and supporting guidance developed by FEMA. The planning process followed these steps:

- Conduct kickoff meeting with the Larimer County Small Planning Team
- Conduct a 5-year Plan review
- Conduct a Hazard Risk Factor exercise
- Establish a Large Planning Team made up of local stakeholders and subject matter experts
- Review and update the local hazard, risk, and vulnerability summary
- Determine capability for the county and each municipality
- Present risk assessment to local communities





- Conduct a Mitigation Action workshop with the large planning team
- Update the Mitigation Strategy
- Update the Plan maintenance procedures
- Complete a draft plan for review by the Small Planning Team
- Advertise opportunity/hold public meeting for comment on final draft
- Provide final draft to DHSEM for review
- Provide final draft to FEMA for review
- Present Plan to municipalities for adoption
- Present Plan to Larimer County for adoption

Each of the planning steps described above resulted in key products and outcomes that collectively make up the Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan. These work elements are discussed below in further detail.

The County and Community Profiles, located in Chapters 4 and Appendix B respectively, describe the general makeup of Larimer County and its municipalities, including prevalent geographic, demographic, and economic characteristics. This baseline information provides a snapshot of the countywide planning area and assists participating officials in recognizing the social, environmental, and economic factors that ultimately play a role in determining community vulnerability to natural hazards.

The Risk Assessment (RA), found in Chapter 5, focuses on three elements for each identified hazard: *Hazard Identification/Profile, Hazard Analysis* and a *Vulnerability/Loss Assessment*. Together, these elements identify, assess, and profile Larimer County's overall risk to natural and human-caused hazards. The RA builds on available historical data from previous occurrences, establishes hazard-by-hazard profiles, and culminates in a hazard risk priority or ranking based on conclusions about the frequency of occurrence, potential impact, spatial extent, warning time, and duration of each hazard. FEMA's Hazus loss estimation software was also used in evaluating known flood and earthquake risks according to their relative long-term cost, measured in expected damages. The RA is designed to assist communities in seeking the most appropriate mitigation actions to pursue and implement by focusing their efforts on those hazards of greatest concern and those structures or planning areas facing the greatest risk(s).

The Community Profiles and RA collectively serve as a basis for establishing goals for this Plan, each contributing to the development, adoption, and implementation of a meaningful Mitigation Strategy update that is based on accurate background information and community goals.

The Mitigation Strategy, located in Chapter 6, consists of broad goal statements as well as specific mitigation actions for each jurisdiction participating in the planning process. This updated strategy provides the foundation for detailed *Mitigation Action Guides* (MAGs) that link jurisdictionally-specific mitigation actions to locally assigned implementation mechanisms. Together, these sections are designed to make the 2016 Plan more strategic and functional through the identification of both long-term goals and near-term actions that will guide day-to-day decision-making and project implementation.

In addition to the identification and prioritization of possible mitigation projects, emphasis has been placed on the use of program and policy alternatives to help make Larimer County and participating municipalities less vulnerable to the damaging forces of nature while improving the economic, social, and





environmental health of the community. The concept of multi-objective planning is emphasized throughout this Plan, identifying ways to link hazard mitigation policies and programs with complimentary community goals that may be related to housing, economic development, community revitalization, recreational opportunities, transportation improvements, environmental quality, land development, and public health and safety. This Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan should be seen as a proactive document that represents a concerted effort to make Larimer County and its participating jurisdictions more livable, resilient communities.

The *Plan Implementation and Maintenance* procedures, found in Chapter 7, includes the measures Larimer County and participating jurisdictions will take to ensure the Plan's continuous long-term implementation. The procedures also include the manner in which the Plan will be regularly monitored, reported upon, evaluated, and updated to remain a current and meaningful planning document. Local capabilities are outlined in this section to highlight strengths and areas of improvement related to personnel, planning capacity, and ongoing risk-reduction efforts.

3.4 The Planning Team

A participatory, community-based planning approach contributed heavily to the development of this Plan. Larimer County formed both a Hazard Mitigation Small & Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team (HM SPT & LPT). Additionally, local government officials, public stakeholders, and Larimer County residents were invited and included in local meetings and planning workshops to discuss and complete tasks associated with preparing the Plan. The HM SPT was created prior to the initial kick-off meeting and consisted of members of those jurisdictions that participated in the 2010 NCRHMP. The HM LPT was identified during the HM SPT kick-off meeting and included all jurisdictions and special districts within Larimer County, well as non-governmental organizations (NGO's) and public stakeholders. Members of the HM LPT participated in the risk assessment, mitigation strategy development, plan review, public outreach, and plan maintenance strategy.

The participants listed in the following Table represent the members of the HM SPT & LPT who were responsible for participating in the updating of this Plan.

| Name | Jurisdiction | Small Planning Team | Large Planning Team |
|---|---|------------------------|------------------------|
| Lori Hodges, Director of Emergency Management | Larimer County | х | х |
| Mike Gavin, Emergency Manager | City of Fort Collins, Poudre Fire Authority | х | х |
| Eric Rose, Emergency Manager | Town of Estes Park | Х | Х |
| Gary Green, Fire Chief | Wellington Fire Protection District | х | х |
| Pat Mialy, Emergency Manager | City of Loveland, Loveland Fire Rescue Authority | х | х |
| Marsha Hilmes-Robinson, Floodplain Administrator | City of Fort Collins | Х | Х |

Table 1. 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Small Planning Team (HM SPT)





All members of the HM SPT were also included as members of the HM LPT. After the initial HM SPT kickoff meeting the HM LPT was assembled for meetings and plan development throughout all phases of the planning process. The HM SPT reviewed the 2010 Plan, identified new information that needed to be included in the 2016 Plan update and incorporated it as required by state and federal guidelines. The HM SPT was also tasked with collecting all accurate data from plan participants and provided outreach to the HM LPT, local agencies and special interest groups, and public stakeholders to ensure that everyone's information was included in this Plan.

| Name | Jurisdiction | Small Planning Team | Large Planning Team |
|------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| Lori Hodges | Larimer County | Х | Х |
| Mike Gavin | City of Fort Collins | Х | Х |
| Eric Rose | Town of Estes Park | Х | Х |
| Gary Green | Wellington Fire Protection District | Х | x |
| Pat Mialy | City of Loveland | Х | Х |
| Marsha Hilmes-Robinson | City of Fort Collins | Х | Х |
| Jan Dowker | Town of Berthoud | | Х |
| Steve Charles | Berthoud Fire Protection District | | x |
| Shayna Jones | Big Thompson River Watershed Coalition | | x |
| Marian Kelly | Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | | x |
| Ken Quintana | Colorado State University | | Х |
| Mike Bielmaier | Estes Park Medical Center | | X |
| Jim Duell | Estes Park Sanitation District | | x |
| Jon Landkamer | Estes Valley Fire Protection District | | х |
| Matt Hines | Estes Valley Recreation and Park District | | х |
| Robert Issacson | Glacier View Fire Protection District | | х |
| Tom Hellen | Town of Johnstown | | Х |
| Donn Maynard | Livermore Fire Protection District | | х |
| Bill Lundquist | Loveland Fire Rescue Authority | | x |
| Jim Struble | Northern CO Water Conservation District | | x |
| Dick Wilcox | Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District | | x |
| Jim Boizot | Platte River Power Authority | | x |
| Hugh Collins | Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District | | x |
| Jim Montague | Poudre Fire Authority | | Х |
| Braden Applegate | Poudre Valley EMS | | Х |

Table 2. 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team (HM LPT)





| Name | Jurisdiction | Small Planning Team | Large Planning Team |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Mike Larson | Thompson Valley EMS | | х |
| April Getchius Town of Timnath | | | х |
| Matt Allon | Upper Thompson | | v |
| Matt Alleli | Sanitation District | | ~ |
| Larry Lorentzen | Town of Wellington | | Х |
| Gary Groop | Wellington Fire | | ~ |
| Gary Green | Protection District | | ~ |
| John Vazquez | Town of Windsor | | Х |
| Miko Blackwill | Windsor Severance Fire | | × |
| | Rescue | | Χ. |

3.5 Planning Meetings and Documentation

The preparation of the Plan update required a series of meetings and workshops intended to facilitate discussion and initiate data collection efforts with local community officials. More importantly, the meetings and workshops prompted continuous input and feedback from local officials, public stakeholders, staff, and subject matter experts throughout the update process.

Below is a summary of the key meetings and workshops conducted throughout the development of the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan. Sign-in sheets and meeting minutes for both the HM SPT and HM LPT meetings and conference calls are provided in Appendix A.

HM SPT KICK-OFF MEETING

The Small Team kickoff meeting for the Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan was held via conference call on June 4th, 2015. All official representatives of the HM SPT attended the call. Largely a logistics-focused meeting, the SPT come together to organize the following action items:

Large Team Invites: The first meeting topic was to identify who to invite to participate on the project's large planning team. The project's small planning team agreed that they wanted this hazard mitigation planning process to include as many potential stakeholders as possible, to ensure the resulting mitigation strategy includes input from a diverse cross section of the county, its jurisdictions, and other organizations. The small team agreed to send each of their recommended contacts to Michael Baker International (Baker), its selected contractor for this project, to compile.

Large Team Proposed Meetings: The next topic involved the large planning team's proposed meetings that would be held during the planning process. The small team decided on three separate meetings to be held throughout the planning process. The first would be a project overview and informational meeting. The second would focus on the results of the hazard risk assessment and would begin to define the mitigation strategy. The third would focus on specific mitigation actions and also plan maintenance and incorporation into other planning processes.

Jurisdictional Participation Requirements: The small team then discussed the need to define (and communicate) requirements for plan participants and adoptees. It was agreed that those wanting to formally adopt the countywide hazard mitigation plan would agree to the following: *submit a participation letter; help to identify hazards unique to that jurisdiction; identify how vulnerabilities and risks may differ from the county as a whole; formulate mitigation actions specific that that jurisdiction; offer community*





stakeholders an opportunity to be involved in the planning process; document a process for plan integration and maintenance; and formally adopt the plan by the jurisdiction's governing body.

Hazards to Profile: The next topic involved identifying the hazards to be profiled in the plan. The team agreed that all hazards previously identified in the current plan would be discussed in the plan, but that only those hazards which present the most risk would receive a full hazard profile and risk assessment. The team agreed to each offer up their own 'top 10' list of those hazards and then work together via email and phone to come to consensus. It was also stressed that team members should remember to focus on those hazards that can truly be mitigated through actions or projects.

Public Project Communications and Outreach: The team then discussed preferred public outreach and communication preferences for the planning process. It was agreed that a centralized public project website would be created where all project-related information will be posted. The county agreed to utilize OEM's existing Facebook and Twitter social media accounts to keep followers informed and engaged throughout the planning process. This would also help to drive the public to the project website. The team agreed to utilize online surveys as a method to collect information and comments from both participating jurisdictions as well as the general public. The team also agreed to utilize existing email contact lists to share plan updates and information as necessary. Lastly the team agreed to discuss later on in the project the potential for public meetings or events where the hazard mitigation plan could be presented and disseminated.

Project Surveys: As mentioned above, online project surveys were agreed upon as a key tool to engage the public and also to collect necessary information from participating jurisdictions throughout the planning process. These surveys would be disseminated to the public on a regular schedule and will be posted to the website and shared via social media. Other large planning team specific surveys would be sent out to the team as needed to collect required information for inclusion into the plan.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the small team agreed that it would hold both project meetings and calls as needed throughout the planning process. The team would also utilize group emails as necessary. Finally, the following project schedule (and date for the 1st large planning team meeting) was established.

- 6/29/2015: Large Team Kick-Off Meeting
- August 2015: Risk Assessment / Mitigation Strategy Meeting
- September 2015: Mitigation Actions / Plan Maintenance Meetings
- Late Summer / Fall 2015: Public Outreach
- November/December 2015: Final Draft Posted for Comment
- November 2015: Submit to State/FEMA
- TBD: FEMA Approval Pending Adoption
- TBD: Presentation to County Commissioners

The following post-meeting action items were established by the members for the Small Team:

- Small team to provide their own large planning team invite lists to Baker.
- Small team to provide 'top 10' hazard list to Baker for further facilitation of that discussion.
- Small team to fill out survey to set the date for the other two large planning team meetings.





Throughout the duration of the planning process, the HM SPT held a total of four logistics and project management meetings/conference calls. The meeting minutes for these calls are documented in Appendix A.

HM LPT KICKOFF MEETING #1



The Large Team (HM LPT) kickoff meeting for the Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan was held on June 29th at the Larimer County Courthouse. After a welcome and brief introductions, members of the HM SPT reviewed the importance of hazard mitigation and went over the basic processes involved with hazard mitigation planning. During this time, the members of the Large Team were informed of the participation requirements for any jurisdictions planning to formally adopt the 2016 Plan. Additionally, the project schedule was explained to the members of the Large Team, including the process of formal plan adoption.

During the kickoff meeting, members of the HM LPT participated in a review of the previously adopted Hazard Mitigation Plan. This was referred to as the *5-Year Plan Review*. The project team gave an overview of the Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan and introduced the HM LPT to the first planning team survey (located on the project website). The intent of the survey was to solicit comments about the existing plan: *what are the strengths and weaknesses; has the Plan been implemented in your community and what were implementation challenges; have hazard risks changed, etc.*

During this discussion, the project team asked the audience to raise their hands if they were involved in the development of the Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan. Less than 10 people raised their hands (about 15% of the meeting attendees). This indicated that the 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning Process was new to the majority of planning team members and that additional effort would be well-spent educating them about how hazard mitigation could improve quality of life in their communities. The Project Team made sure to devote meeting time to talk to the Large Team about mitigation actions including a conversation about the four main categories of actions, which include: Local Plans and Regulations, Structure and Infrastructure Projects, Natural Systems Protection, and Education and Awareness Programs.

The Large Planning Team also reviewed and provided comments on the list of hazards that the Small Team agreed to profile fully. The 'Top 10' list of hazards ended up including the following 12:

• Biological Hazards / Contagion





- Civil Disturbance
- Earthquake
- Erosion / Deposition
- Fire Wildland
- Flood Flash and Riverine
- Hazmat Fixed and Transport
- Landslide / Rockslide
- Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)
- Tornado
- Utility Disruption
- Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

After the list of hazards was established, the Planning Team reviewed the goals and objectives outlined in the 2010 Hazard Mitigation Plan. The goals and objectives were updated at HM LPT Meeting #2 based on comments received after the Kickoff Meeting.

The last 20 minutes of the Kickoff Meeting was spent conducting a group Planning Exercise. Attendees were divided into small groups (3-6 people) and each group was provided with a specific hazard scenario. Four different scenarios were proposed with hazard situations specific to flooding, wildfire, tornado, or winter storm. Each group was then asked to spend some time brainstorming potential mitigation actions to help reduce or eliminate the hazard, preferably one from each of the four mitigation action categories. Throughout the meeting, the project team circulated copies of FEMA's Mitigation Ideas booklet, which contains ideas for specific mitigation ideas focused on individual hazards. When the exercise was complete, the groups were asked to present their mitigation ideas and explain their reasoning. This lead to beneficial dialog and was a great learning opportunity for the members of the Planning Team.

At the end of the meeting, participants were given three action items to complete:

- 1. Large team members were asked to begin compiling and sending existing data and plans that may be applicable to this hazard mitigation plan.
- 2. Large team members were asked to begin sharing news of this project with their communities.
- 3. Large team members were asked to begin thinking about mitigation actions that they want to document in this plan.

HM LPT MEETING #2

The second HM LPT meeting was held on August 24th, 2015, at the Ranch Complex in Loveland. Official representatives from all jurisdictions and districts participating in the Hazard Mitigation Plan and representatives from other organizations and stakeholder groups were invited to participate. The intent of the meeting was to review the results of the first planning team surveys, to increase participant familiarity with the Risk Assessment results and how to use the interactive webmap, to define the goals and objectives of the County Mitigation Strategy, and to collect status updates on any mitigation actions included in the 2010 plan from previously participating communities. The following agenda items were discussed at the second planning meeting:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Project Overview Update: Schedule, Status, HM SPT Role





- Jurisdictional Participation Requirements / Expectations
- Review of 5-Year Plan Review & Risk Factor survey results
- Overview of Risk Assessment Results
- 2016 Mitigation Strategy Goals and Objectives
- Review status updates for 2010 Mitigation Actions
- Review of 2016 Mitigation Action Guides
- Jurisdictional/Special District Break-Out Session
- Q&A Session

The second planning meeting provided the project team with an opportunity to reiterate the planning participation requirements and to present the results of the Risk Assessment to members of the HM LPT. Participants were encouraged to leverage the interactive risk assessment maps on the project website as they worked to identify priorities and mitigation actions for the 2016 Mitigation Strategy.

During this meeting, the project team presented some of the high-level results of the 5-Year Plan Review and Risk Factor Survey. This survey was conducted through the large planning team and will be used for the jurisdictional and district appendixes to the plan document. The planning team also presented preliminary results from the first public survey, which will be shared with the large planning team for their use in compiling mitigation actions.

The updated mitigation strategy goals and objectives, revised and reviewed by the HM SPT were then presented to the large team. The project team explained how the goals and objectives define the high-level mitigation strategy for the plan update and how the proposed mitigation actions will align with defined goals. Members of the HM LPT were given an opportunity to comment on the goals and add content as needed. At this time, the Project Team introduced the jurisdiction-specific Mitigation Action Guides (MAGs) that were developed as a planning tool for the multi-jurisdictional project. Each jurisdiction was assigned a number of MAGs, which were designed to help keep track of how mitigation projects are progressing over time.

Near the end of the meeting HM LPT participants were broken out into jurisdictional groups for an opportunity to discuss strategies, brainstorm, ask questions, and plot out next steps forward. The jurisdictional groups then reported back to the larger group on what they discussed. Some jurisdictions agreed that they would be holding internal planning meetings in preparation for the 3rd and final large planning team meeting.

At the end of the meeting, participants were given three action items to complete:

- 1. Participating jurisdictions to submit Participation Letter (if not already done).
- 2. Adopting jurisdictions to complete pending surveys.
- 3. Adopting jurisdictions (and other interested Large Team organizations) to begin brainstorming / compiling mitigation actions/projects for review during the final large planning team meeting.

HM LPT MEETING #3

The third and final large planning team meeting was held on October 20th at the Larimer County Sheriff's Office. Official representatives from all jurisdictions and districts participating in the Hazard Mitigation Plan and representatives from other organizations and stakeholder groups were invited to participate.





Organized as a working session, the intent of the meeting was to discuss and finalize plan maintenance and implementation strategies for both the County and its participating jurisdictions, to finalize local Mitigation Action Guides (MAGs), and to prioritize mitigation actions at the community level. The following agenda items were discussed at the second planning meeting:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Project Overview Update: Schedule, Status
- Jurisdictional Participation Requirements / Expectations
- Mitigation Action Guide (MAG) Working Session
- Mitigation Action Prioritization Exercise
- Q&A

The third round of planning meetings gave participating communities and districts the opportunity to work directly with the project team and local subject matter experts to refine their identified mitigation projects. The workshop setting proved incredibly helpful for vetting ideas, sharing resources, and establishing best practices for project implementation and maintenance. Members of the HM LPT revisited the interactive risk assessment maps on the project website as they worked to refine their MAGs and identify additional mitigation actions for the 2016 Mitigation Strategy.









During the third planning meeting members of the HM LPT also worked with staff from Larimer County OEM and Michael Baker International to prioritize each of their identified mitigation actions. Using the STAPLEE method recommended by FEMA in the State and Local Mitigation Planning How-To Guide, each community weighed the pros and cons of their different mitigation actions based on social, technical, administrative, political, legal, economic, and environmental considerations. The objective was for each jurisdiction to systematically prioritize their mitigation projects in a way that led to an overall Mitigation Strategy that was realistic, cost effective, and attainable.

At the end of the meeting, participants were given two action items to complete:

- 1. Participating jurisdictions to complete any remaining project surveys
- 2. Adopting jurisdictions to submit digital versions of final MAG's to small team for review

3.6 Public and Stakeholder Participation

An important component of the success of Larimer County's mitigation planning process involved ongoing public, stakeholder, and jurisdiction participation. Individual citizen involvement provided both the HM SPT and HM LPT with a greater understanding of local concerns and ensured a higher degree of mitigation success by developing community "buy-in" from those directly affected by the planning decisions of public officials.

A broad range of public and private stakeholders, including agencies, local businesses, nonprofits, and other interested parties were invited to participate in the development of the 2016 Plan. Stakeholder involvement was encouraged through staff and planning team invitations to agencies and individuals to actively participate in local planning meetings and to interact with the planning materials and surveys posted on the project website.





Public input was sought throughout the planning process by advertising open public meetings through the following outlets:

- Local newspapers and bulletins in communities across the county
- Social media networks (including agency and municipal Twitter and Facebook accounts)
- Online agency websites (including the Larimer County website)

Below are examples of a few of the planning announcements and public meeting invitations created and distributed by members of the HM LPT.







Multiple media platforms were used in order to reach and engage the maximum number of local and regional stakeholders. Additionally, a website was created to provide information to public stakeholders and to obtain feedback on the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update.¹ In addition to providing hazard mitigation resources and announcements about community events, the draft plan was posted on the website for public review. Community members were encouraged to share their input, photos and experiences for use during the hazard mitigation planning process. The screen shot below provides a visual of the project website.



¹ The project website was discontinued upon completion of the Plan update.





Based on website traffic diagnostics, the project website reached over 3,000 users throughout the course of the hazard mitigation planning process. The image below summarizes website use between June 2015 and November 2015.

| Overview | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|--|---|--------------|-----------------------|
| Sessions v VS. Select a metri | c | | | | | | Hourly Day Week Month |
| Sessions | | | | | | | |
| 200 | | | | | ٨ | | |
| 100 | Mun | A_MA | MM | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | \sim | him | <u> </u> |
| | June 2015 | July 2015 | Augus | st 2015 | September 2015 | October 2015 | November 2015 |
| | | | | | | New Visitor | Returning Visitor |
| Sessions | Users | Pageviews | Pages / Session | Avg. Session Duration | Bounce Rate | | |
| 3,745 % New Sessions 87.26% | 3,269 | 5,288 | 1.41 h | 00:00:53 | 82.32% _///T1///////////////////////////////// | | B 45 |
| | | | | | | | |

The majority of visitors to the project website were between the ages for 18 and 34. In the future, webbased outreach efforts in the county should keep in mind that use of these tools skews to a relatively younger age group.



The website included two public surveys designed to gather information about public hazard risk perceptions and visions for community resilience:

- 1. Survey #1 *Public Hazard Risk Perceptions*: The purpose of this survey was to engage citizens in order to better understand risk perceptions among members of the Larimer County community and to identify the best ways to communicate with public stakeholders moving forward.
- Survey #2 Visions for a Resilient Larimer County: The purpose of this survey was to gather preliminary information from community members and stakeholders about the current capacities and resiliency conditions of their community as well as a long-range vision for a resilient Larimer County.





The surveys were utilized throughout the planning process to engage with and educate local residents. Information and comments from the surveys were shared with members of the planning team and were used to guide the planning process. Links to the surveys were posted on the website and updates were communicated through multiple county and local jurisdiction media outlets. Participating jurisdictions posted links to the public surveys on their local websites and social media links to gather input from interested stakeholders. At the time of the third and final HM LPT meeting a total of 402 Larimer County residents had submitted responses for the "Visions for a Resilient Larimer County" survey. 324 residents submitted response for the "Public Risk Perceptions" survey. Both the HM SPT and HM LPT were thrilled about the response rate for both surveys, which greatly exceeded previous survey participation for similar planning efforts. The results of the Visions for a Resilient Larimer County survey will be used for ongoing planning projects related to hazard risk reduction and community planning.



In addition to the project website, the Michael Baker International Team used the data from the results of the risk assessment to create a series of interactive online maps. Available to the public on the internet, the maps served as a tool for analyzing hazards and patterns of risk at various scales within the county. In addition to helping members of the HM LPT visualize and assess their risks to various hazards, the online maps were also designed as an outreach tool and were used to communicate risk to the public and to ground-truth quantitative risk assessment results at local public meetings throughout the planning process.







The following image provides a screen shot of the online mapping tool:

Finally, participating members of the Larimer County HM SPT were encouraged to initiate and sustain their own public outreach program throughout the planning process. These local representatives serve as a vital link between the county and its businesses and residents. The conversations that were held outside of the formal hazard mitigation planning meetings helped to ensure a successful, open, and collaborative planning process.

Throughout the planning process, members of the HM SPT and HM LPT leveraged any opportunities that they had to inform the public about the hazard mitigation planning project. Not only did their efforts help to inform citizens about the planning process, it also contributed to the ultimate goal of creating a more disaster resilient Larimer County. A few participating communities documented their public interactions in order to keep track of strategies that worked and to facilitate improved outreach efforts during the next plan update. This information is included in Appendix C.

Two public meetings were held in Fort Collins during the planning process to educate residents about multi-hazard risks, to gather feedback and local perspectives about risk and vulnerability to hazards, and to inform community members about the hazard mitigation planning process (including the benefits of hazard mitigation and a review of proposed mitigation actions). The following figures show flyers for the two events, the first of which was held in July 2015 and the second held in December 2015.







A Resilient Fort Collins: Mitigating Hazards in our Backyard

Larimer County and its jurisdictions have recently kicked-off a planning process to update the local hazard mitigation plan and would like input from the community.

Attend a Meeting

To learn more, the Larimer County Office of Emergency Management and City of Fort Collins invite you to a casual evening of discussions about local natural hazards and what impacts can be expected. Your input regarding what you think can be done to mitigate these impacts is important.

Questions to think about:

- What natural hazards impact you?
- What can we do to reduce these impacts?
- How could natural hazards impact those you care about and services you rely on daily?

Other details include:

- open house setting
- casual discussions facilitated by the City of Fort Collins
- high-quality, up-to-date natural hazard maps
- · opportunities to learn and share ideas

Information regarding additional meeting locations and dates, as well as background on the project and hazard mitigation, are available at *www.larimerhmp2016.com*.

Take a Survey

Public participation is a vital component of this planning process. In addition to attending upcoming meetings, we welcome you to take a brief, anonymous survey related to this project at *www.larimerhmp2016.com/home/surveys*.

Thank you for your time and participation.

OPEN HOUSE

Monday, July 27

Fort Collins Police Services Building 2221 S. Timberline Rd. 6:30–8:30 p.m. Short presentations will be given at 6:45 p.m. and 7:45 p.m.

Contact:

Lori Hodges, Larimer County Director of Emergency Management 303-656-3214

Mike Gavin, City of Fort Collins Emergency Manager 970-416-2878

www.larimerhmp2016.com











A Resilient Larimer County: Mitigating Hazards in our Backyard

Larimer County and its jurisdictions are finalizing a planning process to update the local hazard mitigation plan and would like input from the community.

Attend a Meeting

To learn more, the Larimer County Office of Emergency Management and its major cities and towns invite you to a casual evening of discussions about local natural hazards and what impacts can be expected. Your input regarding what you think can be done to mitigate these impacts is important.

Questions to think about:

- What natural hazards impact you?
- . What can we do to reduce these impacts?
- How could natural hazards impact those you care about and services you rely on daily?

Other details include:

- open house setting
- · casual discussions facilitated by city representatives
- high-quality, up-to-date natural hazard maps
- · opportunities to learn and share ideas

Information regarding additional meeting locations and dates, as well as background on the project and hazard mitigation, are available at *www.larimerhmp2016.com*.

OPEN HOUSE

Wednesday, Dec. 2, 6-8 p.m. Larimer County Building 200 West Oak St. Boyd Lake Conference Room, 1st Floor Short presentations will be given at 6:15 p.m. and 7:15 p.m.

Contact:

Lori Hodges, Larimer County Director of Emergency Management 303-656-3214

Mike Gavin, City of Fort Collins Emergency Manager 970-416-2878

Pat Mialy, Loveland Fire Rescue Authority Emergency Manager 970-962-2534

www.larimerhmp2016.com



11/15







BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

200 W. Oak Street

(970) 498-7010

Post Office Box 1190 Fort Collins, Colorado 80522-1190 Fax (970) 498-7006 E-mail: bocc@larimer.org

NEWS RELEASE

Collins

City of

CONTACT: Lori R. Hodges, Director of Emergency Management, (970) 498-7147, hodgeslr@co.larimer.co.us Mike Gavin, City of Fort Collins Emergency Management, 970-416-2878, migavin@poudre-fire.org FROM: Deni La Rue, Community Information Manager, 970.498.7150

DATE: December 11, 2015

Larimer Hazard Mitigation Plan – Public Comment SUBJECT:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Larimer Jurisdictions are looking for public input on the new Hazard Mitigation Plan

FORT COLLINS, Colo. - Larimer cities, towns, and special districts have been working collaboratively with Larimer County over the last year to update our Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. Twenty-seven different jurisdictions throughout Larimer County participated in this planning process, with additional input from non-profit and non-governmental organizations. The plan outlines the hazards that we face here in Larimer County, as well as the various ways in which each jurisdiction can mitigate those hazards in the future. Additionally, the participating jurisdictions added a social vulnerability analysis to the plan in recognition of the various social and economic factors that play a role in how each community may respond to emergencies and disasters.

Please take the time to review the plan and provide comments to ensure that the plan information accurately portrays the needs of the larger community. The public comment period will be open until January 10, 2016. Following the public comment period, the plan will be sent to the State Office of Emergency Management and to FEMA for approval, which will assist Larimer County in getting necessary support for hazard mitigation in the future.

For information regarding the plan or the process, please visit the project website at www.larimerhmp2016.com. Comments are welcome online at the project website or, if internet is not available, by contacting Lori Hodges, Director of Emergency Management at (970) 498-7147.

#####

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER





3.7 Multi-Jurisdictional Planning and Participation

The 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is a multi-jurisdictional plan. To satisfy multi-jurisdictional participation requirements, each of the local jurisdictions listed in the participation table below committed to the planning process. Each jurisdiction wishing to join the planning partnership acknowledged their understanding of the following expectations:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Meeting attendance was tracked at all planning activities and attendance records are included in Appendix A of this plan. All participating communities attended and actively participated in all meetings. Participating jurisdictions acknowledged that their failure to meet these criteria may result in being dropped from the partnership by the County, and thus losing eligibility under the scope of this plan.

| JURISDICTION | PARTICIPATED IN 2010 NORTHERN CO REGIONAL HMP | PARTICIPATED IN 2016 LARIMER COUNTY HMP | SIGNED PARTICIPATION LETTER | 2016 ADOPTION DATE |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Larimer County | • | • | N/A | May 31, 2016 |
| Town of Berthoud | • | • | • | August 1, 2016 |
| Berthoud Fire Protection District | • | • | • | September 20, 2016 |
| Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | • | • | • | June 16, 2016 |
| Colorado State University | • | • | • | N/A |
| Town of Estes Park | • | • | • | June 28, 2016 |
| Estes Park Medical Center | • | • | • | October 25, 2016 |
| Estes Valley Fire Protection District | • | • | • | June 22, 2016 |

Table 3. 2010 and 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Participation





| JURISDICTION | PARTICIPATED IN 2010 NORTHERN CO REGIONAL HMP | PARTICIPATED IN 2016 LARIMER COUNTY HMP | SIGNED PARTICIPATION LETTER | 2016 ADOPTION DATE |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Estes Valley Recreation and Park District | • | • | • | July 19, 2016 |
| City of Fort Collins | • | • | • | June 21, 2016 |
| Glacier View Fire Protection District | • | • | • | September 19, 2016 |
| Town of Johnstown | • | • | • | June 28, 2016 |
| Livermore Fire Protection District | • | • | • | October 20, 2016 |
| City of Loveland | • | • | • | July 5, 2016 |
| Loveland Fire Rescue Authority | • | • | • | June 29, 2016 |
| Northern CO Water Conservation District | • | • | • | October 13, 2016 |
| Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District | • | • | • | October 12, 2016 |
| Platte River Power Authority | • | • | • | July 28, 2016 |
| Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District | • | • | • | July 13, 2016 |
| Poudre Fire Authority | • | • | • | May 24, 2016 |
| Thompson Valley EMS | • | • | • | September 29, 2016 |
| Town of Timnath | • | • | • | October 7, 2016 |
| Upper Thompson Sanitation District | • | • | • | June 21, 2016 |
| Town of Wellington | • | • | • | August 1, 2016 |
| Wellington Fire Protection District | • | • | • | June 1, 2016 |
| Town of Windsor | • | • | • | May 27, 2016 |
| Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | • | • | • | July 14, 2016 |

3.8 Existing Planning Mechanisms

There are numerous existing regulatory and planning mechanisms in place at the state and county levels of government which support hazard mitigation planning efforts. These tools include the State of Colorado Hazard Mitigation Plan, county subdivision regulations and road and bridge standards, the Larimer County Master Plan, and local zoning regulations. These planning mechanisms were discussed at mitigation planning meetings and the members of the Larimer County HM LPT were encouraged to review all available technical information available for their jurisdictions as they worked to develop the risk





assessment and their mitigation actions. Moving forward, the local jurisdictions included in the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan will continue to integrate the goals and actions of the Plan into their evolving local planning mechanisms, including comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, and resource and land use regulations.

The State of Colorado mitigates natural hazards through a number of statutes and programs. Funded by the state and federal government, several agencies and programs within the state implement mitigation actions through assistance to local governments. State statues that are applicable to hazard mitigation are listed below:

- County Fire Planning Authority, Colorado Statute, Title 30, Article 11, Part 1:30-11-124
- Colorado Land Use Commission Authority, Colorado Revised Statute, 24-65-101 & 102
- Colorado Land Use Commission Directives & Duties, Colorado Revised Statutes, 25-65-105 & 24-65-104
- County Building Codes Master Plan, Colorado Statute, Title 30, Article 28, Part 1:30-28-106
- Local Government Land Use Control Enabling Act, Colorado Revised Statute, 29-20-101, et seq
- Local Land Use Control and Regulation, Colorado Revised Statute, 29-20-104
- Colorado Wildfire Preparedness Plan and Fund, Colorado Revised Statute 24-30-310(2)(3)
- Fire Suppression Program Rules, Colorado Revised Statute, 24-33.5-1205(1) (a)
- State Fire Ban Authority, Colorado Revised Statute, 24-30-308
- Colorado Geological Survey (CGS), Colorado Statute, 34-1-1-1 & 103
- CGS Land Use Review Program (Subdivision Law), Colorado Revised Statute, 30-28-101, et seq
- Soils & Hazard Analyses of Residential Construction Act, Colorado Revised Statute, 6-6.5-101
- Drought Mitigation Planning, Colorado Revised Statute, 37-60-126.5
- Building Codes Zoning Planning, Colorado Revised Statute, 22-32-124(1)
- Colorado Floodplain Management Authority, Colorado Revised Statute, 24-65.1-403(1)
- Emergency Dam Repair Cash Fund, Colorado Revised Statute, 37-60-122.5
- Flood Response Fund, Colorado Revised Statute, 37-60-123.2
- Office of Smart Growth, Colorado Revised Statute, 24-32-3201 et seq
- State Engineer High Hazard Dams Reports, Colorado Revised Statute, 37-87-123
- State Planning and Interest, Colorado Revised Statute, 24-65.1-203

Colorado Statute includes a number of measures that dictate the state's ability to influence land use decisions and subsequently impact local vulnerability to hazards. In most cases, these statutes allow county level and local governments to establish their own rules and regulations.

Larimer County's risk and vulnerability reduction efforts are supported by additional planning efforts, including the following:

- The 2015 Larimer County Code of Ordinances
- Larimer County Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (2015)
- Colorado Emergency Resource Mobilization Plan (2012)
- State of Colorado Emergency Operations Plan (2013)





- State of Colorado EOP Emergency Support Function Annexes (2013):
 - State of Colorado EOP Supporting Annexes (2013):
 - Evacuation
 - Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
 - o International Coordination
 - Public Affairs
 - o Tribal Relations
 - Volunteer and Donations Management
- State of Colorado EOP Incident Annexes (2013):
 - Drought Incident
 - o Tornado Incident
 - Mass Casualty Incident
 - o Earthquake Incident
 - Landslide and Debris Flow Incident
 - $\circ \quad \text{Flood Incident} \quad$
 - o Winter Incident
 - o Terrorism, Law Enforcement, and Investigation Incident
 - o Cyber Incident
 - Biological Incident
 - o Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program Incident

Larimer County is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Since it entered the program, the county has adopted the minimum NFIP requirements and imposed additional requirements into its Charter and County Code and Ordinances.

In the future, this plan will serve as a source document for risk reduction, policy making, and land use planning. It will be incorporated into existing planning mechanisms as they are updated or developed. These planning mechanisms will enhance the county's ability to implement the actions outlined in the mitigation plan. During the hazard mitigation planning process, the county worked together with local jurisdictions to identify ways in which identified mitigation actions/projects will be incorporated into their existing planning and regulatory mechanisms over time. The results of these conversations and planning activities are described in each Community Profile.




4 County Profile

Larimer County describes itself as a "thriving, friendly place where people of all ages, cultures, and economic backgrounds live, work, play and most of all, call home." Larimer County's 2013 Visions and Goals framework outlines a number of key strengths, priorities, and guiding principles that serve as key focus areas for the county:

- Our strength lies in the diversity, talents, and character of our people. We encourage and foster an environment of respect, supporting both physical and mental health.
- Our county is beautiful and clean. We protect our air and water, open spaces, and natural resources. We are prepared for wildfires, floods, and water supply. There are plenty of things to do both in nature and within our local communities.
- We have safe and clean neighborhoods, schools, businesses, roads, structures, and parks throughout our county.
- A prosperous economy is powered by innovation, education, a business-friendly atmosphere, well-paying jobs, affordable housing, and convenient transportation networks that keep pace with growth.
- We place a priority on our youth and their healthy development so that quality of life extends to future generations.
- We "tell our story" so our residents understand, engage, and are fully vested in our shared Community Vision.
- We promote collaboration with citizens, local governments, businesses, non-profits and community organizations by working together to create the County's future.

These visions reflect the character of the county and are evident in the outcomes of the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

4.1 Demographics

The current population of Larimer County is 324,122. Population forecasts are created annually by the Colorado State Demography Office. The population forecast below illustrates the population of Larimer County in future years, based on "plausible courses of future population change."

| Area | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Colorado | 4,338,801 | 5,049,717 | 5,924,692 | 6,519,379 | 7,752,887 |
| Larimer County | 253,087 | 300,532 | 360,434 | 424,882 | 483,322 |

 Table 4. Population Forecasts for Larimer County, 2000-2040

Source: State Demography Office, Colorado (2015)

In 2010, Larimer County became the sixth most populated county in the state of Colorado. Net migration (which is calculated as the difference between residents moving into and out of the county) has accounted for two thirds (over 66%) of the population increase in Larimer County between 1980 and 2009. This growth factor is estimated to account over 78% of total growth between 2010 and 2039. The Colorado State Demography Office estimates that net migration will continue to provide the large majority of population growth in Colorado through 2040.





Based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau's County Business Patterns (CBP), the following private businesses employ the lion's share of Larimer County residents:

- Poudre Valley Health Systems
- Hewlett Packard
- Center Partners
- Woodward, Inc.
- o Banner Health

In addition to the private employers listed above, several public employers (Colorado State University, Poudre and Thompson School Districts, Larimer County and the Cities of Fort Collins and Loveland) employ more than 1,500 workers each.

Larimer County is adjacent to Jackson, Grand, Boulder and Weld Counties and the State of Wyoming to the north. Major transportation corridors cross the county from east to west (State Highway 34) and north to south (I-25 and US Route 287). Many Larimer County residents commute across county boundaries for work. This creates important emergency management considerations both pre- and post-disaster. The top five commuting destinations by workers living in Larimer County are as follows (DOLA, 2010; Census *LEHD*):

- 1. Boulder County
- 2. Weld County
- 3. Denver County
- 4. Arapahoe County
- 5. Jefferson County

Larimer County has a rich agricultural history and the county's agricultural lands are rapidly vanishing as the county continues to develop. Although the number of farms in Larimer County rose steadily between 1982 and 2007, the number of acres covered by farms declined. Over the 24 year period, Larimer County saw an overall drop of 16.1% in the total acreage in farmland, compared with an increase of 56% in number of farms. The trend in Larimer County is more pronounced than it is nationally or in the state of Colorado. In Larimer County, this increase in number of farms, followed by a decrease in acreage, is due to larger farms going out of business and being resold as smaller 'ranchettes'.

4.2 Social Vulnerability

Local vulnerability to disasters depends on more than the relationship between a place and its exposure to hazards. Social and economic factors – including race, age, income, renter status, or institutionalized living – directly affect a community's ability to prepare for, respond to, and recover from hazards and disasters. The concept of social vulnerability helps explain why communities often experience a hazard event differently, even when they experience the same amount of physical impacts or property loss.

Social vulnerability to disasters refers to "the characteristics and situation of a person or group that influence their capacity to anticipate, cope with, resist, or recover from the impact of a hazard"². It is determined by a number of pre-existing social and economic characteristics. Very often, the impacts of

² Wisner, B., Blaikie, P., Cannon, T., Davis, I. (2004). At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters. London: Routledge.





hazards fall disproportionately on the most disadvantaged or marginalized people in a community – the poor, children, the elderly, the disabled, and minorities. During emergencies, for example, self-evacuation can be nearly impossible for disabled or institutionalized individuals. Additionally, the willingness of an individual/family to invest in residential mitigation actions is often limited if their home is a rental and they are adverse to investing money in long-term mitigation activity. Not only do conditions like these limit the ability of some communities to get out of harm's way, they also decrease the ability of communities to recover from and thrive in the aftermath of a disaster event.

The 2016 Plan integrates social vulnerability into the hazard risk analysis in order to more effectively identify hazard risk experienced by the most vulnerable residents and communities within the county. The social vulnerability assessment is designed to improve local decision making, hazard prioritization, and emergency management activities. By incorporating social vulnerability into the risk assessments of individual hazards, local communities are able to identify more vulnerable areas and tailor their mitigation actions to accommodate all members of their community, including the most sensitive groups.

The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003)³, a county-wide social vulnerability analysis was carried out at the census tract level. Local socioeconomic and demographic data were used to identify spatial patterns in social vulnerability across the county and have been applied to the hazards in the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The table below outlines the social vulnerability indicators that were used in the Larimer County social vulnerability analysis. Indicators with plus signs (+) are positively related to social vulnerability levels. For example, communities with higher percentages of people 65 years or older have higher levels of social vulnerability to disasters. Indicators with minus signs (-) are negatively related to social vulnerability levels. For the purpose of the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, each social vulnerability factor was weighted equally in the Social Vulnerability Index.

| Social Vulnerability Factors | Indicators |
|------------------------------|---|
| Age/Elderly | Children (Age 18 and under) (+) Elderly (Age 65 and over) (+) Social Security Recipients, % Population (+) Renter Occupied, % HH (+) Median Age |

Table 5. Social Vulnerability Indicators – Larimer County, CO

³ Cutter, S.L., Boruff, B.J., and Shirley, W.L. (2003). Social Vulnerability to Environmental Hazards. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84:242-261.





| Social Vulnerability Factors | Indicators |
|------------------------------|--|
| Special Needs | Group Quarters, % Population (+) Mobile Homes, % OCHH (+) 5 years old, % Population (+) Age 18 and under (+) |
| Ethnicity | Hispanic, % Population (+) Native American, % Population (+) Other Races, % Population (+) Pacific Islander, % Population (+) Linguistically Isolated, % Population (+) |
| Race, Class, Poverty | African American Population, % Population(+) Female Headed Households, % HH (+) No Vehicles, % HH (+) No High School Diploma, % Over 25 years old (+) Poverty, % Population Unemployment Rate (+) |
| Wealth | Asian, % Population (-) Household earnings greater than \$200K, % HH (-) Housing Density (+) Per-Capita Income (-) Population Density (+) White, % Population |

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The social vulnerability map shows relative levels of social vulnerability across the county. It is important to note that although many areas within the county have medium-low to low levels of social vulnerability, it does not mean that there are no socially vulnerable people living in those areas.

On its own, the social vulnerability map can inform communities about disparate social conditions across the county. When combined with physical hazard analyses, the map illustrates where human hardships may occur in a disaster situation. These hardships may result in citizens that are less likely to prepare, respond, withstand, or recover from a hazard event due to their elevated levels of social vulnerability. This information is valuable for both mitigation and disaster response activity.

During the risk assessment and mitigation strategy development phases of the 2016 planning process, participating jurisdictions reviewed the results of the social vulnerability analysis in conjunction with the multi-hazard risk assessment results. The social vulnerability information helped communities uncover unseen risks and better prioritize their local mitigation actions.







Figure 1. Larimer County Social Vulnerability Map⁴

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003), this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

Social vulnerability analysis is particularly useful in the context of hazard mitigation planning because it can reveal disparities within a community that make a difference when it comes to the ability of residents to prepare, evacuate, mobilize resources, and recover from disasters. The Larimer County social vulnerability assessment is designed to improve local decision making, hazard prioritization and emergency management activities. By incorporating social vulnerability into the risk assessments of

⁴ Citation: Colorado Division of Water Resources, Dam Safety Branch. Dam Inundation Consequence and Social Vulnerability Analysis. Laura Ferre and Bill McCormick. Project funding: FEMA NDSP Grant and CWCB Grant. 2013-2014.





individual hazards, local communities are able to identify highly vulnerable areas and tailor their mitigation actions to accommodate all members of their community, including the most sensitive groups.

4.3 Housing Stock

Below, the County and Regional Housing Snapshot highlights the variations and similarities between Larimer County and the State. The county's low vacancy rate means that as population growth continues to surge, rents are likely to increase, putting more pressure on the labor force and potentially leading to more commuters into the county from neighboring jurisdictions.

| | Larimer County | Colorado |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| Total Housing Units | 138,463 | 2,273,441 |
| Average Household Size | 2.42 | 2.49 |
| Group Quarter Population | 8,927 | 117,735 |
| Vacancy Rate | 6.13% | 7.64% |

Table 6. County and State Housing Snapshot

Source: Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA), 2014 Estimates

COMMUNITY VALUES, HISTORIC AND SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Historic resources include landmarks buildings, historic structures and sites, commercial and residential districts, historic rural resources, archaeological and cultural sites, and the historic environment in which they exist. Historic resources serve as visual reminders of a community's past, providing a link to its development. Preservation of these important resources makes it possible for them to continue to play an integral, vital role in the community. Currently, Larimer County has 98 properties and Historic Districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places, including two National Historic Landmarks.

Depending on the number of historic resources within a community, it can be unrealistic to assume that all of the necessary mitigation activities can be taken to protect these resources. Historic preservation and protection work must be done in a manner that retains the character-defining features of a historic property. Because this work can be costly, it is important to set priorities in terms of which resources and mitigation projects should become the point of focus. Larimer County and its jurisdictions recognizes that the preservation and maintenance historic sites and structures contributes to the cultural heritage of the county and is in the long-term best interest of the community.

4.4 Critical Facilities

Critical facilities are essential to a community's long-term disaster resilience as they are important delivery pathways for diverse crisis management services and resources. Members of the Larimer County Small Hazard Mitigation Planning Team worked collaboratively to define a critical facility inventory for the 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. For safety and security reasons, neither a map nor a detailed description of critical facilities have been included in this plan.





The following table provides a count of how many critical facilities, structures, and parcels are located in Larimer County. The table also outlines estimated replacement costs based on aggregate appraised values, when available.

| | Count | Total Assessor Value |
|---------------------|---------|----------------------|
| Structures/Parcels | 159,154 | \$80,263,478,166 |
| Critical Facilities | 937 | \$3,956,652,337 |

| Table 7. Larimer County Critical Facilities |
|---|
|---|

Critical facilities deserve additional mitigation attention because of the higher potential for the loss of life, property, and/or environmental quality in the event that they suffer significant damage. The protection of critical facilities is essential because these specific facilities can have a significant impact on the scope of damage caused by a natural disaster. Additionally, the disruption of critical facilities during a natural disaster is likely to affect response and recovery activity.

4.5 Future Development

A key strategy for reducing future losses in a community is to avoid development in known hazard areas while enforcing the development of safe structures in other areas. The purpose of this strategy is to keep people, businesses, and buildings out of harm's way before a hazard event occurs. The 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan highlights areas where future development can be expected and areas where mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions to ensure safe, smart growth in the county.

The State Demography Office, a division of the Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA), monitors population growth trends across the state and between counties. The two tables below provide a picture of future population growth rates and numbers within the state, within the Denver primary metro statistical area (PMSA), and within Larimer County.





| | Average Annual Percent Change (5 year increments) | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 00-05 | 05-10 | 10-15 | 15-20 | 20-25 | 25-30 | 30-35 | 35-40 |
| Colorado | 1.4% | 1.6% | 1.7% | 1.9% | 1.7% | 1.4% | 1.3% | 1.1% |
| Denver PMSA | 1.4% | 1.7% | 1.8% | 1.7% | 1.4% | 1.2% | 1.0% | 0.8% |
| Larimer County | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.9% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.5% | 1.4% | 1.2% |

Table 8. Population Forecasts by Region and County (2000 – 2040)

Source: Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA)

| Table 9. State Demographers | Office Population | Projections by | Region and Count | y (2010 – 2040) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|

| | Population Projections (5 year increments) | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | July, 2010 | July, 2015 | July, 2020 | July, 2025 | July, 2030 | July, 2034 | July, 2040 |
| Colorado | 5,049,717 | 5,439,290 | 5,924,692 | 6,429,532 | 6,915,379 | 7,352,327 | 7,752887 |
| Denver PMSA | 2,502,291 | 2,736,460 | 2,971,101 | 3,183,692 | 3,383,952 | 3,554,764 | 3,704,391 |
| Larimer County | 3000,532 | 329,559 | 360,434 | 393,517 | 424,882 | 454,593 | 483,322 |

Source: Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA)

The population of the county is expected to reach over 390,000 by 2025 and over 480,000 by 2040. This growth is slightly faster than the projected growth of the state of Colorado and is much faster than the projected growth rate of the Denver PMSA. The first of the following two maps shows average annual percent population change forecasts by county for the state of Colorado. Larimer County is expected to grow at a moderate rate compared to the majority of Colorado counties between now and 2040. The second map shows projected population growth across the state between 2010 and 2040. Again, Larimer County is expected to sustain large amounts of growth in the next 25 years.















Figure 3. Projected Statewide Population Growth

Larimer County has grown significantly in the past decade and is one of the fastest growing counties in the State. The amount of growth that Larimer County has seen over the past decade has been dictated by the availability of undeveloped land. Based on observed population growth trends, housing demand within Larimer County is expected to remain steady over the next decade.





5 Risk Assessment

This section of the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan describes the local Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment summary undertaken by the county and participating jurisdictions and special districts. This section consists of the following subsections:

- Introduction and Update Summary
- Climate Change and Hazards
- Hazard Profiles
 - Biological Hazards / Contagion
 - o Civil Disturbance
 - Earthquake
 - Erosion / Deposition
 - \circ Fire Wildland
 - Flood Flash and Riverine
 - Hazmat Fixed and Transport
 - Landslide / Rockslide
 - Spring / Summer Storm
 - o **Tornado**
 - Utility Disruption
 - o Winter Storm

5.1 Introduction and Update Summary

A key step in preventing disaster losses in Larimer County is developing a comprehensive understanding of the hazards that pose risks to its communities. The following terms facilitate comparisons between communities and can be found throughout the Plan.

| Hazard: | Event or physical conditions that have the potential to cause fatalities, injuries, property damage, infrastructure damage, agricultural loss, damage to the environment, interruption of business, other types of harm or loss |
|----------------|---|
| Risk: | Product of a hazard's likelihood of occurrence and its consequences to society; the estimates impact that a hazard would have on people, services, facilities, and structures in a community |
| Vulnerability: | Degree of susceptibility to physical injury, harm, damage, or economic loss; depends on an asset's construction, contents, and economic value of its functions |

Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2001

A Risk Assessment (RA) is a method for evaluating risk as defined by probability and frequency of occurrence of a hazard event, exposure of people and property to the hazard, and consequences of that exposure. Different methodologies exist for assessing the risk of hazard events, ranging from qualitative to quantitative approaches.

Larimer County and its communities are vulnerable to a wide range of natural and human-caused hazards that threaten life and property. The hazards identified by the Small Planning Team for inclusion in the Plan





are those determined to be of potential threat to the county and its municipalities and are consistent with the hazards identified by the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency for this part of the State and this region of the country. The hazards profiled for the 2016 Plan include:

- Biological Hazards / Contagion
- Civil Disturbance
- Earthquake
- Erosion / Deposition
- Fire Wildland
- Flood Flash and Riverine
- Hazmat Fixed and Transport
- Landslide / Rockslide
- Spring / Summer Storm
- Tornado
- Utility Disruption
- Winter Storm

Some of these hazards are interconnected (for example, severe storms can cause flooding and prolonged drought can lead to wildfire). Therefore, discussion of these hazards overlaps throughout the Risk Assessment. Of the sixteen (16) hazards profiled in the State of Colorado's 2013 Hazard Mitigation Plan, twelve (12) are addressed in the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. Hazards that were excluded were done so because no significant vulnerability was identified within Larimer County. The following Table summarizes this information.

| INCLUDED IN 2013 COLORADO NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN | INCLUDED IN 2010 NORTHERN COLORADO REGIONAL HMP | INCLUDED IN 2016 LARIMER COUNTY MITIGATION PLAN |
|--|--|---|
| Avalanche | Aircraft Accidents | Biological Hazards / Contagion |
| Drought | Avalanche | Civil Disturbance |
| Earthquake | Biological Hazards / Influenza | Earthquake |
| Erosion and Deposition | Civil Disturbance | Erosion / Deposition |
| Expansive Soil | Dam Failure | Fire – Wildland |
| Extreme Temperatures | Drought / Extreme Heat | Flood – Flash and Riverine |
| Flood | Earthquake | Hazmat – Fixed and Transport |
| Hail | Fire – Urban | Landslide / Rockslide |
| Landslide, Mud/Debris Flow, Rockfall | Fire – Wildland | Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) |
| Lightning | Flood – Flash and Riverine | Tornado |
| Pest Infestation | Hail Storm | Utility Disruption |
| Severe Wind | Hazmat – Fixed Facility | Winter Storm (Blizzard |
| Subsidence | Hazmat – Transportation | Conditions, Heavy Snow |
| T | | Accumulation) |

Table 10. State/Region/County Plan Hazards Matrix



Landslide / Rockslide



Tornado

| INCLUDED IN 2013 COLORADO NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN | INCLUDED IN 2010 NORTHERN COLORADO REGIONAL HMP | INCLUDED IN 2016 LARIMER COUNTY MITIGATION PLAN |
|--|--|--|
| Wildfire | Lightning | |
| Winter Storm | Terrorism / WMD | |
| | Tornado | |
| | Utility Interruption | |
| | Wind Storm – Severe | |
| | Winter Storm - Severe | |

To further focus on the list of identified hazards for the Plan, the following table presents a list of all federal disaster and emergency declarations that have occurred in Larimer County since 1953, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency. This list presents the foundation for identifying what hazards pose the greatest risk to the County and to its local jurisdictions.

Table 11. Presidential Disaster and Emergency Declarations in Larimer County

| DECLARATION # | DATE | EVENT DETAILS |
|---------------|------------|--|
| FEMA-4145-DR | 09/14/2013 | Severe Storms, Flooding, Landslides, and Mudslides |
| FEMA-3365-EM | 09/12/2013 | Severe Storms, Flooding, Landslides, and Mudslides |
| FEMA-4067-DR | 06/28/2012 | High Park and Waldo Canyon Wildfires |
| FEMA-2980-FM | 06/09/2012 | High Park Fire |
| FEMA-2877-FM | 04/03/2011 | Crystal Fire |
| FEMA-2857-FM | 09/12/2010 | Reservoir Road Fire |
| FEMA-1762-DR | 05/26/2008 | Severe Storms and Tornadoes |
| FEMA-3270-EM | 01/07/2007 | Snow |
| FEMA-3224-EM | 09/05/2005 | Hurricane Katrina Evacuation |
| FEMA-2514-FM | 4/1/2004 | CO - PICNIC ROCK FIRE - 03/30/2004 |
| FEMA-2511-FM | 11/12/2003 | CO - BUCKHORN CREEK FIRE - 11/11/2003 |
| FEMA-2486-FM | 7/25/2003 | CO-CLOUDY PASS FIRE-07/25/2003 |
| FEMA-EM-3185 | 04/09/2003 | Snowstorm |





| DECLARATION # | DATE | EVENT DETAILS |
|---------------|------------|---|
| FEMA-2447-FS | 07/18/2002 | Big Elk Fire |
| FEMA-1421-DR | 6/19/2002 | Wildfires |
| FEMA- 2383-FS | 11/1/2001 | CO – Armageddon Fire |
| FEMA-2308-FS | 6/12/2000 | Bobcat Gulch Fire |
| FEMA-1276-DR | 05/17/1999 | CO Flooding 4/30/1999 |
| FEMA-1186-DR | 08/01/1997 | Severe Storms, Heavy Rain, and Flash Floods, Flooding, Mudslides |
| FEMA-665-DR | 7/22/1982 | Flash Flood Due to Dam Failure |
| FEMA-517-DR | 08/02/1976 | Severe Storms and Flash Flooding |
| FEMA-385-DR | 05/23/1973 | Heavy Rain, Snowmelt, Flooding |
| FEMA-261-DR | 05/19/1969 | Severe Storms, Flooding |
| FEMA-200-DR | 06/19/1965 | Tornadoes, Severe Storms, Flooding |

Source: FEMA Disaster Declarations Summary – Open Government Dataset













Hazards were ranked in order to provide structure and prioritize the mitigation goals and actions discussed in the Plan. Ranking was both quantitative and qualitative. First, the quantitative analysis considered all the historical and geospatial hazard-specific data available. Then, a qualitative method, the Risk Factor (RF) approach, was used to provide additional insights on the specific risks associated with each hazard. This process also served as a valuable cross-check and validation of the quantitative analysis performed.

The RF approach combines historical experiences, local knowledge, and consensus opinions to produce numerical values that allow identified hazards to be ranked against one another. During the planning process, the Larimer County HM SPT compared the results of the hazard profile against their local knowledge to generate a set of ranking criteria. These criteria were used to evaluate hazards and identify those posing the highest risk.





RF values are obtained by assigning varying degrees of risk to five categories for each hazard: *probability, impact, spatial extent, warning time*, and *duration*. Each degree of risk is assigned a value ranging from 1 to 4 and a weighing factor for each category was agreed upon by the MH SPT (documented in the following Table). To calculate the RF value for a given hazard, the assigned risk value for each category is multiplied by the weighting factor. The sum of all five categories equals the final RF value, as demonstrated in the following example equation:

RF Value = [(Probability x .30) + (Impact x .30) +

(Spatial Extent x .20) + (Warning Time x .10) + (Duration x .10)]

| RISK ASSESSMENT CATEGORY | LEVEL | DEGREE OF RISK LEVEL | INDEX | WEIGHT |
|--|----------|-------------------------|-------|--------|
| | UNLIKELY | LESS THAN 1% ANNUAL | 1 | |
| | | PROBABILITY | _ | |
| What is the likelihood of a | POSSIBLE | BETWEEN 1 & 10% | 2 | |
| bazard event occurring in a | | ANNUAL PROBABILITY | | 30% |
| | | BETWEEN 10 &100% | 3 | 5676 |
| given year? | | ANNUAL PROBABILITY | | |
| | | 100% ANNUAL | Д | |
| | | PROBABILTY | + | |
| | | VERY FEW INJURIES, IF | | |
| | | ANY. ONLY MINOR | 1 | |
| IMPACT In terms of injuries, damage, or death, would you | MINOR | PROPERTY DAMAGE & | | |
| | | MINIMAL DISRUPTION | | |
| | | OF QUALITY OF LIFE. | | |
| | | TEMPORARY | | |
| | | SHUTDOWN OF | | |
| anticipate impacts to be | | CRITICAL FACILITIES. | | 20% |
| minor, limited, critical, or | | MINOR INJURIES ONLY. | | 50% |
| catastrophic when a | | MORE THAN 10% OF | | |
| significant hazard event | | PROPERTY IN AFFECTED | | |
| occurs? | | AREA DAMAGED OR | 2 | |
| | | DESTROYED. COMPLETE | 2 | |
| | | SHUTDOWN OF | | |
| | | CRITICAL FACILITIES FOR | | |
| | | MORE THAN ONE DAY. | | |

| TADIE 12. RISK FACIOF CITETIA | Table | 12. | Risk | Factor | Criteria |
|-------------------------------|-------|-----|------|--------|----------|
|-------------------------------|-------|-----|------|--------|----------|





| RISK ASSESSMENT CATEGORY | LEVEL | DEGREE OF RISK LEVEL | INDEX | WEIGHT |
|---|------------------|--|-------|--------|
| | CRITICAL | MULTIPLE DEATHS/INJURIES POSSIBLE. MORE THAN 25% OF PROPERTY IN AFFECTED AREA DAMAGED OR DESTROYED. COMPLETE SHUTDOWN OF CRITICAL FACILITIES FOR MORE THAN ONE WEEK. | 3 | |
| | CATASTROPHIC | HIGH NUMBER OF DEATHS/INJURIES POSSIBLE. MORE THAN 50% OF PROPERTY IN AFFECTED AREA DAMAGED OR DESTROYED. COMPLETE SHUTDOWN OF CRITICAL FACILITIES FOR 30 DAYS OR MORE. | 4 | |
| SPATIAL EXTENT How large of an area could be impacted by a hazard event? Are impacts localized or regional? | NEGLIGIBLE | LESS THAN 1% OF AREA AFFECTED | 1 | |
| | SMALL | BETWEEN 1 & 10% OF AREA AFFECTED | 2 | 2001 |
| | MODERATE | BETWEEN 10 & 50% OF AREA AFFECTED | 3 | 20% |
| | LARGE | BETWEEN 50 & 100% OF AREA AFFECTED | 4 | |
| WARNING TIME | MORE THAN 24 HRS | SELF DEFINED | 1 | |
| Is there usually some lead | 12 TO 24 HRS | SELF DEFINED | 2 | |
| time associated with the hazard event? Have warning measures been implemented? | 6 TO 12 HRS | SELF DEFINED | 3 | 10% |
| | LESS THAN 6 HRS | SELF DEFINED | 4 | |
| DURATION | LESS THAN 6 HRS | SELF DEFINED | 1 | |
| How long does the hazard | LESS THAN 24 HRS | SELF DEFINED | 2 | 10% |
| event usually last? | LESS THAN 1 WEEK | SELF DEFINED | 3 | |





| RISK ASSESSMENT CATEGORY | LEVEL | DEGREE OF RISK LEVEL | INDEX | WEIGHT |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------|--------|
| | MORE THAN 1 WEEK | SELF DEFINED | 4 | |

According to the default weighting scheme applied, the highest possible RF value is 4.0. The methodology illustrated above lists categories that are used to calculate the variables for the RF value.

HAZARD RANKING RESULTS

The following table summarizes the results of the Risk Factor ranking exercise performed by Larimer County. The results represent the relative rank of different hazards within the county from the perspective of local stakeholders and subject matter experts.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 2.70 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.20 |
| Earthquake | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.80 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.30 |
| Fire - Wildland | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 3.30 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 3.40 |
| HAZMAT | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.50 |
| Landslide/ Rockslide | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.50 |
| Spring / Summer Storm | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.90 |
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.70 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.30 |
| Winter Storm | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.60 |

Table 13. Risk Factor Results for Larimer County





Based on the Larimer County RF analysis, the natural hazards with the highest Risk Factor scores are Flood and Fire. Both hazards have a RF value over 3.0. This is primarily due to the high probability of the hazards occurring and the wide spatial extent of their potential damages and impacts. Biological Hazards/Contagion, Earthquake, HAZMAT, Landslide/Rockslide, Spring/Summer Storm, Tornado, and Winter Storm also ranked within the "High Risk" RF category. Civil Disturbance, Erosion/Deposition, and Utility Disruption round out the list of moderate to high ratings, with scores between 2.2 and 2.3.

The conclusions drawn from the qualitative assessment carried out by Larimer County were organized into three categories (shown in the following table) and provided a summary of hazard risk for Larimer County based on High, Moderate or Low risk designations. This process helped frame ongoing planning discussions around local and regional hazard risks and assisted with the prioritization of mitigation actions.

| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | Biological Hazards/Contagion; Earthquake; Fire – Wildland; Flood – Flash and Riverine; HAZMAT; Landslide/Rockslide; Spring/Summer Storm; Tornado; Winter Storm |
|---------------------------|--|
| MODERATE RISK (2.0 – 2.4) | Civil Disturbance; Erosion/Deposition; Utility Disruption |
| LOW RISK (1.9 or lower) | None |

Table 14. Hazard Risk Conclusions for Larimer County

Although the following hazards from the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazards Mitigation Plan were not included in the risk assessment for the 2016 Larimer County Plan, they can impact residents of Larimer County (as evidenced by their inclusion in the 2010 plan). For this reason, descriptions of these hazards have been included below to facilitate decision making and the hazard prioritization process during the next plan update:

<u>Aircraft Accidents</u>: Aircraft accidents can occur at any location, with significant differences in magnitude due to the size of aircraft, altitude of the incident, and population density at the crash site and/or debris field. The cities of Fort Collins and Loveland, and Larimer County, are subject to potential aircraft accidents. The cities of Loveland and Fort Collins share a municipal airport that offers limited commercial service. The Fort Collins-Loveland Municipal Airport primarily handles small aircraft and helicopters, along with various larger private and commercial aircraft. The airspace above this region is utilized and controlled by Denver Center, which also services the Denver International Airport (DIA). The City of Fort Collins operated the Fort Collins Downtown Airport until 2005, when it was permanently closed. Larimer County experienced several aircraft accidents while controlling wildland fires during 2001.

<u>Avalanche</u>: An avalanche is a mass of snow, ice, and other debris that flows and/or slides rapidly down a steep slope. If conditions are right, an avalanche can reach speeds in excess of 150 mph. Avalanches can be triggered by either natural causes such as earthquake, thermal changes, or blizzards, or by human activities such as snowmobiling, skiing, or hiking. The greatest threat of avalanche is in the mountainous area of Larimer County. While avalanches are quite common in the mountains, the risk of personal injury or property damage from avalanche is minimal due to the remote location. There is minimal development in mountainous areas where avalanches occur. Furthermore, there is usually a small number of people in the area when avalanches occur.





<u>Dam Failure</u>: Dam failures are rare; however, they can cause immense damage and loss of life when they occur. The hazard risk associated with dam failure is determined by the potential loss of life and downstream property damage it may cause. There are many reasons and/or potential causes for dam failure, including terrorism, earthquakes, rapid erosion, etc. However, the most common reasons for dam failure are spillway design error, geologic instability, poor maintenance, extreme rainfall, and dam design error.

<u>Drought / Extreme Heat</u>: According to the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional HMP, drought is defined as "a shortage of water associated with a deficiency of precipitation." The 2010 plan highlights, however, that water shortages can also be induced by humans through water mismanagement practices: *drought occurs when a normal amount of moisture is not available to satisfy an area's usual water-consuming activities.* For the purpose of the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan, drought was defined as a condition of climatic dryness that is severe enough to reduce soil moisture and water below the minimum necessary for sustaining plant, animal, and human life systems.

Although Extreme Heat was not profiled in the 2016 HMP, it is a hazard that has increasing potential to impact residents of Larimer County. The City of Fort Collins recently commissioned an Extreme Heat Report (The Rocky Mountain Climate Organization, 2014) and the information included in the report has great potential to be useful for future planning efforts and hazard mitigation plan updates.⁵

<u>Fire – Urban</u>: Structure fires are among the most costly of fires in the nation. The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) reports that residential structure fires currently account for 25 percent of fires nationwide, 83 percent of fire deaths, 77 percent of fire injuries, and 64 percent of direct dollar loss from fire (2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan). Most structure fires in the region occur in residential occupancies. The two primary reasons for the lack of significant commercial structure fires are constantly improving business safety practices and frequent fire department inspections

<u>Terrorism / WMD</u>: Terrorism is defined in the U.S. Patriot Act as "activities that (A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the U.S. or of any state; that (B) appear to be intended (i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population, (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion, or (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and (C) occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the U.S." Terrorism can be domestic or international depending on its origin, base, and the objectives of the terrorist. Incidents usually involve a criminal act, often symbolic in nature and intended to influence an audience beyond the immediate victims. Although political violence has existed in the country since the American Revolution, new forms of politically motivated terrorism are rapidly emerging.

5.2 Climate Change and Hazards

In May of 2014, the U.S. Global Change Research Program released the Third U.S. National Climate Assessment, the authoritative and comprehensive report on climate change and its impacts in the United States. Not only did the report confirm that climate change is affecting Americans in every region of the U.S., the report identifies increased heat, drought, insect outbreaks, wildfire, and flooding as key climate-related concerns for the Southwest region of the U.S. (which includes Colorado).⁶

⁶ *Third U.S. National Climate Assessment*, 2014. U.S. Global Change Research Program.





⁵ *Extreme Heat in Fort Collins*, 2014. The Rocky Mountain Climate Organization.

The myriad impacts of climate change are already being felt by communities and ecosystems in the southwestern United States. The Southwest is the hottest and driest region in the U.S. and climate change poses significant challenges for an already parched region that is expected to get hotter and significantly drier.

Recent warming in the region is among the most rapid in the nation and is significantly greater than the global average, and the period since 1950 has been hotter than any comparable long period in at least 600 years. Current climate models predict that average temperatures in Colorado will warm by 2.5°F to 5.5°F by 2041-2070 and by 5.5°F to 9.5°F by 2070-2099.⁷ Summer temperatures across the state are expected to warm more than winter temperatures and projections suggest that typical summer months will be as warm as (or warmer than) the hottest 10% of summers that occurred between 1950 and 1999.⁸



Figure 6. Climate Change: Projected Temperature Increases in the Southwestern U.S.

The maps in the preceding Figure show projected changes in average temperatures in the Southwest region, as compared to 1971-1999. The top row of the figure (A2) shows projections assuming heat-trapping gas emissions continue to rise (also known as "business-as-usual"). The bottom row (B1) shows projections assuming substantial reductions in emissions. These temperature changes have great potential to directly affect urban public health through increased risk of heat stress, and urban infrastructure through increased risk of disruptions of electric power generation. Rising temperatures also have direct impacts on crop yields and productivity of key regional crops and livestock.

The impacts of climate change already pose a threat to people and property in the southwest region of the United States, including Larimer County. Together, these impacts represent a slow-onset disaster that is likely to manifest and change over time. Recently, climate change impacts have altered the intensity and rate of weather and climate extremes in the region. Current projections predict even more

⁸ Colorado Climate Change: A Synthesis to Support Water Resource Management and Adaptation. Colorado Water Conservation Board (2008).





⁷ Third U.S. National Climate Assessment, 2014. U.S. Global Change Research Program.

rapid changes in the near future, which are likely to affect hazards such as heat waves, wildfire, and drought.⁹

In the future, many of the natural hazards that Larimer County has historically dealt with are likely to evolve due to the effects of climate change. This is particularly true for drought, flooding, wildfire and extreme temperature hazards. The nature of erosion/land subsidence and public health hazards are also likely to evolve in intensity and character due to a changing regional climate. For these reasons, the hazard identification and risk assessment for the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation plan includes a discussion of how climate change may impact the frequency, intensity, and distribution of specific hazards within the county. Because many impacts of climate-related hazards cross county boundaries, some of the discussion looks at impacts on a regional scale. As climate science evolves, future mitigation plan updates may consider including climate change projections in the risk rankings and vulnerability assessments of the hazards included in the Plan.

5.3 Hazard Profiles

Over time, accepted risk assessment methodologies evolve, develop, and grow. Data availability also tends to change as funding shifts and technological improvements emerge. For this reason, it is important to incorporate best available data and analysis strategies when formulating a comprehensive mitigation plan. The following summarizes the vulnerability and loss estimation methodologies used in the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan and presents the updated methodologies used for the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. This table highlights the progress of Larimer County's hazard mitigation planning efforts over time and provides a record of data use to inform future mitigation planning projects in the County.

The following table summarizes the methodologies used in the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan to analyze vulnerability and estimate losses associated with each identified hazard, and the updated methodologies used as part of the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

⁹ Summary for Policy Makers: Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. IPCC (2012).





| | 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan | 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan |
|---|---|---|
| Atmospheric Hazar | rds | |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | <i>Vulnerability Analysis:</i> Input from city / county departments, public input, review of past disaster declarations, identification of NFIP losses of properties in the region <i>Loss Estimation:</i> None | Vulnerability Analysis: Enhanced Hazus Level 2 analysis of a 1% annual chance flood event scenario using: FEMA defined 100-yr floodplains supplemented by additional floodplains provided by the City of Fort Collins, best available LiDAR and DEMs terrain coverages; Critical facilities also assessed separately; UDF/parcel centroids; inundation extents and flood depth and boundaries from the 2013 flood event (for select areas); Narrative of historical flood events from NCDC and the current State Hazard Mitigation Plan |
| | | event scenario using: FEMA defined 100-yr floodplains supplemented by Hazus 100-yr floodplains, best available LiDAR and DEMs terrain coverages; UDF/parcel centroids; Critical facilities also assessed separately. |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | <u>Hail</u> <i>Vulnerability Analysis (Hail):</i> Public input, review of past declarations | <u>Hail</u> <i>Vulnerability Analysis:</i> GIS mapping using Storm Prediction Center historical hail events; Narrative of historical events from NCDC. |
| | <i>Loss Estimation (Hail):</i> None <u>Lightning</u> <i>Vulnerability Analysis (Lightning):</i> NWS, review of past incidents | <i>Loss Estimation:</i> Narrative; Loss estimates based on historical events reported by NCDC; Loss estimates representing 10 percent, 30 percent and 50 percent of the assessed value of exposed building stock/critical facilities for those jurisdictions and districts ranking this hazard as high. |
| | Loss Estimation (Lightning): None <u>Wind Storm</u> Vulnerability Analysis: NWS reports, review of past incidents, input from OEM | Lightning Vulnerability Analysis: GIS mapping using National Weather Service Historical lightning flash density maps; National Climatic Data Center - Historical lightning events by county and jurisdiction. |
| | <i>Loss Estimation:</i> None <u>Thunderstorm</u> | <i>Loss Estimation:</i> Narrative; Loss estimates based on historical events reported by NCDC; National Weather Service - Historical lightning casualties by county. <u>Wind Storm</u> |

Table 15. Summary of Vulnerability Analysis and Loss Estimation and Methodologies

| | 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan | 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan |
|------------------|--|---|
| | Not profiled in previous plan | Vulnerability Analysis: Assessment of historical high wind events based on data supplied by the NCDC. Loss Estimation: Narrative; Loss estimates based on historical events reported by NCDC <u>Thunderstorm</u> Vulnerability Analysis: Assessment of historical thunderstorm events based on data supplied by the NCDC. Loss Estimation: Narrative |
| Tornado | Vulnerability Analysis: NWS reports, review of past disasters, input from residents Loss Estimation: None | <i>Vulnerability Analysis:</i> Assessment of historical tornado events based on data supplied by the NCDC: Storm Paths and F-scale mapping from NCDC; Social vulnerability/housing stock analysis for vulnerable community identification. <i>Loss Estimation:</i> Narrative; Loss estimates based on historical events reported by NCDC |
| Winter Storm | Vulnerability Analysis: Emergency response records, business interruption reports, traffic reports, NWS reports, news articles, public input, utility input Loss Estimation: None | Vulnerability Analysis: Vulnerability Analysis: Narrative of historical eventsfrom NCDC, Larimer OEM, CDEMLoss Estimation: Narrative; Loss estimates based on historical events reportedby NCDC |
| Geologic Hazards | | |
| Earthquake | <i>Vulnerability Analysis:</i> Geological reports, history of incidents in the area <i>Loss Estimation:</i> Narrative | Vulnerability Analysis: Hazus Level 2 analysis of a Golden Fault scenario using:CGS fault, soil, and landslide inputs and FEMA Region VIII updated enhanced(Level 2) building inventory derived from local, state, and federal datasources; Critical facilities also assessed separately; Narrative of historicalearthquake events from COGS and the current State Hazard Mitigation PlanLoss Estimation: Hazus Level 2 analysis of a Golden Fault scenario using: CGSfault, soil, and landslide inputs and FEMA Region VIII updated enhanced |

| | 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan | 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| | | (Level 2) building inventory derived from local, state, and federal data sources; Critical facilities also assessed separately. |
| Erosion / Deposition | Not profiled in previous plan | Vulnerability Analysis: GIS mapping and analysis using building stock data and COGS expansive soil, collapsible soil, subsidence, and undermined areas; Narrative of historical land subsidence events from CGS and the current State Hazard Mitigation Plan. |
| Deposition | | Loss Estimation: Loss estimates representing 10 percent, 50 percent and 100 percent of the assessed value of exposed building stock/critical facilities; Counts and estimated losses focused on those areas classified at potential risk. |
| Landslide / | <i>Vulnerability Analysis:</i> CDOT Records, input from utilities | Vulnerability Analysis: GIS mapping and analysis using building stock/critical facility data and CGS rockfall and historical/potential landslide areas; Narrative of historical land subsidence events from COGS and the current State Hazard Mitigation Plan. |
| Rockslide | Loss Estimation: None | <i>Loss Estimation:</i> Loss estimates representing 10 percent, 50 percent and 100 percent of the assessed value of exposed building stock/critical facilities; Counts and estimated losses focused on those areas classified at potential risk. |
| Other Hazards | | |
| Biological | Vulnerability Analysis: Input from health officials, Review of local | Vulnerability Analysis: Narrative based on records of historical occurrences (Colorado CDPHE) |
| Hazards / Contagion | Loss Estimation: None | Loss Estimation: Assessment of loss using CDC's FluWorkLoss 1.0 tool. The tool estimates the potential number of days lost from work due to a pandemic based on Census 2010 data (Source: CO-specific Census data in the CDC's FluAid program) |

| | 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan | 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Civil Disturbance | Vulnerability Analysis: Review of past incidents, input from local law enforcement, input from residents | Vulnerability Analysis: Review of past incidents, input from local law enforcement, input from residents |
| | Loss Estimation: None | Loss Estimation: Narrative |
| Fire — Wildland | <i>Vulnerability Analysis:</i> County Wild and Plan, input from USFS, review of past disasters <i>Loss Estimation:</i> None | Vulnerability Analysis: GIS mapping and analysis using building stock/critical facility data and COWRAP wildfire and wildland urban interface risk analysis; Reference analysis included in County CWPPs; Narrative of historical prairie fire events. Loss Estimation: Loss estimates representing 10 percent, 50 percent and 100 percent of the assessed value of exposed building stock/critical facilities; Counts and estimated losses focused on those areas classified as most vulnerable across the county based on COWRAP analysis. |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | Vulnerability Analysis: Public input, risk assessments, review of past incidents Loss Estimation: None | Vulnerability Analysis: Incident report Database-PHMSA - Office of Hazardous Materials Safety- Historical Hazmat incidents Loss Estimation: Narrative |
| Utility Disruption | Vulnerability Analysis: Input received during public meeting process | Vulnerability Analysis: Input received during public meeting process |
| | | |

The following table shows a summary of each participating jurisdictions' self-identified vulnerability to the hazards identified in the Plan. The results are a product of each jurisdiction's review of the multi-hazard risk assessment and their individual RF value obtained by assigning varying degrees of risk to the five categories for each hazard: *probability, impact, spatial extent, warning time,* and *duration*.





| | Biological Hazards | Civil Disturbance | Earthquake | Erosion / Deposition | Fire - Wildland | Flood | Hazmat | Landslide / Rockslide | Spring / Summer Storm | Tornado | Utility Disruption | Winter Storm |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Larimer County | High Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk |
| Town of Berthoud | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | High Risk |
| Berthoud Fire Protection District | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk |
| Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk |
| Colorado State University | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk |
| Town of Estes Park | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk |
| Estes Park Medical Center | High Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk |
| Estes Valley Fire Protection District | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk |
| Estes Valley Recreation and Park District | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk |
| City of Fort Collins | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk |
| Glacier View Fire Protection District | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk |
| Town of Johnstown | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk |
| Livermore Fire Protection District | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk |

Table 16. Hazard Vulnerability Summary by Jurisdiction

| | Biological Hazards | Civil Disturbance | Earthquake | Erosion / Deposition | Fire - Wildland | Flood | Hazmat | Landslide / Rockslide | Spring / Summer Storm | Tornado | Utility Disruption | Winter Storm |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| City of Loveland | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk |
| Loveland Fire Rescue Authority | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk |
| Northern CO Water Conservation District | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk |
| Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk |
| Platte River Power Authority | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk |
| Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk |
| Poudre Fire Authority | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk |
| Thompson Valley EMS | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk |
| Town of Timnath | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | High Risk |
| Upper Thompson Sanitation District | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk |
| Town of Wellington | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk |
| Wellington Fire Protection District | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk |
| Town of Windsor | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk |

| | Biological Hazards | Civil Disturbance | Earthquake | Erosion / Deposition | Fire - Wildland | Flood | Hazmat | Landslide / Rockslide | Spring / Summer Storm | Tornado | Utility Disruption | Winter Storm |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | High Risk | Moderate Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | Moderate Risk | High Risk | High Risk | Low Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk | High Risk |

The following sections provide hazard profiles and risk assessments for each of the hazards identified by the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Planning Team for the 2016 Plan update. The hazards are presented in alphabetical order rather than by their levels of risk.

5.3.1 Biological Hazards / Contagion

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|-----------|--|
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 2.70 | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

Biological hazards and contagions, including epidemics and pandemics, have the potential to cause serious illness and death, especially among those who have compromised immune systems due to age or underlying medical conditions. There are several contagious and infectious diseases present in the State of Colorado that constitute a public health risk. Emergency Support Function 8 (ESF 8) of the State Emergency Operations Plan provides an organizational framework for public health and medical service preparedness, response, and recovery efforts for various emergency epidemics. During the 2016 planning process, pandemic flu was identified as the key public health hazard in the county. This hazard risk assessment includes an analysis of pandemic flu risk in Larimer County and an analysis of the impacts of the hazards profiled in this plan on biological hazards and contagions.

A pandemic can be defined as a disease that attacks a large population across great geographic distances. Pandemics are larger than epidemics in terms of geographic area and number of people affected. Epidemics tend to occur seasonally and affect much smaller areas. Pandemics, on the other hand, are most often caused by new subtypes of viruses or bacteria for which humans have little or no natural resistance. Consequently, pandemics typically result in more deaths, social disruption, and economic loss than epidemics.

According to data from the Colorado Reportable Disease Statistics (CDPHE) database, Influenza viruses represent the most common cause of hospitalization due to disease in Larimer County. Seasonal influenza (often referred to as the flu) is a common infection that affects large numbers of people in Colorado every year. Influenza is an acute respiratory disease caused by influenza type A or B viruses. The typical features of seasonal influenza include abrupt onset of fever and respiratory symptoms such as cough, sore throat, as well as headache, muscle ache, and fatigue. For seasonal influenza, the incubation period ranges from 1 to 4 days and the clinical severity of infection can range from asymptomatic infection to primary viral pneumonia and death. Most people experience influenza as a very-uncomfortable but ultimately benign illness. However, the influenza virus can mutate, causing it to be much more dangerous to humans. Yearly seasonal influenza remains a significant disease in the U.S. and Colorado, and seasonal epidemics can result in high morbidity and mortality, as well as create strains on the health care system and communities.

Unlike influenza viruses that have achieved ongoing transmission in humans, the sporadic human infections with avian A (H5N1) viruses are far more severe with high mortality. Initial symptoms include





high fever and other influenza-like symptoms. It also appears that the incubation period in humans may be longer for avian (H5N1) viruses, ranging from 2 to 8 days, and possibly as long as 17 days. Diarrhea, vomiting, abdominal pain, chest pain, and bleeding from the nose and gums have also been reported. The disease often manifests as a rapid progression of pneumonia with respiratory failure ensuing over several days.

With the increase in global transport, as well as urbanization, epidemics due to new influenza viruses are likely to occur in and around Larimer County. A new flu virus, which eventually became known as H1N1, came to the world's attention in March 2009. The symptoms of pandemic H1N1 2009 influenza were similar to those of seasonal influenza. Illness in most cases was mild but there were cases of severe disease requiring hospitalization and a number of deaths. The initial experience with the emerging pandemic of H1N1 prompted the World Health Organization (WHO) to redefine their phase descriptions for an influenza pandemic.

The six-phase approach was designed for the easy incorporation of recommendations into existing national and local preparedness and response plans. Phases 1—3 correlate with preparedness in the **pre-pandemic interval**, including capacity development and response planning activities, while Phases 4—6 signal the need for response and mitigation efforts during the **pandemic interval**.

Pre-Pandemic Interval

In nature, influenza viruses circulate continuously among animals (primarily birds). Even though such viruses might develop into pandemic viruses, in Phase 1 no viruses circulating among animals have been reported to cause infections in humans.

• **Phase 1** is the natural state in which influenza viruses circulate continuously among animals but do not affect humans.

In Phase 2 an animal influenza virus circulating among domesticated or wild animals is known to have caused infection in humans, and is thus considered a potential pandemic threat.

• **Phase 2** involves cases of animal influenza that have circulated among domesticated or wild animals and have caused specific cases of infection among humans.

In Phase 3 an animal or human-animal influenza virus has caused sporadic cases or small clusters of disease in people, but has not resulted in human-to-human transmission sufficient to sustain community-level outbreaks. Limited human-to-human transmission may occur under some circumstances, for examples, when there is close contact between an infected person and an unprotected caregiver. Limited transmission under these circumstances does not indicate that the virus has gained the level of transmissibility among humans necessary to cause a pandemic.

• **Phase 3** represents the mutation of the animal influenza virus in humans so that it can be transmitted to other humans under certain circumstances (usually very close contact between individuals). At this point, small clusters of infection have occurred.





Pandemic Interval

Phase 4 is characterized by verified human to human transmission of the virus able to cause "communitylevel outbreaks." The ability to cause sustained disease outbreaks in a community marks a significant upward shift in the risk for a pandemic.

• **Phase 4** involves community-wide outbreaks as the virus continues to mutate and become more easily transmitted between people (for example, transmission through the air)

Phase 5 is characterized by verified human to human spread of the virus into at least two countries in one World Health Organization (WHO) region. While most countries will not be affected at this stage, the declaration of Phase 5 is a strong signal that a pandemic is imminent and that the time to finalize the organization, communication, and implementation of the planned mitigation measures is short.

• Phase 5 represents human-to-human transmission of the virus in at least two countries

Phase 6, the pandemic phase, is characterized by community-level outbreaks in at least one other country in a different WHO region in addition to the criteria defined in Phase 5. Designation of this phase will indicate that a global pandemic is underway.

• **Phase 6** is the pandemic phase, characterized by community-level influenza outbreaks.

Zoonotic Diseases

Zoonotic diseases are diseases that can be spread through animals and humans. These diseases can be caused by bacteria, viruses, parasites, and fungi that are carried by animals and insects.

Previous Occurrences

Public health hazards can manifest as primary events by themselves, or they may be secondary to another disaster or emergency, such as a flood, a severe storm, or a hazardous materials incident. The common characteristic of most public health emergencies is that they adversely impact, or have the potential to adversely impact, a large number of people.

The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment releases an annual reportable disease summary for each county. The events with the highest incidences in Larimer County between 2010 and 2014 are summarized in the table below.

| | Year | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|--|--|--|
| Disease | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | Total | | | |
| CAMPYLOBACTER | 91 | 78 | 49 | 80 | 62 | 360 | | | |
| CRYPTOSPORIDIOSIS | 8 | 14 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 41 | | | |
| GIARDIASIS | 21 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 16 | 81 | | | |

Table 17. Colorado Reportable Disease Statistics CDPHE, Larimer County





| | | | Ye | ar | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Disease | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | Total |
| HAEMOPHILUS INFLUENZAE | 5 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 23 |
| HEPATITIS B, CHRONIC | 14 | 19 | 16 | 18 | 22 | 89 |
| HEPATITIS C, CHRONIC | 115 | 104 | 94 | 80 | 80 | 473 |
| INFLUENZA-hospitalized | 1 | 40 | 69 | 103 | 169 | 382 |
| KAWASAKI SYNDROME | 3 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| MENINGITIS ASEPTIC/VIRAL | 29 | 24 | 19 | 6 | 7 | 85 |
| PERTUSSIS | 8 | 7 | 79 | 81 | 79 | 254 |
| SALMONELLOSIS | 34 | 21 | 37 | 28 | 39 | 159 |
| SHIGELLOSIS | 2 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 3 | 28 |
| STEC (shiga toxin producing E.coli) | 21 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 5 | 69 |
| STREP PNEUMO INVASIVE | 16 | 20 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 86 |
| VARICELLA(CHICKEN POX) | 22 | 29 | 43 | 20 | 41 | 155 |
| WEST NILE VIRUS | 14 | 2 | - | - | - | 16 |
| Total: | 404 | 398 | 476 | 473 | 557 | 2,308 |

Source: Division of Disease Control and Environmental Epidemiology, CDPHE

Chronic Hepatitis C and hospitalizations from influenza represent the largest disease incidence in Larimer County between 2010 and 2014.

Inventory Exposed

The information in the table below is from the Impact Analysis of Potential for Detrimental Impacts of Hazards for the Emergency management Accreditation Program (EMAP). The table explains possible impacts to various subjects due to public health emergencies.





| Subject | Detrimental Impacts | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Health and Safety of Persons in the Area as the | Adverse impacts are expected to be severe for | | | | |
| Time of Incident | unprotected personnel and moderate to light for | | | | |
| | protected personnel. | | | | |
| | Adverse impacts are expected to be severe for | | | | |
| Health and Safety of Persons Responding to the | unprotected personnel and uncertain for trained and | | | | |
| Incident | protected personnel, depending on the nature of the | | | | |
| | incident. | | | | |
| | Danger to personnel in the area of the incident may | | | | |
| Continuity of Operations | require relocation of operations and lines of succession | | | | |
| | execution. | | | | |
| | Access to facilities and infrastructure in the area of the | | | | |
| Property, Facilities, and Infrastructure | incident may be denied until decontamination is | | | | |
| | complete. | | | | |
| | Stress on resources and facilities due to increased | | | | |
| Delivery of Services | volume and demand may overwhelm and/or | | | | |
| | extensively postpone delivery of services. | | | | |
| The Environment | Incident may cause denial or delays in the use of some | | | | |
| The Environment | areas. | | | | |
| For participand Financial Condition | Local economy and finances may be adversely affected, | | | | |
| | possibly for an extended period of time. | | | | |
| | Regulatory waivers may be needed. Fulfillment of | | | | |
| Regulatory and Contractual Obligations | contracts may be difficult. Demands may exceed the | | | | |
| | ability to deliver. | | | | |
| Deputation of an Confidence in Management | Ability to respond and recover may be questioned and | | | | |
| Reputation of, or Confidence in, Management | challenged if planning, response, and recovery are not | | | | |
| and Kesponse Authorities | timely and effective. | | | | |

Table 18. Impacts to Subjects Impacted by Public Health Emergencies

Potential Losses

FluWorkLoss 1.0 is a tool developed by the CDC to estimate the potential impact of pandemic influenza on a community in terms of cost. Based on local demographic data, the tool allows communities to estimate the potential number of days lost from work due to a pandemic. Users of FluWorkLoss can change input values, such as the number of workdays lost due to a worker staying come to care for a family member. Users can also change the length and virulence of the pandemic so that a range of possible impacts can be estimated.

Days missed from work cost both employees (in lost wages) and employers (in work not completed). The following table shows the total estimated number of days lost from work in Larimer County due to a four-week long influenza pandemic with a 25% clinical attack rate. The available workdays are calculated as a





product of the total population in the working age group (Census 2010), the employment rate of Larimer County (Census 2010), and the number of workdays in a week (5).

| Scenario | Workdays Lost |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Most Likely Scenario | 144,596 |
| Minimum Loss Scenario | 121,312 |
| Maximum Loss Scenario | 180,307 |

Table 19. Total Workdays Lost (Pandemic Influenza)

Source: FluWorkLoss 1.0, CDC

The number of workdays lost includes the workdays lost for both self-care and care of sick family members due to the pandemic. Although the workdays lost do not include those lost due to factors such as fear and school closings, the model does provide a general picture of the impact on the productivity of the local economy due to an influenza pandemic. Results are estimated to create three scenarios of pandemic impact: the minimum (the best case scenario), which estimates the fewest possible number of hospitalizations/outpatient visits/deaths (i.e., the fewest possible days lost from work); the mean (the most likely scenario); and the maximum (the worst case scenario), which estimates the largest number of hospitalizations/outpatient visits/deaths (i.e., the largest possible number of days lost from work).

The following graph shows the proportion of workdays lost for each day of the modeled influenza outbreak for the three loss scenarios. Again, the scenario assumes a four-week long pandemic with a 25% clinical attack rate.






The numbers and projections generated through FluWorkLoss are not considered predictions of what *will* happen during an influenza pandemic. Rather, the results should be treated as estimates of what *could* happen.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Climate change threatens to increase the spread of infectious diseases because changing heat, rain, and humidity levels allow disease carrying vectors and pathogens to come into closer contact with humans. Climate change has the potential to expand the habitats and infectivity of disease-carrying insects and rodents, thus increasing the risk of disease transmission. For example, mosquitoes capable of transmitting West Nile virus are already present in Colorado. If Colorado's climate becomes warmer, mosquito populations could swell, making the region more favorable for disease transmission.

Hantavirus is another infectious disease that may pose a higher risk to Larimer County residents in the future. Deer mice are the primary reservoir for Hantaviruses and climate change (warmer weather) plays a role in elevated seasonal deer mouse populations.

Based on historical record of 2,308 recorded diseases in Larimer County since 2010, public health hazards have affected Larimer County residents and visitors more than once every year from 2010 through 2014. The historic frequency suggests that there is a 100% chance of some type of public health hazard will affect Larimer County every year.





Land Use and Development

Future development in and around Larimer County has the potential to change how infectious diseases spread through the community and impact human health in both the short and long term. New development may increase the number of people and facilities exposed to public health hazards and greater population concentrations (often found in special needs facilities and businesses) put more people at risk. During a disease outbreak those in the immediate isolation area would have little to no warning, whereas, the population further away in the dispersion path may have some time to prepare and mitigate against disease depending on the hazard, its transmission, and public notification.

Due to the nature of public health hazards, jurisdictions within Larimer County with higher numbers of vulnerable individuals are expected to be impacted to a greater extent than others. In the context of extreme temperature events, the most vulnerable members of the Larimer County community are:

- The elderly (people over 65 years of age)
- Children (under 5 years old)
- The infirm

The following table highlights a number of key pandemic vulnerability factors in Larimer County jurisdictions.

| Jurisdiction | Age: 5 and Under (%) | Age: 65 and Over (%) | Persons Below Poverty Level (%) |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Colorado | 6.8 | 10.9 | 13.2 |
| Larimer County | 5.9 | 11.9 | 14.1 |
| Town of Berthoud | 5.7 | 12.4 | 9.3 |
| Town of Estes Park | 4.8 | 25.2 | 4.2 |
| City of Fort Collins | 5.7 | 8.8 | 18.6 |
| Town of Johnstown | 9.4 | 8.7 | 5.1 |
| City of Loveland | 6.8 | 14.9 | 10.5 |
| Town of Timnath | 11.3 | 7.4 | < 1.0 |
| Town of Wellington | 10.6 | 4.8 | 9.2 |
| Town of Windsor | 7.3 | 10.0 | 4.8 |

Table 20. Biological Hazards / Contagion Vulnerability Factor Data

Source: U.S. Census

The communities of Berthoud, Estes Park, Loveland and Windsor all have higher percentages of elderly residents than the average for the State of Colorado. The communities of Johnstown, Timnath, Wellington, and Windsor have higher percentage of residents who are children, as compared to the





State's average. The City of Fort Collins is the only community in the county with higher than state-average poverty rates. These demographic trends are important to monitor over time as they will present unique challenges for the management and mitigation of biological hazards/contagions.

Preparing for, responding to, and recovering from pandemic influenza will require a strategy that includes a holistic suite of public health activities designed to lessen the impact on morbidity and mortality. These activities include education, vaccination, prophylaxis, isolation/quarantine, and the closure of public facilities. In addition, clear, concise communication with the public and with other agencies remains a critical component, as does the ability of the involved agencies to achieve collaboration and coordination. By its very nature, an influenza pandemic, once started, will not be stopped until it has run its course. This course can be shortened and weakened by a number of factors, with vaccination being the gold standard for protecting the population. Pandemic plans describe strategies of preparedness, response, and recovery to attempt to decrease illnesses and deaths during the pandemic period to manageable levels (i.e., that do not overwhelm the critical infrastructures of the State), and to promote community resiliency and rapid recovery.

The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment has developed a number of resources related to pandemic health hazards to supplement the State Emergency Operations Plan. Listed below are a number of pandemic response plans, health alert networks, and resources currently available for residents and planners in the State of Colorado and Larimer County.

| Title | Source |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Pandomic Influenza Action Plan for Schools (2000) | Colorado Department of Public |
| | Health and Environment |
| Infectious Diseases in Child Care and School Settings: Guidelines for | Colorado Department of Public |
| Childcare Providers, School Nurses and Other Personnel (2013) | Health and Environment |
| Pandomic Influenza Planning Guidelines for Hespitals (2000) | Colorado Department of Public |
| Pandemic initidenza Planning Guidennes for Hospitals (2009) | Health and Environment |
| Home Care Guide: Providing Care at Home During Pandemic Flu | Colorado Department of Public |
| (2009) | Health and Environment |
| Guidelines for Medical Office Pandemic Pandiness (2007) | Colorado Department of Public |
| Guidelines for Medical Office Paridernic Readiness (2007) | Health and Environment |
| Social Distancing Support Guidelines for Pandemic Readiness (2008) | Colorado Department of Public |
| Social Distancing Support Guidelines for Pandemic Readiness (2008) | Health and Environment |
| Colorado Health Alert Network (HAN) | Colorado Department of Public |
| | Health and Environment |
| Public Health Emergency Operations Plan | Larimer County |
| Continuity of Operations Plan | Larimer County |
| Epidemiology Plan | Larimer County |
| Quarantine and Isolation Plan | Larimer County |
| Risk Communication Plan | Larimer County |
| Strategic National Stockpile and Mass Prophylaxis/Vaccination Point- | Larimer County |
| of-Dispensing Plan | |

Table 21. Influenza Planning Resources and Guidelines





| Mass Fatality Plan | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Incident Recovery Plan | |
| Pandemic Influenza Plan | |

Where necessary, details or public information templates unique to pandemic influenza have been included in the plans listed above. The guidelines and plans provide background information related to pandemic influenza and infectious diseases, outline concepts of operations for response, list primary and support functional areas, and outline available resources and tools to mitigate a pandemic and promote community resilience recovery.

Ongoing mitigation activities should focus on preventing infection during flu season. This includes, but is not limited to pre-season community outreach campaigns to educate the public about risks and available support; establishing convenient vaccination centers; reaching out to vulnerable populations and care givers; and issuing advisories and warnings.





5.3.2 Civil Disturbance

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Civil Disturbance | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.20 |
| MODERATE RISK (2.0 – 2.4) | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

Civil Disturbance is a catch-all term that describes one or more forms of disturbance caused by a group of people. The term is typically used by law enforcement and includes acts of violence and disorder detrimental to the public law and order. Civil disturbance includes acts such as riots, acts of violence, insurrections, unlawful obstructions or assemblages, or other disorders prejudicial to public law and order. It also includes all domestic conditions requiring or likely to require the use of federal armed forces.

Acts of civil disturbance are usually a symptom and/or form of protest against major socio-political problems, and the severity of the event can coincide with public sentiment or expressions of displeasure. These acts may be spontaneous, such as when a group of people suddenly and unexpectedly erupts into violence, or it may be a planned event, such as a demonstration, a march, or a protest designed to intentionally interfere with another's lawful business or activity.

Universities, industry, government officials and buildings, research laboratories, medical facilities, and populated areas are all potential sites and targets for civil disturbances. All of the communities within the county region have the potential to experience civil disturbance events. The diverse (and rapidly growing) population of the region, coupled with the presence of numerous research facilities, universities, and other outlets for active political and/or social activity contribute to the increased risk for civil disturbance.

Previous Occurrences

The following table highlights a number of notable instances of civil disturbance in Larimer County.

| Date | Event | Details |
|------|--------------------|--|
| 1987 | College Daze riots | 10,000-12,000 college students involved in disturbance for more than three days in Fort Collins. |
| 1988 | Baystone riots | 10,000 people involved in civil disturbance over three day period. |
| 1989 | Baystone riots | 10,000 people involved in civil disturbance over three day period. |
| 1995 | Football riots | CSU football team wins WAC Championship, nearly 3,000 people involved in riots over two days. |
| 1997 | Whitcomb/Howes | More than 3,000 people involved in two consecutive nights of riots on and near Colorado State University campus. |
| 1998 | Super Bowl riot | 3,000 to 6, 000 people involved in riots along College Ave., Mountain Ave., and Plum St. after Denver Broncos won the Super Bowl football championship |
| 2000 | Stanley Cup riot | 2,000 to 3,000 people involved in riots in Old Town Fort Collins after Colorado Avalanche won Stanley Cup hockey championship |
| 2004 | CSU Student riots | Fort Collins experienced two consecutive nights of out-of-control parties, which developed into riots near the CSU campus |





| 2013 Riots | Fort Collins experienced riots near the CSU campus after an out-of- control party |
|------------|--|
| 2014 Riots | Fort Collins experienced riots near the CSU campus after an out-of- |

The causes and perpetrators of civil disturbance events are broad. Many of the most recent civil disturbance incidents in the county were located in Fort Collins and were related to annual CSU sporting events and/or large parties that devolved in to riots. Other civil disturbance events have occurred when protesters gathered near Pineridge Reservoir in Larimer County to protest the planned removal of prairie dog colonies. Additionally, extremist groups such as the Animal Liberation Front and the Environmental Liberation Front have been known to be involved in several civil disturbance incidents in Larimer County and the surrounding region. Intelligence reports gathered by law enforcement indicate that several research facilities have been burglarized and/or vandalized, and this included having laboratory facilities destroyed and/or research animals being released.

Recently, "Right to Life" groups have participated in civil disturbance activity by obstructing sidewalks and entryways to certain medical facilities within the communities of Fort Collins, Loveland, and Larimer County. Since 2001, several small-scale civil disturbances involving religious groups have occurred within the City of Fort Collins and other local jurisdictions at local mosques.

Inventory Assets Exposed

All areas of the County and its local jurisdictions are vulnerable to the impacts of civil disturbances. This includes 324,122 people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County. The county's critical facilities should be given special attention when planning for and mitigating against future civil disturbance events.

Potential Losses

Generally, civil disturbance events have the potential to cause both injuries and casualties. Additionally, participants in these events often destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation process exists for civil disturbance, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths for events of various size.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Although previous civil disturbance events in Larimer County have occurred most frequently in Loveland and Fort Collins, civil disturbance events have the potential to affect the entire planning area. Due to the nature of the hazard, it is an extremely difficult to predict when a civil disturbance event may erupt. The probability of Larimer County and its jurisdictions experiencing a civil disturbance event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historic record of previous events, it is reasonable to assume that civil disturbance activity will be most probable during certain times of the year (specifically, annual sporting events, holidays, or elections). Keeping aware of these annual events, their anticipated size, and any history of contention between communities will help local law enforcement plan and anticipate potential risks. Civil disturbance will remain a highly likely occurrence for Larimer County over time.





Future Land Use and Development Trends

As Larimer County continues to experience rapid population growth, development, and diversification, it is anticipated that there will be increased exposure to potential casualties, injuries, and property damage due to civil disturbance incidents.





5.3.3 Earthquake

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Earthquake | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.80 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

An earthquake is the motion or trembling of the ground produced by sudden displacement of rock usually within the upper 10 - 20 miles of the Earth's crust. Earthquakes can affect hundreds of thousands of square miles, cause damage to property measured in the tens of billions of dollars, result in loss of life and injury to hundreds of thousands of people, and disrupt the social and economic functioning of the affected area. Most property damage and earthquake-related deaths are caused by the failure and collapse of structures due to ground shaking which is dependent upon amplitude and duration of the earthquake (FEMA, 1997).

Earthquake Mechanics

Regardless of the source of the earthquake, the associated energy travels in waves radiating outward from the point of release. When these waves travel along the surface, the ground shakes and rolls, fractures form, and water waves may be generated. Earthquakes generally last a matter of seconds but the waves may travel for long distances and cause damage well after the initial shaking at the point of origin has subsided.

Breaks in the crust associated with seismic activity are known as "faults" and are classified as either active or inactive. Faults may be expressed on the surface by sharp cliffs or scarps or may be buried below surface deposits.

"Foreshocks," minor releases of pressure or slippage, may occur months or minutes before the actual onset of the earthquake. "Aftershocks," which range from minor to major, may occur for months after the main earthquake. In some cases, strong aftershocks may cause significant additional damage, especially if the initial earthquake impacted emergency management and response functions or weakened structures.

Factors Contributing to Damage

The damage associated with each earthquake is subject to four primary variables:

- The nature of the seismic activity
- The composition of the underlying geology and soils
- The level and quality of development of the area struck by the earthquake
- The time of day

Seismic Activity: The properties of earthquakes vary greatly from event to event. Some seismic activity is localized (a small point of energy release), while other activity is widespread (e.g., a major fault shifting or slipping all at once). Earthquakes can be very brief (only a few seconds) or last for a minute or more.





The depth of release and type of seismic waves generated also play roles in the nature and location of damage; shallow quakes will hit the area close to the epicenter harder, but tend to be felt across a smaller region than deep earthquakes.

Geology and Soils: The surface geology and soils of an area influence the propagation (conduction) of seismic waves and how strongly the energy is felt. Generally, stable areas (e.g., solid bedrock) experience less destructive shaking than unstable areas (e.g., fill soils). The siting of a community or even individual buildings plays a strong role in the nature and extent of damage from an event.

Development: An earthquake in a densely populated area which results in many deaths and considerable damage may have the same magnitude as a shock in a remote area that has no direct impacts. Large magnitude earthquakes that occur beneath the oceans may not even be felt by humans.

Time of Day: The time of day of an event controls the distribution of the population of an affected area. On work days, the majority of the community will transition between work or school, home, and the commute between the two. The relative seismic vulnerability of each location can strongly influence the loss of life and injury resulting from an event.

Types of Damage

Often, the most dramatic evidence of an earthquake results from the vertical and/or horizontal displacement of the ground along a fault line. This displacement can sever transportation, energy, utility, and communications infrastructure potentially impacting numerous systems and persons. These ground displacements can also result in severe and complete damages to structures situated on top of the ground fault. However, most damage from earthquake events is the result of shaking. Shaking also produces a number of phenomena that can generate additional damage

- Additional ground displacement
- Landslides and avalanches
- Liquefaction and subsidence
- Seismic Seiches

Shaking: During minor earthquake events, objects often fall from shelves and dishes rattle. In major events, large structures may be torn apart by the forces of the seismic waves. Structural damage is generally limited to older structures that are poorly maintained, poorly constructed, or improperly (or not) designed for seismic events. Un-reinforced masonry buildings and wood frame homes not anchored to their foundations are typical victims of earthquake damage.

Loose or poorly secured objects also pose a significant hazard when they are loosened or dropped by shaking. These "non-structural falling hazard" objects include bookcases, heavy wall hangings, and building facades. Home water heaters pose a special risk due to their tendency to start fires when they topple over and rupture gas lines. Crumbling chimneys may also be responsible for injuries and property damage.

Dam and bridge failures are significant risks during stronger earthquake events, and due to the consequences of such failures, may result in considerable property damage and loss of life. In areas of severe seismic shaking hazard, shaking Intensity levels of VII or higher (see Table 35) can be experienced even on solid bedrock. In these areas, older buildings especially are at significant risk.





Ground Displacement: Ground displacement can also occur due to shaking, resulting in similar damages as mentioned previously.

Landslides and Avalanches: Even small earthquake events can cause landslides. Rock falls are common as unstable material on steep slopes is shaken loose, but significant landslides or even debris flows can be generated if conditions are ripe. Roads may be blocked by landslide activity, hampering response and recovery operations. Avalanches are possible when the snowpack is sufficient.

Liquefaction and Subsidence: Soils may liquefy and/or subside when impacted by the seismic waves. Fill and previously saturated soils are especially at risk. The failure of the soils has the potential to cause widespread structural damage. The oscillation and failure of the soils may result in increased water flow and/or failure of wells as the subsurface flows are disrupted and sometimes permanently altered. Increased flows may be dramatic, resulting in geyser-like water spouts and/or flash floods. Similarly, septic systems may be damaged creating both inconvenience and health concerns.

Seiches: Seismic waves may rock an enclosed body of water (e.g., lake or reservoir), creating an oscillating wave referred to as a "seiche." Although not a common cause of damage in past Colorado earthquakes, there is a potential for large, forceful waves similar to a tsunami ("tidal waves") to be generated on the large reservoirs. Such a wave would be a hazard to shoreline development and pose a significant risk on dam-created reservoirs. A seiche could either overtop or damage a dam leading to downstream flash flooding.

Environmental impacts of earthquakes can be numerous, widespread, and devastating, particularly if indirect impacts are considered. Some examples of impacts are listed below:

- Induced flooding and landslides
- Poor water quality
- Damage to vegetation
- Breakage in sewage or toxic material containments

HAZARD PROFILE

The impact an earthquake event has on an area is typically measured in terms of earthquake intensity. Intensity is most commonly measured using the Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) Scale based on direct and indirect measurements of seismic effects.

Another way to express an earthquake's severity is to compare its acceleration to the normal acceleration due to gravity. Peak ground acceleration (PGA) measures the strength of ground movements in this manner. PGA represents the rate in change of motion of the earth's surface during an earthquake as a percent of the established rate of acceleration due to gravity. PGA can be partly determined by what soils and bedrock characteristics exist in the region. Unlike the Richter scale, PGA is not a measure of the total energy released by an earthquake, but rather of how hard the earth shakes at a given geographic area (the intensity). PGA is measured by using instruments including accelerographs and correlates well with the Mercalli scale.

When the peak ground acceleration nears 0.04 - 0.092g, an earthquake can be felt by people walking outside. As PGA nears 0.19 - 0.34g the intensity is considered to be very strong. At this level, plaster can break off and fall away from structures and cracks in walls often occur. PGA magnitudes of 1.24g are





considered to be very disastrous. This magnitude of ground acceleration represents an earthquake of roughly 6.9 to 8.1 on the Richter Scale. A detailed description of the Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale is shown in the table below.

| SCALE | INTENSITY | DESCRIPTION OF EFFECTS | PGA (g) | RICHTER SCALE MAGNITUDE | |
|-------|-----------------|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| I | Instrumental | Detected only on seismographs | < 0.0017 | | |
| Ш | Feeble | Some people feel it | 0.0018 | | |
| 111 | Slight | Felt by people resting; like a truck rumbling by | 0.014 | < 4.2 | |
| IV | Moderate | Felt by people walking | 0.015 – 0.039 | | |
| v | Slightly Strong | Sleepers awake; church bells ring | 0.040 – 0.092 | < 4.8 | |
| VI | Strong | Trees sway; suspended objects swing; objects fall off shelves | 0.093 – 0.18 | < 5.4 | |
| VII | Very Strong | Mild alarm, walls crack, plaster falls | 0.19 - 0.34 | < 6.1 | |
| VIII | Destructive | Moving cars uncontrollable, masonry fractures, poorly constructed buildings damaged | 0.34 – 0.65 | < 6.9 | |
| іх | Ruinous | Some houses collapse, ground cracks, pipes break open | 0.65 – 1.24 | | |
| x | Disastrous | Ground cracks profusely, many buildings destroyed, liquefaction and landslides widespread | > 1.24 | < 7.3 | |
| XI | Very Disastrous | Most buildings and bridges collapse, roads, railways, pipes and cables destroyed, general triggering of other hazards | buildings and bridges pse, roads, railways, pipes and s destroyed, general triggering her hazards | | |
| XII | Catastrophic | Total destruction, trees fall, ground rises and falls in waves | n, trees fall, ground waves > 124 | | |

| Table 22. | Modified | Mercalli | Intensity | Scale |
|-----------|----------|-------------|-----------|-------|
| TUDIC EE | mounicu | i i i cuini | | ocure |





Studies indicate that there are about 100 potentially active fault lines in Colorado. Over 500 earthquake tremors of magnitude 2.5 or higher have been recorded across the state since 1870. It is likely that more earthquakes of similar magnitude occurred during that time, but were not recorded due to low population densities and limited coverage of sensors across most of the state. For comparison, over 20,500 similarly sized events have been recorded in the State of California since 1870.

Relative to other western states, Colorado's earthquake risk is higher than Kansas or Oklahoma, lower than Utah, and much lower than Nevada and California (Colorado OEM, 2003). Despite Colorado's lower earthquake risk, based on geologic observations and characteristics of faults located in the region, seismologists predict that Colorado will indeed experience a magnitude 6.5 earthquake at some point in the future.

Earthquakes are extremely difficult to predict and their occurrence rate is determined in one of two ways. If geologists can find evidence of distinct, datable earthquakes in the past, the number of these ruptures is used to define an occurrence rate. If evidence of ruptures is not available, geologists estimate fault slip rates from accumulated scarp heights and estimated date for the oldest movement on the scarp. Because a certain magnitude earthquake is likely to produce a displacement (slip) of a certain size, we can estimate the rate of occurrence of earthquakes of that magnitude.

Recurrence rates are different for different assumed magnitudes thought to be "characteristic" of that fault type. Generally, a smaller magnitude quake will produce a faster recurrence rate, and for moderate levels of ground motion, a higher hazard risk. Future earthquakes are assumed to be likely to occur where earthquakes have produced faults in the geologically recent past. Quaternary faults are faults that have slipped in the last 1.8 million years and it is widely accepted that they are the most likely source of future large earthquakes. For this reason, quaternary faults are used to make fault sources for future earthquake models.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Climate change is not expected at this time to have any impacts on geological hazards such as earthquakes. There is potential for increased heat and reduced soil moisture to contribute to the instability of regional soils. In theory, these subtle changes to the surface of the earth may affect the damage profile of local earthquake events in the future. However, it is unlikely that earthquake events in Larimer County will be affected by climate change in a measurable way.

Previous Occurrences

Earthquakes are relatively infrequent in Colorado and records of historical earthquakes in and around Larimer County are limited. The following Table provides a list of Colorado's larger earthquakes recorded since 1870.

| Date | Location | Magnitude | Intensity |
|------|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| 1870 | Pueblo/Ft. Reynolds | - | VI |
| 1871 | Lily Park, Moffat County | - | VI |

Table 23. Notable Earthquake Events in Colorado (1870 – 2015)





| Date | Location | Magnitude | Intensity |
|------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| 1880 | Aspen | - | VI |
| 1882 | Larimer County | 6.6* | VII |
| 1891 | Axial Basin (Maybell) | - | VI |
| 1901 | Buena Vista | - | VI |
| 1913 | Ridgeway Area | - | VI |
| 1944 | Montrose/Basalt | - | VI |
| 1955 | Lake City | - | VI |
| 1960 | Montrose/Ridgeway | 5.5 | V |
| 1966 | NE of Denver | 5.0 | V |
| 1966 | CO-NM border, near Dulce, NM | 5.5 | VII |
| 1967 | NE Denver | 5.3 | VII |
| 1967 | NE Denver | 5.2 | VI |
| 2011 | Southwest of Trinidad | 5.3 | VIII |

*Estimated, based on historical felt reports

Source: Colorado Geological Survey

The most economically damaging earthquake in Colorado's history occurred on August 9th, 1967 in the Denver metro area. The 5.3 magnitude earthquake caused more than a million dollars of damage in Denver and the northern suburbs. The August 1967 earthquake was followed by an earthquake of magnitude 5.2 three months later in November 1967. Although these two earthquake events cannot be classified as "major earthquakes" they are significant because of their location along the Front Range Urban Corridor, an area where nearly 75 percent of Colorado residents and many critical facilities are located. Historically, earthquake risk in Colorado has been rated lower than most subject experts consider justified. It is critically important that local emergency managers in and around Larimer County become fully aware of the size and consequences of an earthquake that could occur.

Inventory Exposed

The most appropriate risk assessment methodology for seismic hazards involves scenario modeling using FEMA's Hazus loss estimation software. Hazus is a very useful planning tool because it provides an acceptable means of forecasting earthquake damage, loss of function of infrastructure, and casualties, among many other factors. There are three levels of Hazus analysis, from Level 1, which uses the default





FEMA-derived datasets and damage functions, to Level 3, which uses independently compiled and accurately verified structure and infrastructure inventories and damage functions.

Utilizing Hazus 2.2, FEMA's loss estimation and hazard modeling software, a detailed earthquake analyses was conducted for infrastructure within Larimer County. The risk assessment leveraged locally managed inventory, hazard, and terrain data, where available. Hazus is a regional earthquake loss estimation model developed by FEMA and the National Institute of Building Science. The primary purpose of Hazus is to provide a methodology and software application to develop earthquake loss at a regional scale.

The Hazus earthquake scenario modeled a 6.5 event along the Golden Fault, located approximately 36 miles south of Larimer County. This scenario was used because it represents the "worst case scenario": a large earthquake event along the closest quaternary fault to the county. Statewide soil type and landslide layers were incorporated into the model in order to further refine the results of the analysis. Ground motion was modeled for the event at each structure point in order to provide building loss estimates as well as at the census tract level to estimate debris generation and shelter requirements.









Structure point data was leveraged from a previous FEMA losses avoided study that was done in region. Additional pre-processing was necessary to prepare these points for the countywide analysis in Hazus and in some cases field assumptions were made based on the standards set forth in FEMA's regional guidance as well as the Hazus manuals. It should be noted that point location was not further refined, and FEMA manually adjusted those points only within their particular areas of interest/analysis. Finally, areas without an assessed or improved value were removed from the resulting loss estimates as it was assumed that there was no structure present in these land parcels.

Potential Losses

In Colorado, earthquakes are considered low probability, high-consequence events. Although earthquakes may occur infrequently they can have devastating impacts. Ground shaking can lead to the collapse of buildings and bridges; disrupt gas, life lines, electric, and phone service. Deaths, injuries, and extensive property damage are possible vulnerabilities from this hazard. Some secondary hazards caused by earthquakes may include fire, hazardous material release, landslides, flash flooding, avalanches, tsunamis, and dam failure. Moderate and even very large earthquakes are inevitable, although very

¹⁰ Scenario with an epicenter defined along the golden fault at a Latitude of 39.65 and a Longitude of -104.38 Decimal Degrees. The moment magnitude of this epicenter was defined as 6.5.





infrequent, in areas of normally low seismic activity. Consequently, buildings in these regions are seldom designed to deal with an earthquake threat; therefore, they are extremely vulnerable.

Most property damage and earthquake-related injuries and deaths are caused by the failure and collapse of structures due to ground shaking. The level of damage depends upon the amplitude and duration of the shaking, which are directly related to the earthquake size, distance from the fault, site, and regional geology. Other damaging earthquake effects include landslides, the down-slope movement of soil and rock (mountain regions and along hillsides), and liquefaction, in which ground soil loses shear strength and the ability to support foundation loads. In the case of liquefaction, anything relying on the substrata for support can shift, tilt, rupture, or collapse.

For the risk assessment conducted as part of the 2016 Plan, a 6.5-magnitude earthquake scenario with an epicenter on the Golden Fault was simulated in Hazus. Again, this scenario's event parameters and locations were chosen based on pre-existing scenarios outlined by the Colorado Geological Survey. The Front Range is defined by a 500- to 1,000-m-high, east-facing escarpment called the Golden Fault that is both a tectonic and erosional feature. The Golden Fault is a quaternary fault that bounds the eastern side of the Front Range near the town of Golden, adjacent to the Denver Metropolitan Area. The Golden Fault was selected as an epicenter because it is the closest proximity quaternary fault to Larimer County. The map below depicts Larimer County and the location and magnitude of historical earthquake events in the region.









In the following two maps Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) for the Golden Fault scenario is represented as %g. The Golden Fault model shows relatively low PGA in the northern part of Larimer County as the energy released from the Golden fault radiates away from the epicenter. The majority of the high PGA values are found in southern part of the County.

¹¹ Statewide historical reported earthquake epicenters, as of 12-9-2013. Source: Colorado Geological Survey









Loss estimates from the Hazus scenario is included in the following Tables and maps. Data summarized for the scenario includes the following:

- Expected building damage (number of structures) by occupancy
- Expected building damage (number of structures) by building type
- Expected damage to essential facilities (number of structures)
- Expected building loss estimates (\$)

Economic Losses and Building Damage

The following Figure provides a map of total economic losses in Larimer County projected by the Golden Fault earthquake scenario. Total economic losses include losses from building/infrastructure damage, relocation, and business interruption. For the Golden Fault earthquake scenario, the total losses were

¹² Ground motion information derived from Hazus-MH 2.1 earthquake scenario with an epicenter defined along the golden fault at a Latitude of 39.74 and a Longitude of -105.22 Decimal Degrees. The moment magnitude of this epicenter was defined as 6.5.





estimated to be approximately \$726,604,919. Spatially, a majority of the high loss areas were located in the eastern, urban portion of the county. Generally, these are areas which are more densely/highly populated and more closely located to the Golden epicenter.



Figure 10. Earthquake Scenario Loss Estimation – Larimer County¹³

Hazus measures direct building economic losses. The direct building losses are the estimated costs to repair or replace the damage caused to a building and its contents. The following Table details the Hazus loss estimates for the Golden Fault event.

¹³ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 6.5 magnitude earthquake scenario was defined along the Golden fault and losses were calculated for each point (structure) based on the Hazus damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 earthquake scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses.





| Category | Single Family | Other Residential | Commercial | Industrial | Other | Total |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|
| Direct Structural Losses | \$217.4 | \$ 41.7 | \$147.9 | \$7.0 | \$312.6 | \$726.6 |

Table 24. Economic Losses – Golden Fault Scenario (Losses in Millions of Dollars)

The expected damages in Larimer County are defined by the following parameters:

- "Slight" damage includes diagonal hairline fractures on most shear wall surfaces and hairline cracks on most infill walls.
- "Moderate" damage includes cracks on most walls and failure of some shear walls.
- "Extensive" damage means that most shear wall surfaces in the structure have reached or exceeded their capacity exhibited by large, through-the-wall diagonal cracks.
- "Complete" damage means that the structure has collapsed or is in danger of collapse.

Hazus estimates that approximately 101,822 buildings in the County will have no damage, approximately 8,153 buildings will be at least slightly damaged, approximately 765 buildings will be at least moderately damaged, approximately 37 buildings will be at least extensively damaged, and approximately 5 buildings in the County will be completely damaged if a 6.5 earthquake were to occur on the Golden Fault.

Damages to Critical Facilities/Infrastructure

The Hazus earthquake model also provides estimates relating to the expected damages to and functionality of the County's critical facilities and critical infrastructure, as defined by Hazus. The tables on the following pages detail these estimates.

For the Golden Fault scenario, the following Table provides post-event damage and functionality estimates for specific types of essential facilities within Larimer County. In addition to estimating the number of facilities what will suffer either moderate or complete damage to over 50% of the structure, the table shows the number of facilities that will be operating at or over 50% functionality almost immediately after the earthquake event.

| | | # of Facilities | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Classification | Total | At Least Moderate Damage >50% | Complete Damage >50% | With Functionality >50% on day 1 | |
| Church | 178 | <6 | <1 | 177 | |
| Day Care | 31 | <1 <1 | | 31 | |

Table 25. Golden Fault Scenario – Expected Damage to Critical Facilities





| | Total | # of Facilities | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Classification | | At Least Moderate Damage >50% | Complete Damage >50% | With Functionality >50% on day 1 | |
| Distribution Warehouse | 28 | <1 | <1 | 28 | |
| Dormitory | 16 | <1 | <1 | 16 | |
| Elderly Housing/Care | 36 | <1 | <1 | 36 | |
| Fire Station | 29 | <1 | <1 | 29 | |
| Government | 17 | <1 | <1 | 17 | |
| Jail/Correctional Facility | 1 | <1 | <1 | 1 | |
| Laboratories | 9 | <1 | <1 | 9 | |
| Library | 10 | <1 | <1 | 10 | |
| Medical Facilities | 372 | <6 | <1 | 372 | |
| Mortuary | 5 | <1 | <1 | 5 | |
| Post Office | 8 | <1 | <1 | 8 | |
| Schools | 118 | <4 | <1 | 118 | |
| Supermarket | 12 | <1 | <1 | 12 | |
| Visitor Center | 3 | <1 | <1 | 3 | |
| Miscellaneous | 31 | <1 | <1 | 31 | |

Probability of Future Occurrences

Even though the seismic hazard risk in Larimer County is low to moderate, it is likely that earthquakes will occur in the county in the future. It is reasonable to expect future earthquakes as large as magnitude 6.5, the largest event on record in Colorado. Calculations based on the historical earthquake records and geological evidence of recent fault activity suggest that an earthquake of magnitude 6 or greater may be expected somewhere in Colorado every several centuries.

Earthquakes strike with little to no warning and they are capable of having multiple impacts on an area. After-effects from an earthquake can include impacted roadways, downed power and communication





lines, fires, and damages to structures (especially poorly built, or those already in disrepair). Earthquakes are not a seasonal hazard, and thus can be experienced year round. This fact presents its own set of planning and preparedness concerns.

Ultimately, the probability of an earthquake occurring in Larimer County is low. Additionally, if an earthquake were to occur in the near future it is likely to be of a low magnitude, with expected damages to property and people to be minimal. History has shown, however, that Larimer County and Colorado are at risk to a larger magnitude seismic event. Should that type of event occur, major damages and losses should be expected. This fact makes these low probability, high impact hazards a challenge to deal with when planning a mitigation strategy to combat all hazards faced by a community.

Standard building codes have the opportunity to provide Larimer County with reasonable guidance for development throughout unincorporated and incorporated areas. Contractors and builders should be aware of applicable codes and regulations designed to reduce losses sustained by new and existing construction due to seismic hazards.

For example, the light weight of wood frame buildings results in less force from inertia. Less force means less damage. Wood's natural flexibility also is an advantage when seismic forces are brought to bear and the nailed joints in wood frame buildings dissipate energy and motion. Wood's inherent earthquake resistance must be accompanied by design and construction techniques that take advantage of those characteristics.

Structural wood panels nailed to wall framing add rigid bracing, help resist lateral loads and help tie framing members together. Bolted connections at the sill plate/foundation joint help keep the structure in one spot. Securely connected wall, floor, and roof framing also help tie a structure together and make it a single, solid structural unit. Proper connections will do more to hold a house together during an earthquake than any other single seismic design element.

As development grows in the County and its municipalities, it will be important for citizens to consult with local building codes as modern building codes generally require seismic design elements for new construction.

Land Use and Development

With the unpredictable nature of earthquake epicenter locations, it is not feasible to identify specific areas where development may exacerbate the risk to an earthquake. It should be assumed that all development increases the risk to the County from the threat of earthquakes. As population and development continue to expand in Larimer County, continued enforcement of the unified construction code has great potential to mitigate increasing vulnerability and development pressure.

Earthquakes are relatively uncommon in Larimer County and the probability is low that they will occur regularly in the future. However, if an event was to occur within the county, there is potential for significant structural damage to occur near the epicenter. Due to the nature of earthquake hazards, areas in Larimer County with high population densities and large numbers of structures and critical facilities are expected to experience greater damage and loss from an earthquake event. This includes jurisdictions located primarily in the southern, central eastern and southwestern portion of the county, including:

- Fort Collins
- Loveland





- Windsor
- Berthoud
- Johnstown
- Estes Park

Communities located in the eastern part of the County, may experience differential impacts from an earthquake event if transportation or utility infrastructure is damaged and prevents communities from responding or evacuating.





5.3.4 Erosion / Deposition

| NATURAL HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | ІМРАСТ | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|----------------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Erosion/Deposition | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.30 |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4) | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

Erosion and deposition is the removal and transportation of earth materials from one location to another by water, wind, waves, or moving ice. It occurs when soil is removed at a greater rate than it is formed. The natural geologic process of erosion has occurred since the Earth's formation and continues at a very slow and uniform rate. Soil erosion hazard is the term used to describe how likely it is for soil in a given area to erode. It depends on the inherent properties of the soil, the topography, vegetative cover, soil disturbance (including over-grazing, drought, flooding, wind, etc.), and rainfall intensity.

Although soil erosion is a natural process, rapid erosion can lead to a serious loss of topsoil and a reduction of cropland productivity. It can also contribute to the pollution of adjacent watercourses, wetlands, and lakes. During the processes of wind and water erosion, infrastructure and mechanical equipment can be damaged by soil build-up and dust. Additionally, blowing soils can affect human and animal health and create public safety hazards.

Land Subsidence describes any depressions, cracks, and/or sinkholes in the earth's surface which can threaten people and property. Causes of subsidence include, but are not limited to, the removal or reduction of sub-surface fluids (water, oil, gas, etc.), mine subsidence, and hydro compaction. Of these causes, hydro compaction and mine subsidence usually manifest as localized events, while fluid removal may occur either locally or regionally.

HAZARD PROFILE

Soil erosion and deposition have the potential to cause substantial losses to Larimer County assets. Erosion and deposition alone pose little harm to the county; however, when assets are placed in close proximity to erosion and deposition-prone environments such as a valley near a stream or riverbed, hazard vulnerability increases significantly. For example, when heavy rain and snowmelt result in increased stream flow, the erosion of riverbanks can pose significant risks to transportation infrastructure, including roads and bridges. Severe erosion can remove earth from beneath bridges, roads, and foundations of structures adjacent to streams. In Larimer County, the deposition of material can block culverts, aggravate flooding, destroy crops and lawns, and reduce capacity in water reservoirs.

Due to the difficulties in truly defining an "erosional" event and the lack of identified subsidence occurrences, it is not possible to attempt to calculate any type of probability for future events. It can be assured though, that erosion will continue to slowly alter the landscape of Larimer County going forward.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Changing climate norms are expected to affect soil resources in many ways. During hot, dry years annual grasses that stabilize and protect topsoil often fail to germinate or do not grow well. This leaves soil





surfaces highly vulnerable to erosion from wind and precipitation.¹⁴ Without the availability of nutrientrich topsoil, crops struggle to survive and flourish. As discussed previously, higher rates of erosion can have a profound effect on agricultural production and on the economies of rural areas of the county.

Previous Occurrences

Based on data provided by CGS, there are undermined areas within northeastern Larimer County that are more vulnerable to subsidence. The following Figure presents a map identifying the locations within Larimer County that have potential for subsidence due to historical mining activity.



Figure 11. Historically Undermined Areas – Larimer County¹⁵

Parcels were identified using CGS data. This dataset shows areas of historic (pre-1970s) coal and clay mining activity and potentially undermined areas throughout Colorado. The dataset does not include hard rock mineral mines, prospects, etc. Due to incomplete historic mine records and survey errors, the dataset

¹⁵ This dataset shows areas of historic (pre-1970s) coal and clay mining activity and potentially undermined areas throughout Colorado. The dataset does not include hard rock mineral mines, prospects, etc. Due to incomplete historic mine records and survey errors, the dataset should NOT be considered complete or perfectly accurate. The dataset was developed from multiple sources and digitized by the Colorado Geological Survey in 2008.





¹⁴ Belnap, J., and D.J. Eldridge. (2003). *Disturbance and recovery of biological soil crusts*.

should NOT be considered complete or perfectly accurate. The dataset was developed from multiple sources and digitized by the Colorado Geological Survey in 2008.

The map of undermined areas shows areas of historic (pre-1970s) coal and clay mining activity and potentially undermined areas throughout Larimer County. The dataset was developed from multiple sources and digitized by the Colorado Geological Survey in 2008 and presents a spatial view of potential risk.

There is no historical data available for collapsible soil areas, expansive soil areas, or subsidence areas.

Inventory Exposed

There are a number of locations across Larimer County that are vulnerable to erosion and deposition. As population growth brings new development into available land in the county, more inventory assets may become exposed to erosion and deposition hazards. The following figure shows geological hazard areas in Larimer County.





¹⁶ Used for identifying geologic hazard areas for land use. Source: Larimer County, CGS





Land subsidence can occur rapidly due to sinkholes, the collapse of underground mines, or during an earthquake. Subsidence can also take place slowly, becoming evident over the time span of many years. Soils that tend to collapse and settle are those characterized by low-density materials that shrink in volume when they become wet and/or are subjected to weight from development. Subsidence events, depending on their location, can pose significant risks to health, safety, and local agricultural economies and interruption to transportation, and other services.

There are hundreds of abandoned underground coal mines scattered throughout Colorado that present potential subsidence hazards to structures and surface improvements. The Colorado Geological Society (CGS) operates the Colorado Mine Subsidence Information Center (MSIC) which is the repository for all of the known existing maps of inactive or abandoned coal mines in the state. Subsidence tends to be problematic along the Colorado Front Range, Western Slope, and in the central mountains near Eagle and Garfield Counties.¹⁷ The following figure presents a map identifying the locations within Larimer County that have potential for subsidence. The highest potential for land subsidence are located in the eastern region of the county.





¹⁸ Potential expansive soils areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.





¹⁷ 2013 Colorado Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan

"Collapsible Soil" describe soils that can quickly settle or collapse the ground. This settling of the ground can cause damage to manmade structures. The most common type of collapsible soil is Hydrocompactive soil. This type of soil occurs in semi-arid to arid climates and consist of low density and low moisture content soil. The soil grains in these areas are not compact tightly together but rather stacked loosely. These soils are considered strong while in a dry state. However, when moisture is introduced the stacked soil grains can collapse causing ground surface subsidence or settlement.¹⁹ The following figure presents a map identifying the locations within Larimer County that have potential for collapsible soil. The highest potential for collapsible soil are located in the eastern region of the county.





"Expansive Soils" describes soils that contain minerals that are capable of absorbing water. As the soil absorbs water it expands and increases in volume. The change in soil volume can cause damage to manmade structures such as foundations. As the soils begin to dry they will then shrink. The shrinking of the soils can deplete the structural support of soil and cause damaging subsidence. The following figure presents a map identifying the locations within Larimer County that have potential for expansive soil. The highest potential for expansive soil are located in the eastern region of the county.

²⁰ Potential collapsible soils areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.





¹⁹ Colorado Geological Survey (CGS)





Potential Losses

Damages to property due to erosion and deposition are usually classified as cosmetic, functional, or structural. Cosmetic damages refer to slight problems where only the physical appearance of a structure is affected (e.g. cracking in plaster or drywall). Functional damage refers to situations where the use of a structure has been impacted due to subsidence. Structural damages include situations where entire foundations require replacement due to subsidence-caused cracking of supporting walls and footings.

Buildings and infrastructure across the county may be vulnerable to the impacts of erosion and deposition. In September of 2013, Colorado's Front Range (including parts of Larimer County) experienced a catastrophic flood event. This flood event provides a benchmark for infrastructure losses associated with a large-scale flood and the associated erosion hazards.

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 89 critical facility and 13,651 structures in Larimer County that are prone to severe geological hazards (not including the total miles of severe geological hazard prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is approximately \$246 million dollars and the exposed structures is over \$13 billion dollars.

²¹ Potential expansive soils areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.







Figure 16. Geologic Hazard Exposure – Larimer County²²

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are no critical facility and 157 structures in Larimer County that are located in subsidence areas (not including the total miles of infrastructure within subsidence areas). The appraised value of the exposed structures is over \$38.5 million dollars. The following Figure presents a map identifying the parcels within Larimer County that have potential for collapsible soil.

²² Parcels that intersect the 'Severe' geologic hazard areas used for identifying county land use. Source: Larimer County, CGS







Figure 17. Subsidence Exposure – Larimer County²³

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 349 critical facility and 37,739 structures in Larimer County that are located in collapsible soil areas (not including the total miles of infrastructure within collapsible soil areas). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$1.6 billion dollars and the exposed structures is over \$26.8 billion dollars. The following Figure presents a map identifying the parcels within Larimer County that have potential for collapsible soil.

²³ Potential subsidence areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.









The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 571 critical facility and 65,413 structures in Larimer County that are located in expansive soil areas (not including the total miles of infrastructure within expansive soil areas). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$3 billion dollars and the exposed structures is over \$45.5 billion dollars. The following Figure presents a map identifying the parcels within Larimer County that have potential for expansive soil.

²⁴ Potential collapsible soils areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.









Probability of Future Occurrences

Due to the uncertainty associated with existing data, it is challenging to accurately calculate probability for future events related to landslide and rockslide hazards. It can be assured however, that these hazards will continue to alter the landscape of Larimer County in the future.

In areas where climate change results in decreased precipitation in the summer months and reduced surface-water supplies, communities are often forced to pump more ground water to meet their needs. In Colorado, the major aquifers are composed primarily of compressed clay and silt, soil types that are prone to compact when ground-water is pumped. In the past, major land subsidence has occurred in agricultural settings where ground-water has been pumped for irrigation. It is probable that the eastern region of Larimer County will experience more frequent land subsidence hazards over time as a result of local climate change. It is important that Larimer County consider future mitigation actions that will address this hazard, particularly in rapidly growing areas.

²⁵ Parcels intersecting potential expansive soils areas deemed a moderate risk, presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.





Land Use and Development Trends

Rapid and sustained population growth across Colorado and the Front Range has contributed to increasing trends in geologic hazard risk, exposure, and vulnerability across Larimer County. Larimer County and the surrounding areas are rich in natural resources and the continued development of industries related to these natural resources is a distinct possibility. Continued water and mineral resource extraction has the potential to exacerbate geologic hazards further and planning efforts should remain pro-active towards assessing changing geologic hazard risks.

The natural process of erosion and deposition will continue in Larimer County. While erosion and deposition have been categorized as moderate risk hazards in Larimer County, there have been property and infrastructure damages associated with these hazards within Colorado. In the semi-arid climate of Colorado, increases in seasonal precipitation, coupled with periods of prolonged drought, may accelerate processes of erosion.

Based on past and projected population growth, it is very likely that future development will lead to the intersection of erosion-prone soils. As development pressures continue in un-developed areas of the county, vulnerability erosion and deposition may increase along the I-25 corridor and the central region of eastern Larimer County.

Typically, the process of erosion does not limit land use, especially if efforts are made to minimize it. Erosion impacts can be reduced and controlled by surface drainage management, re-vegetation or disturbed lands, controlling stream-carried eroded materials in sediment catchment basins, and riprapping of erosion-prone stream banks (especially adjacent to structures). Ground modification and structural solutions can help mitigate the threats of localize erosion and deposition. Proper drainage and water management are also important to prevent increasing vulnerability to erosion and deposition hazards.





5.3.5 Fire - Wildland

| NATURAL HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Fire – Wildland | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 3.30 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

Wildfires are defined as unwanted or unplanned wildland fires. They include unauthorized human caused fires, escaped prescribed burn projects, and all other wildland fires where the objective is to put the fire out.

Wildfires are fueled by natural ground cover, including native and non-native species of trees, brush and grasses, and crops along with weather conditions and topography. While available fuel, topography, and weather provide the conditions that allow wildfires to spread, most wildfires are caused by people through criminal or accidental misuse of fire.



Wildfires pose serious threats to human safety and property in Larimer County. They can destroy crops, timber resources, recreation areas, and critical wildlife habitat. Wildfires are commonly perceived as hazards in the western part of the state; however, wildfires are a growing problem in the wildland-urban interfaces of eastern Colorado, including communities within Larimer County.

Wildfire behavior is dictated in part by the quantity and quality

of available fuels. Fuel quantity is the mass of material per unit area. Fuel quality is determined by a number of factors, including fuel density, chemistry, and arrangement. Arrangement influences the availability of oxygen surrounding the fuel source. Another important aspect of fuel quality is the total surface area of the material that is exposed to heat and air. Fuels with large area-to-volume ratios, such as grasses, leaves, bark and twigs, are easily ignited when dry.

Climatic and meteorological conditions that influence wildfires include solar insulation, atmospheric humidity, and precipitation, all of which determine the moisture content of wood and leaf litter. Dry spells, heat, low humidity, and wind increase the susceptibility of vegetation to fire. Additional natural agents can be responsible for igniting wildfires, including lightning, sparks generated by rocks rolling down a slope, friction produced by branches rubbing together in the wind, and spontaneous combustion.





Arson and accidents, including sparks from equipment and vehicles, can also cause wildfires. Humancaused wildfires are typically worse than those caused by natural agents. Arson and accidental fires usually start along roads, trails, streams, or at dwellings that are generally on lower slopes or bottoms of hills and valleys. Nurtured by updrafts, these fires can spread quickly uphill. Arson fires are often set deliberately at times when factors such as wind, temperature, and dryness contribute to the spread of flames.

HAZARD PROFILE

Local impacts from wildfire events include the following:

- Loss of life (human, livestock, wildlife)
- Damage to municipal watersheds
- Loss of property
- Evacuations
- Transportation interruption (closing highways)
- Reductions in air quality and human health
- Injuries burns, smoke inhalation, etc.
- Coal seam or other energy facility ignitions
- Loss of vegetation (erosion, loss of forage and habitat for livestock and wildlife)
- Expense of responding (equipment, personnel, supplies, etc.)
- Loss of revenue from destroyed recreation and tourism areas

Predicting the intensity of a wildfire, its rate of spread, and its duration are important for wildfire mitigation activity, response, and firefighter safety. Three key factors affect wildfire behavior in the WUI:

- 1. *Fuels:* The type, density, and continuity of surrounding vegetation and, sometimes, flammable structures, that provide fuel to keep a wildfire burning. Fuels consist of combustible materials and vegetation (including grasses, leaves, ground litter, plants, shrubs, and trees) that feed a fire.
- 2. *Weather:* Relative humidity, wind, and temperatures all affect wildfire threat and behavior.
- *3. Topography:* The steepness and aspect (direction) of slopes, as well as building-site locations, are features that affect fire behavior.

Very often the only factor that a community can have direct influence over is fuel.

Wildfires are often rated based on their ability of their fuels to ignite. Descriptions for the commonly used "Fire Danger Rating" system are listed below:

- Low: Fuels do not ignite readily from small firebrands. However, an intense heat source, such as lightning, may start fires in duff or rotted wood. Fires in open grasslands may burn freely for a few hours after rain, but wood fires spread slowly by creeping or smoldering, and burn in irregular fingers. There is little danger of spotting.
- **Moderate:** Fires can start from most accidental causes, with the exception of lightning. Fires in open grasslands will burn briskly and rapidly on windy days. Timber fires spread slowly to moderately fast. The average fire is of moderate intensity, although heavy concentrations of fuel




may burn hot. Short-distance spotting may occur. Fires are not likely to become serious and control is relatively easy.

- High: All fine dead fuels ignite readily and fires start easily from most causes. Unattended brush and campfires are likely to escape. Fires spread rapidly and short-distance spotting is common. High-intensity burning may develop on slopes or in concentrations of fine fuels. Fires may become serious and their control difficult unless they are attacked successfully while small.
- Extreme/Very High: Fires start easily from all causes and immediately after ignition, spread rapidly and increase quickly in intensity. Spot fires are a constant danger. Fires burning in light fuels may quickly develop intensity characteristics such as long-distance spotting and fire whirlwinds when they burn into heavier fuels.

For the purpose of wildfire mitigation strategy development, this Plan divides the various land use types within Larimer County into four categories: *cultivated agricultural land, forested land, grazing land,* and *miscellaneous.* Cultivated agricultural lands include both irrigated and non-irrigated crop land. Typically, this category of land has very dynamic burning characteristics and seasons. Crops and dormant stands located on Larimer County's cultivated agricultural land can both serve as fuel for wildfires. What makes agricultural land unique is the dynamic nature of the fuel locations and seasons of availability. These factors add to the challenge of wildfire suppression and mitigation.

In the context of the Larimer County landscape, forested land includes the riparian forest, windbreaks, shelterbelts, living snow fences, and urban forests. Much of the forested land in Larimer County occurs along rivers, seasonal water courses, lakes, and ponds. Other forested lands include farmsteads and urban areas. Here, trees are often planted near homes and outbuildings, which contribute to elevated wildfire risk. In addition to the trees, forested lands include a surface cover of dry brush and grasses, which are primary fuel sources for rapidly moving fires.

Grazing lands are primarily made up of sandhill steppe and prairie landscapes. Sandhill steppe is a combination of mixed grasses and sage, and is widely used for livestock grazing. Fuel loads on grazing lands are moderate to heavy and large fires have occurred with this fuel type during springtime wind events. In some areas within

Income 65: Wildfire Mitigation Measures Income Tax Subtraction

Individuals, estates, and trusts may subtract from their federal taxable income certain costs incurred while performing wildfire mitigation measures on their property.

Limitations:

- The taxpayer must own the property upon which the wildfire mitigation measures are performed.
- The property must be located in Colorado and within the wildland urban interface area.
- For tax tears 2009 2012 only, the wildfire mitigation measures must be authorized by a community wildfire protection plan adopted by a local government within the interface area.
- The total amount of the subtraction cannot exceed \$2,500 or the owner's federal taxable income, whichever is less.
- The deduction is available for tax years 2009 2024.

For more information about eligible mitigation projects, please contact the Colorado Department of Revenue's Taxation Division.



Larimer County livestock grazing maintains a rather sparse fuel load. Miscellaneous areas include transportation right of ways, fence lines, disturbed areas, and other locations that contain grasses, tumbleweeds, wild sunflowers, and other vegetation.

Long-term weather patterns in Larimer County have followed a cyclical pattern of wet years (characterized by average to high precipitation levels for the region), followed by a series of drought years (characterized by below average precipitation levels). During wet years, the typical fire season is from March through November. During drought years, the fire season in Colorado has been as long as a full year.

"Wildfire hazard" can be described as the relative likelihood that a wildfire, once started, will become disastrous. Predicting where and when a detrimental wildfire will occur is difficult. However, forest cover type and fire regime are important, and measurable, indicators of wildfire potential. Guidelines have been established for identifying wildfire hazards for the state and private lands in Larimer County. For this analysis the information needed to identify wildfire hazards are vegetative cover type, habitat structural stage, slope, aspect.

Vegetative cover type is identified by first determining if the area is forest land, non-forest land, or water. The dominant plant species with the most canopy cover is used to determine cover type. Habitat Structural Stage determines the size, diameter, and percent of crown cover. Slope helps determine steepness and wind effects on spreading the fire. The steeper the slope, the faster the fire will spread across a surface. The aspect determines the direction the surface faces. Wildfire Hazard Class is determined by identifying the expected fire behavior based on the above data.

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones in the district are located in the western region, in areas where there are lower population densities.







Figure 20. Wildfire Hazard Zone Map – Larimer County²⁶

Before discussing wildland fire risk in Larimer County, a key wildfire management term must first be defined. The term "wildland-urban interface", or WUI, is widely used within the wildland fire management community to describe any area where manmade buildings are constructed close to or within a boundary of natural terrain and fuel, where high potential for wildland fires exist. Communities are able to establish the definition and boundary of their local WUI, and the boundaries often help in meeting local management needs. WUIs can include both public and private land, and can help improve local access to funding sources.

"Wildfire Risk" represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. For the purpose of this Plan, risk has been derived by combining "Wildfire Threat" and "Fire Effects." Fire Effects is comprised of several inputs that identify damaged assets. These inputs include the following: information on where people live (derived from 2012 LandScan data from Colorado), Colorado forest assets, riparian assets, and drinking water assets. The following Wildfire Risk map (Figure 57) identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the county are located in the central region, in areas where there are lower population densities.

²⁶ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.







Figure 21. Wildfire Risk Index Map – Larimer County²⁷

As was discussed previously, understanding the location of people living in the wildland-urban interface is essential for defining potential wildfire impacts to people and homes. The WUI Risk analysis provides a rating of the potential impact of a wildfire on people and their homes. The key input, the wildland-urban interface, reflects housing density (houses per acre).

To calculate WUI risk, WUI housing density data was combined with response function data. Response functions are a method of assigning a net change in the value of a resource or asset based on its susceptibility to fire at various intensity levels (such as flame length). The response functions were defined by a team of experts led by Colorado State Forest Service mitigation planning staff. By combining these data sets it is possible to determine where the greatest potential impact to homes and people are likely to occur in Larimer County.

²⁷ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.







Fire in Larimer County, CO. Photo: Poudre Fire Authority

The following Figure shows the various levels of WUI Risk within Larimer County. The range of values is from -1 to -9, with -1 representing the least negative impacts and -9 representing the most negative impact. For example, areas with high housing density and high flame lengths are rated -9, while areas with low housing density and low flame lengths are rated -1. Understandably so, the Map of WUI Risk shows a number of high risk areas concentrated around densely populated parts of the county. Like the Wildfire Risk and Threat analyses, Wildland-Urban Interface Risk was calculated in the 2013 Colorado State Hazard Mitigation Plan using the same methodology. This allows for comparison and ordination to be made across the state.







Figure 22. WUI Map – Larimer County²⁸

As evidenced by the wildfire risk map, areas within Larimer County that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire. The jurisdictions with the highest WUI Risk Index rating include areas Estes Park, and portions of unincorporated Larimer County.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. The length of the wildfire season and peak months may vary considerably from year to year. Land use, vegetation, available fuels, and weather conditions (including wind, low humidity, and lack of precipitation) are chief factors in determining the number of fires and acreage burned in Colorado each year. Generally, fires are more likely when vegetation is dry from a winter with little snow and/or a spring and summer with sparse

²⁸ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.





rainfall. For these reasons, climate change in Colorado (specifically, a pattern of extended drought conditions) had contributed to increased concern about wildfire in Larimer County.

The frequency, intensity, and duration of wildfires have increased across the Western United States since the 1980s. A 2012 federal report released by the U.S. Department of Agriculture found that the Colorado region, among others, will face an even greater fire risk over time. The report expects Colorado to experience up to a five-fold increase in acres burned by 2050.²⁹ The report's findings are consistent with previous studies on the relationship between climate change and fire risk. Colorado landscapes, including those that characterize Larimer County, are expected to become hotter and drier as the planet warms, which will in turn increase regional wildfire risk.

Previous Occurrences



The High Park fire near homes just northwest of Horsetooth Reservoir, Monday, June 11, 2012, near Fort Collins. (RJ Sangosti, The Denver Post)

According to the best available data there have been 950 wildfire events in Larimer County from 1980 to 2013. Of the 950 wildfires, 62% were natural caused, 35% were human caused, and 3% were unknown caused.

The largest and most destructive fire in Larimer County's history began on June 9, 2012. This fire is known as the High Park Fire and was started by a lightning strike. The High Park fire occurred in the mountains west of Fort Collins. This fire burned over 87, 200 acres, destroyed at least 259 homes, and resulted in the death of

one person. (Source: High Park Fie Burned Area Emergency response (BAER) Report).

Another notable fire is the Bobcat Gulch Fire. This fire burned approximately 10,599 acres in Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest west of Loveland. The fire began on June 12, 2000.

²⁹ US Department of Agriculture. Effects of Climate Variability and Change on Forest Ecosystems. General Technical Report, December 2012







Figure 23. Historical Federal Wildfire Map – Larimer County³⁰

Table 26. Historical Wildfires – Larimer County³¹

| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|-------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| WIND RIVER | Human | 1980 | 10/6/1980 | 10/8/1980 | 0.1 |
| FALL RIVER | Human | 1980 | 9/11/1980 | 9/18/1980 | 0.1 |
| THOMPSON | Human | 1980 | 6/18/1980 | 6/18/1980 | 0.1 |
| HANDICAMP | Human | 1981 | 6/24/1981 | 6/24/1981 | 0.1 |
| ALBERTA FL | Human | 1981 | 10/1/1981 | 10/1/1981 | 0.1 |
| BONE YARD | Human | 1982 | 3/11/1982 | 3/12/1982 | 1 |
| UPPER MORA | Human | 1982 | 11/8/1982 | 11/8/1982 | 0.1 |
| HUBCAP | Natural | 1983 | Not Available | 7/10/1983 | 0.1 |
| HOLLOWELL | Human | 1984 | 5/23/1984 | 5/23/1984 | 0.1 |
| IRON DIKE | Human | 1985 | Not Available | 9/6/1985 | 0.1 |
| RED FEATHER | | 1986 | 6/19/1986 | Not Available | 2 |
| | Human | 1986 | 9/16/1986 | 9/16/1986 | 0.1 |

³⁰ Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|------------|---------|------|------------|------------|----------------|
| | Human | 1986 | 8/17/1986 | 8/18/1986 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 10/15/1986 | 10/15/1986 | 0.5 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/8/1986 | 8/9/1986 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/3/1986 | 8/3/1986 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/6/1986 | 8/7/1986 | 0.3 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/5/1986 | 8/8/1986 | 4 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 7/14/1986 | 7/15/1986 | 1 |
| | Human | 1986 | 7/13/1986 | 7/16/1986 | 1 |
| | Human | 1986 | 6/19/1986 | 6/21/1986 | 2 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/18/1986 | 8/20/1986 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/18/1986 | 8/19/1986 | 0.2 |
| | Human | 1986 | 8/18/1986 | 8/19/1986 | 0.8 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/18/1986 | 8/20/1986 | 2.5 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/16/1986 | 8/17/1986 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/11/1986 | 8/12/1986 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/9/1986 | 8/10/1986 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/9/1986 | 8/10/1986 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1986 | 8/8/1986 | 8/10/1986 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1986 | 8/5/1986 | 8/8/1986 | 3 |
| | Human | 1986 | 8/5/1986 | 8/10/1986 | 48 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/3/1986 | 8/5/1986 | 0.3 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 8/2/1986 | 8/5/1986 | 0.3 |
| | Human | 1986 | 7/17/1986 | 7/20/1986 | 1 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 6/14/1986 | 6/17/1986 | 1 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 5/23/1986 | 5/23/1986 | 0.4 |
| | Natural | 1986 | 3/8/1986 | 3/10/1986 | 1 |
| ESTES CONE | Natural | 1986 | 8/11/1986 | 8/11/1986 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1987 | 10/11/1987 | 10/17/1987 | 6 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 9/21/1987 | 9/23/1987 | 10 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 9/2/1987 | 9/5/1987 | 100 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 8/14/1987 | 8/16/1987 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1987 | 7/26/1987 | 7/28/1987 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 7/8/1987 | 7/10/1987 | 0.3 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 7/5/1987 | 7/6/1987 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 6/27/1987 | 6/30/1987 | 1.5 |
| | Human | 1987 | 6/6/1987 | 6/8/1987 | 1 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 10/23/1987 | 10/25/1987 | 0.3 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 10/26/1987 | 10/28/1987 | 5 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total |
|-------------|---------|------|------------|------------|-------|
| | Natural | 1097 | 10/11/1097 | 10/12/1097 | Acres |
| | Natural | 1907 | 10/11/1987 | 10/13/1987 | 0.5 |
| | Natural | 1907 | 0/25/1987 | 0/26/1087 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 9/25/1987 | 9/26/1987 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 8/16/1987 | 8/19/1987 | 1.5 |
| | Human | 1987 | 8/6/1987 | 8/7/1987 | 0.3 |
| | Human | 1987 | //29/198/ | 8/2/1987 | 1./ |
| | Human | 1987 | //24/198/ | //31/198/ | 0.3 |
| | Human | 1987 | 7/21/1987 | 7/27/1987 | 20 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 7/9/1987 | 7/12/1987 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 6/25/1987 | 6/28/1987 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1987 | 6/13/1987 | 6/13/1987 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1987 | 8/5/1987 | 8/7/1987 | 3 |
| | Natural | 1987 | 7/7/1987 | 7/8/1987 | 0.3 |
| EAGLE CLIF | Natural | 1987 | 7/21/1987 | 7/21/1987 | 0.1 |
| JOHNSTON | Natural | 1987 | 7/27/1987 | 7/27/1987 | 0.1 |
| WIND RIVER | Human | 1987 | 8/19/1987 | 8/20/1987 | 0.8 |
| KNIFES EDGE | Natural | 1987 | 9/12/1987 | 9/14/1987 | 0.1 |
| ASPENGLEN | Human | 1987 | 10/10/1987 | 10/10/1987 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 10/22/1988 | 10/22/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 9/8/1988 | 9/11/1988 | 2 |
| GRACE CREEK | Natural | 1988 | 9/6/1988 | 10/26/1988 | 2800 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 9/4/1988 | 9/5/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 8/31/1988 | 9/1/1988 | 0.5 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 8/30/1988 | 9/1/1988 | 0.3 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 8/27/1988 | 8/29/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 8/23/1988 | 8/25/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1988 | 8/18/1988 | 8/20/1988 | 0.3 |
| | Human | 1988 | 8/7/1988 | 8/9/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 7/31/1988 | 8/4/1988 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 8/1/1988 | 8/7/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 7/25/1988 | 7/27/1988 | 1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 7/25/1988 | 7/28/1988 | 3 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 7/17/1988 | 7/19/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1988 | 7/17/1988 | 7/18/1988 | 0.2 |
| | Human | 1988 | 7/14/1988 | 7/27/1988 | 200 |
| | Human | 1988 | 7/3/1988 | 7/3/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 6/15/1988 | 6/16/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1988 | 6/13/1988 | 6/16/1988 | 3 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total |
|------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|-------|
| | | 4000 | C /0 /4 000 | C /4 C /4 000 | Acres |
| | Human | 1988 | 6/8/1988 | 6/16/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 9/19/1988 | 9/21/1988 | 0.8 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 9/17/1988 | 9/19/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 9/10/1988 | 9/13/1988 | 2 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 8/31/1988 | 9/5/1988 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 8/25/1988 | 8/25/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 8/23/1988 | 8/28/1988 | 20 |
| | Human | 1988 | 7/31/1988 | 8/1/1988 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 7/13/1988 | 7/15/1988 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 7/10/1988 | 7/13/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1988 | 7/6/1988 | 7/7/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 7/5/1988 | 7/8/1988 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 7/2/1988 | 7/3/1988 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 6/13/1988 | 6/13/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1988 | 6/22/1988 | 6/23/1988 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 6/21/1988 | 6/22/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 6/17/1988 | 6/25/1988 | 20 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 6/8/1988 | 6/11/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 6/8/1988 | 6/11/1988 | 2 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 11/1/1988 | 11/1/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 7/11/1988 | 7/11/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1988 | 6/29/1988 | 6/30/1988 | 0.1 |
| FALLRIVER | Natural | 1988 | 6/19/1988 | 6/19/1988 | 0.1 |
| CUBLAKE | Natural | 1988 | 6/21/1988 | 6/22/1988 | 0.2 |
| ESTES CONE | Natural | 1988 | 6/30/1988 | 7/3/1988 | 0.1 |
| SWITCHBACK | Natural | 1988 | 8/27/1988 | 8/28/1988 | 0.1 |
| WILLOWPARK | Human | 1988 | Not Available | 9/7/1988 | 0.1 |
| BIERSTADT | Natural | 1988 | 10/9/1988 | 10/9/1988 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1989 | 10/20/1989 | 10/21/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1989 | 10/7/1989 | 10/9/1989 | 0.2 |
| | Human | 1989 | 9/4/1989 | 9/10/1989 | 100.1 |
| | Human | 1989 | 9/3/1989 | 9/3/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1989 | 8/29/1989 | 8/31/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1989 | 8/14/1989 | 8/14/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1989 | 7/10/1989 | 7/10/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1989 | 7/8/1989 | 7/9/1989 | 0.1 |
| #6 | Natural | 1989 | 7/8/1989 | 7/30/1989 | 1967 |
| | Natural | 1989 | 6/29/1989 | 6/30/1989 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total |
|-----------|---------|------|---------------|------------|-------|
| | Natural | 1080 | 6/20/1080 | 7/30/1989 | 364 |
| | Natural | 1080 | 6/11/1080 | 6/13/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1020 | 5/21/1080 | 5/31/1080 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1000 | 5/32/1080 | 5/31/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1000 | 1/22/1989 | 3/24/1989 | 0.3 |
| | Natural | 1000 | 4/22/1989 | 4/22/1989 | 1.5 |
| | Human | 1000 | 4/22/1989 | 4/23/1989 | 2.5 |
| | Natural | 1000 | 0/21/1000 | 0/27/1090 | 10 |
| | Natural | 1909 | 9/21/1909 | 9/27/1909 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1989 | 8/14/1989 | 8/15/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1989 | 8/12/1989 | 8/13/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1989 | 8/8/1989 | 8/9/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1989 | 8/6/1989 | 8/6/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1989 | 8/7/1989 | 8/7/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1989 | 7/14/1989 | 7/15/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1989 | 7/29/1989 | 7/30/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1989 | 7/7/1989 | 7/8/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1989 | 7/6/1989 | 7/7/1989 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1989 | 6/1/1989 | 6/2/1989 | 0.1 |
| STORMY PK | Natural | 1989 | Not Available | 7/8/1989 | 1 |
| MCCULOUGH | Human | 1989 | Not Available | 8/1/1989 | 0.1 |
| VTS LOT | Natural | 1989 | Not Available | 8/9/1989 | 0.1 |
| CUB LAKE | Human | 1989 | 8/11/1989 | 8/11/1989 | 0.1 |
| OVER HILL | Human | 1989 | 10/14/1989 | 10/16/1989 | 1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 9/2/1990 | 9/3/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 9/2/1990 | 9/3/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 8/30/1990 | 8/31/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 8/27/1990 | 8/29/1990 | 1 |
| | Human | 1990 | 8/11/1990 | 8/12/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 7/17/1990 | 7/18/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1990 | 6/25/1990 | 6/26/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/25/1990 | 6/28/1990 | 1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/30/1990 | 6/30/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/26/1990 | 6/27/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/25/1990 | 7/5/1990 | 141 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/26/1990 | 6/27/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/25/1990 | 6/28/1990 | 2.5 |
| | Human | 1990 | 8/30/1990 | 9/1/1990 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 7/28/1990 | 7/30/1990 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|------------|---------|------|---------------|------------|----------------|
| | Natural | 1990 | 7/16/1990 | 7/18/1990 | 0.3 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 7/6/1990 | 7/6/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 7/3/1990 | 7/3/1990 | 0.2 |
| | Human | 1990 | 6/27/1990 | 6/30/1990 | 1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/26/1990 | 6/26/1990 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/26/1990 | 6/26/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/26/1990 | 6/27/1990 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/24/1990 | 6/26/1990 | 0.5 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 6/25/1990 | 6/27/1990 | 5 |
| | Human | 1990 | 6/19/1990 | 6/22/1990 | 6 |
| | Natural | 1990 | 1/11/1990 | 1/14/1990 | 1 |
| MORAINE PK | Natural | 1990 | Not Available | 7/4/1990 | 0.1 |
| STEEP | Natural | 1990 | 7/29/1990 | 7/30/1990 | 0.1 |
| CHAOS | Natural | 1990 | 9/11/1990 | 9/12/1990 | 0.4 |
| MANY PARKS | Natural | 1990 | 9/26/1990 | 9/27/1990 | 0.3 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 10/11/1991 | 10/13/1991 | 0.5 |
| | Human | 1991 | 9/8/1991 | 9/9/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 8/23/1991 | 8/28/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 8/23/1991 | 8/24/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/19/1991 | 7/21/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/18/1991 | 7/20/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/15/1991 | 7/18/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/15/1991 | 7/16/1991 | 0.8 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/12/1991 | 7/13/1991 | 0.3 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/6/1991 | 7/6/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/5/1991 | 7/6/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 6/24/1991 | 6/25/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1991 | 4/29/1991 | 5/1/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 3/30/1991 | 3/31/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 9/20/1991 | 9/22/1991 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 9/3/1991 | 9/5/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/19/1991 | 7/20/1991 | 0.3 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/19/1991 | 7/19/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/16/1991 | 7/21/1991 | 11 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 9/28/1991 | 9/29/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/5/1991 | 7/8/1991 | 0.8 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 7/5/1991 | 7/6/1991 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 6/28/1991 | 6/29/1991 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|------------|---------|------|---------------|------------|----------------|
| | Human | 1991 | 6/28/1991 | 6/30/1991 | 5 |
| | Natural | 1991 | 5/14/1991 | 5/16/1991 | 1 |
| PUMPHOUSE | Natural | 1991 | 6/29/1991 | 6/29/1991 | 0.1 |
| FLAT TOP | Human | 1991 | Not Available | 7/4/1991 | 0.1 |
| MORAINE PK | Natural | 1991 | 9/21/1991 | 9/22/1991 | 0.1 |
| BEAR LAKE | Human | 1991 | 9/29/1991 | 9/30/1991 | 0.1 |
| UTE TRAIL | Human | 1991 | 10/17/1991 | 10/19/1991 | 0.5 |
| | Human | 1992 | 10/18/1992 | 10/18/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 10/11/1992 | 10/19/1992 | 0.8 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 9/20/1992 | 9/20/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1992 | 9/8/1992 | 9/8/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 8/20/1992 | 8/22/1992 | 0.2 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 8/4/1992 | 8/4/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 5/20/1992 | 5/20/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1992 | 2/6/1992 | 2/6/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 10/26/1992 | 10/26/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 10/7/1992 | 10/9/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 9/15/1992 | 9/16/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 8/21/1992 | 8/21/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 8/14/1992 | 8/15/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 8/11/1992 | 8/11/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 8/10/1992 | 8/10/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 8/9/1992 | 8/10/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 7/4/1992 | 7/5/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1992 | 6/17/1992 | 6/17/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 6/12/1992 | 6/13/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 6/12/1992 | 6/12/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 6/12/1992 | 6/13/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 5/25/1992 | 5/26/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 5/19/1992 | 5/20/1992 | 0.5 |
| | Natural | 1992 | 5/8/1992 | 5/11/1992 | 0.1 |
| WINDRIVER | Natural | 1992 | 7/31/1992 | 8/2/1992 | 0.1 |
| STEEP MT | Natural | 1992 | 8/23/1992 | 8/24/1992 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 9/11/1993 | 9/15/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 9/3/1993 | 9/5/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 9/2/1993 | 9/5/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 8/24/1993 | 8/25/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 8/17/1993 | 8/25/1993 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|---------------|---------|------|------------|-----------|----------------|
| | Human | 1993 | 8/5/1993 | 8/5/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1993 | 7/31/1993 | 8/5/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 7/29/1993 | 7/29/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1993 | 7/16/1993 | 7/18/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1993 | 7/11/1993 | 7/14/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 6/27/1993 | 6/30/1993 | 30 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 8/7/1993 | 8/7/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 7/20/1993 | 7/24/1993 | 0.1 |
| SNOWTOP | Natural | 1993 | 7/9/1993 | 7/19/1993 | 275 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 6/22/1993 | 6/24/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 6/10/1993 | 6/11/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 5/14/1993 | 5/15/1993 | 0.1 |
| | Human | 1993 | 5/6/1993 | 5/7/1993 | 1 |
| | Natural | 1993 | 7/30/1993 | 8/1/1993 | 0.1 |
| TWINSISTER | Human | 1993 | 8/14/1993 | 8/15/1993 | 0.1 |
| BEAVER II | Natural | 1994 | 7/21/1994 | 7/21/1994 | 0.5 |
| BEAVER'S | Natural | 1994 | 7/21/1994 | 7/21/1994 | 0.3 |
| ROACH | Natural | 1994 | 9/8/1994 | 9/10/1994 | 0.1 |
| LINK CREEK | Natural | 1994 | 8/15/1994 | 8/18/1994 | 0.1 |
| | Natural | 1994 | 8/16/1994 | 8/18/1994 | 3 |
| GREY ROCK | Natural | 1994 | 8/5/1994 | 8/7/1994 | 0.1 |
| ELKHOOF | Natural | 1994 | 8/5/1994 | 8/8/1994 | 0.1 |
| HEWLETT GULCH | Natural | 1994 | 8/5/1994 | 8/8/1994 | 7 |
| INDIAN | Natural | 1994 | 7/30/1994 | 8/3/1994 | 0.1 |
| MEADOWS 2 | | 1994 | 7/27/1994 | 7/28/1994 | |
| ROCKPILE | Natural | 1994 | 7/22/1994 | 7/24/1994 | 0.7 |
| GREY ROCK | Natural | 1994 | 7/19/1994 | 9/4/1994 | 0.5 |
| CAMERON | Natural | 1994 | 7/16/1994 | 7/16/1994 | 3 |
| NUNN CREEK | Natural | 1994 | 7/15/1994 | 7/17/1994 | 0.1 |
| LONG DRAW | Natural | 1994 | 7/15/1994 | 7/16/1994 | 1 |
| EATON | Natural | 1994 | 7/15/1994 | 7/15/1994 | 0.5 |
| FISH CREEK | Natural | 1994 | 7/23/1994 | 7/24/1994 | 0.2 |
| NICOMAS | Natural | 1994 | 7/12/1994 | 7/18/1994 | 0.1 |
| JUG GULCH | Natural | 1994 | 7/11/1994 | 7/12/1994 | 30 |
| CREEDMORE | Natural | 1994 | 7/11/1994 | 7/12/1994 | 0.1 |
| LONE PINE | Natural | 1994 | 7/10/1994 | 7/30/1994 | 0.3 |
| EGGERS | Natural | 1994 | 7/4/1994 | 7/6/1994 | 370 |
| DEVIL'S CREEK | Natural | 1994 | 6/29/1994 | 6/30/1994 | 0.7 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|---------------|---------|------|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| LADY MOON | Natural | 1994 | 6/25/1994 | 6/25/1994 | 1 |
| DERBY | Natural | 1994 | 5/12/1994 | 5/12/1994 | 0.1 |
| SWAMP CREEK | Human | 1994 | 1/19/1994 | 1/19/1994 | 0.1 |
| HOOD INCIDENT | Natural | 1994 | 9/9/1994 | 9/10/1994 | 3 |
| ROARING CREEK | Natural | 1994 | 8/5/1994 | 8/8/1994 | 0.1 |
| SALT CABIN | Natural | 1994 | 8/1/1994 | 8/2/1994 | 0.1 |
| SEAM ROCK | Natural | 1994 | 7/22/1994 | 7/24/1994 | 1 |
| POWER PLANT | Natural | 1994 | 7/23/1994 | 7/24/1994 | 0.1 |
| ANSEL | Natural | 1994 | 7/18/1994 | 7/19/1994 | 0.1 |
| MOUNT | Natural | 1994 | 7/16/1994 | 7/16/1994 | 1 |
| OLYMPUS | | 1994 | 7/11/1994 | 7/15/1994 | |
| INDIAN | Natural | 1994 | 7/12/1994 | 7/13/1994 | 0.1 |
| MEADOWS I | | 1994 | 7/11/1994 | 7/15/1994 | |
| POLE HILL | Natural | 1994 | 7/11/1994 | 7/16/1994 | 3.5 |
| WHITE PINE | Natural | 1994 | 7/1/1994 | 7/2/1994 | 0.1 |
| HELLS CANYON | Natural | 1994 | 6/23/1994 | 6/24/1994 | 50 |
| PALISADE | Natural | 1994 | 4/3/1994 | 4/10/1994 | 1 |
| ALEXANDER 3 | Natural | 1994 | 7/13/1994 | 7/14/1994 | 0.1 |
| LONETREE | Natural | 1994 | 6/14/1994 | 6/14/1994 | 0.1 |
| TWIN CABIN | Natural | 1994 | 6/18/1994 | 6/18/1994 | 3 |
| GULCH | | 1994 | 6/19/1994 | 6/19/1994 | |
| COUNTYLINE | Natural | 1994 | 7/11/1994 | 7/13/1994 | 0.1 |
| LILY LAKE | Human | 1994 | 7/29/1994 | 7/30/1994 | 0.5 |
| TUXEDO | Natural | 1994 | Not Available | 8/4/1994 | 0.1 |
| BIERSTADT | Natural | 1994 | Not Available | 8/8/1994 | 0.1 |
| MCGRAW | Natural | 1994 | 8/10/1994 | 8/11/1994 | 0.1 |
| GEM LAKE | Natural | 1994 | 8/27/1994 | 8/28/1994 | 0.1 |
| SOUTH COW | Natural | 1994 | 7/29/1994 | 7/30/1994 | 0.1 |
| SKI SLOPE | Natural | 1994 | Not Available | 8/4/1994 | 0.1 |
| FALL RIVER | Natural | 1994 | Not Available | 8/8/1994 | 0.1 |
| LITTLE | Natural | 1994 | 8/10/1994 | 8/11/1994 | 0.1 |
| GEM LAKE | Natural | 1994 | 8/27/1994 | 8/28/1994 | 0.1 |
| SOUTH COW | Natural | 1995 | 9/3/1995 | 9/3/1995 | 0.1 |
| SKI SLOPE | Natural | 1995 | 8/13/1995 | 8/14/1995 | 0.1 |
| FALL RIVER | Natural | 1995 | 8/17/1995 | 8/18/1995 | 0.1 |
| LITTLE | Natural | 1995 | 8/18/1995 | 8/19/1995 | 0.1 |
| CEDAR GULCH | Natural | 1995 | 8/4/1995 | 8/6/1995 | 0.1 |
| NORTH BALD | Natural | 1995 | 8/1/1995 | 8/3/1995 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|------------------------|---------|------|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| BALD | Natural | 1995 | 4/5/1995 | 4/8/1995 | 0.1 |
| ALMOST | Natural | 1995 | 9/14/1995 | 9/15/1995 | 0.1 |
| HODGE | Natural | 1995 | 8/31/1995 | 9/3/1995 | 0.1 |
| GREYROCK | Natural | 1995 | 8/20/1995 | 8/22/1995 | 1 |
| NORTH | | 1995 | 8/18/1995 | 8/19/1995 | |
| GREYROCK | Human | 1995 | 8/9/1995 | 8/13/1995 | 0.1 |
| DEVILS GULCH | Natural | 1995 | 8/5/1995 | 8/5/1995 | 0.3 |
| BALLARD | Natural | 1995 | 8/3/1995 | 8/5/1995 | 1 |
| PIERSON PARK | Natural | 1995 | 8/2/1995 | 8/3/1995 | 0.1 |
| SHAKEDOWN | Natural | 1995 | 7/29/1995 | 8/2/1995 | 1.5 |
| BIG SOUTH TRAIL | Human | 1995 | 6/21/1995 | 6/23/1995 | 0.3 |
| PALISADE MTN | Natural | 1995 | 7/14/1995 | 7/15/1995 | 0.5 |
| HYATT HILL | Natural | 1995 | 7/23/1995 | 7/30/1995 | 0.1 |
| POVERTY FLATS | Natural | 1996 | 7/7/1996 | 7/8/1996 | 5 |
| STRATTON | Natural | 1996 | 8/28/1996 | 8/29/1996 | 12 |
| BENNETT | Natural | 1996 | 10/3/1996 | 10/6/1996 | 14 |
| CALIFORNIA | Natural | 1996 | 7/23/1996 | 7/26/1996 | 0.1 |
| GULCH | | 1996 | 9/10/1996 | 9/12/1996 | |
| EAGLE CLIF | Natural | 1996 | 9/10/1996 | 9/12/1996 | 0.1 |
| NORTH FORK | Natural | 1996 | 8/29/1996 | 8/30/1996 | 0.1 |
| DUCK LAKE | Natural | 1996 | 8/20/1996 | 8/24/1996 | 0.1 |
| STONE | Natural | 1996 | 8/2/1996 | 8/4/1996 | 0.1 |
| MOUNTAIN | | 1996 | 8/18/1996 | 8/26/1996 | |
| DRAKE | Natural | 1996 | 8/24/1996 | 8/25/1996 | 0.3 |
| ROARING CREEK | Human | 1996 | 8/15/1996 | 8/21/1996 | 0.1 |
| SHEEP CREEK | Human | 1996 | 8/11/1996 | 8/13/1996 | 0.1 |
| HEWLETT | Natural | 1996 | 7/23/1996 | 7/25/1996 | 0.1 |
| CIRQUE MEADOW | Human | 1996 | 5/17/1996 | 5/29/1996 | 0.1 |
| DIVERSION | Natural | 1996 | 6/11/1996 | 6/15/1996 | 0.1 |
| WALTONIA | Natural | 1996 | 6/10/1996 | 6/15/1996 | 8 |
| MINERAL | Natural | 1996 | 5/12/1996 | 5/13/1996 | 0.2 |
| SPRINGS | | 1996 | 5/9/1996 | 5/10/1996 | |
| PROSPECT | Natural | 1996 | Not Available | 7/3/1996 | 2.5 |
| RUSTIC | Human | 1996 | 5/23/1996 | 5/23/1996 | 33 |
| LONE PINE I | Natural | 1996 | 6/10/1996 | 6/10/1996 | 0.1 |
| CRYSTAL | Human | 1996 | Not Available | 7/3/1996 | 178.1 |
| BENNETT CREEK | Natural | 1996 | 7/24/1996 | 7/25/1996 | 1.3 |
| STORM | Natural | 1996 | Not Available | 8/9/1996 | 8 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|---------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| STOVE PRAIRIE | Human | 1996 | Not Available | 7/3/1996 | 1 |
| EGGERS | Natural | 1996 | Not Available | 7/3/1996 | 0.1 |
| CRYSTAL | | 1997 | 9/26/1997 | 9/29/1997 | 0 |
| MCGREGOR | Natural | 1997 | 9/3/1997 | 9/3/1997 | 0.1 |
| INDIANHEAD | Natural | 1997 | 9/14/1997 | 9/17/1997 | 0.1 |
| STORM | | 1997 | 7/21/1997 | 7/23/1997 | 0.2 |
| COTTONTAIL | Natural | 1997 | 7/16/1997 | 7/20/1997 | 0.1 |
| MOSQUITO | Natural | 1997 | 7/16/1997 | 7/21/1997 | 0.1 |
| RUSTIC | | 1997 | 7/16/1997 | 7/18/1997 | 0 |
| WALTONIA | | 1997 | 7/5/1997 | 7/10/1997 | 0 |
| ROARING BONE | Human | 1997 | 7/5/1997 | 7/17/1997 | 0.1 |
| ZIMMERMAN | Human | 1997 | 6/21/1997 | 6/24/1997 | 0.1 |
| BUCKHORN | Human | 1997 | 7/23/1997 | 7/28/1997 | 1.2 |
| NORTH FORK | Natural | 1997 | 7/17/1997 | 7/31/1997 | 0.8 |
| PRAIRIE GULCH | Natural | 1997 | 7/18/1997 | 7/24/1997 | 0.1 |
| BEAR GULCH | Natural | 1997 | 7/18/1997 | 7/20/1997 | 0.1 |
| SYLVANDALE | Natural | 1997 | 7/18/1997 | 7/18/1997 | 0.1 |
| MANY | Natural | 1997 | 7/16/1997 | 7/31/1997 | 0.1 |
| THUNDERS | | 1997 | 7/12/1997 | 7/21/1997 | |
| FALLS GULCH | Natural | 1997 | 7/11/1997 | 7/12/1997 | 0.3 |
| PALISADE | Natural | 1997 | 5/20/1997 | 5/21/1997 | 0.1 |
| BUCK GULCH | Natural | 1997 | Not Available | 5/14/1997 | 15 |
| DEADMAN | Natural | 1997 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| CROSIER 2 | Natural | 1997 | Not Available | 10/15/1997 | 0.1 |
| BIG SOUTH | Human | 1997 | Not Available | 4/4/1997 | 0.1 |
| CROSIER 1 | Natural | 1997 | Not Available | 9/30/1997 | 0.1 |
| LIVERMORE | Natural | 1997 | Not Available | 10/27/1997 | 3.5 |
| LOST LAKE | Human | 1997 | Not Available | 10/27/1997 | 0.3 |
| KIOWA ROAD | Human | 1997 | 6/25/1997 | 6/26/1997 | 0.1 |
| FISH CREEK | Natural | 1997 | 7/13/1997 | 7/13/1997 | 0.3 |
| BALDPATE | Human | 1997 | 7/16/1997 | 7/22/1997 | 5 |
| SUGARLOAF | | 1997 | 7/18/1997 | 7/21/1997 | 0 |
| GLACIERCK1 | Human | 1997 | 7/23/1997 | 7/24/1997 | 13.2 |
| MORAINEDMP | Human | 1997 | 8/23/1997 | 8/28/1997 | 0.1 |
| HIDDEN VAL | Human | 1997 | 8/14/1997 | 8/16/1997 | 2 |
| GLACIERCK2 | Human | 1998 | 9/8/1998 | 9/14/1998 | 8.2 |
| GLACIERCK3 | Human | 1998 | 9/8/1998 | 9/25/1998 | 4.3 |
| BIERSTADT | Natural | 1998 | 9/8/1998 | 9/21/1998 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|--------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| HONDIUS | Human | 1998 | 9/8/1998 | 9/14/1998 | 0.1 |
| BIGHORN | Natural | 1998 | 9/8/1998 | 9/9/1998 | 0.5 |
| DEER RIDGE | Natural | 1998 | 9/8/1998 | 9/11/1998 | 0.1 |
| BEAVER | Natural | 1998 | 9/8/1998 | 9/10/1998 | 0.1 |
| NCOWCREEK | Natural | 1998 | 8/16/1998 | 8/20/1998 | 0.1 |
| MIRRORLAKE | Human | 1998 | 8/10/1998 | 8/13/1998 | 0.1 |
| PINGREE HILL | Natural | 1998 | 8/10/1998 | 8/15/1998 | 0.1 |
| COMANCHE | Natural | 1998 | 7/27/1998 | 7/29/1998 | 0.1 |
| STONE | Natural | 1998 | 7/20/1998 | 7/25/1998 | 80 |
| MOUNTAIN #2 | | 1998 | 7/15/1998 | 7/19/1998 | |
| JUG GULCH | Natural | 1998 | 7/13/1998 | 7/14/1998 | 2 |
| PARROTT | Natural | 1998 | 7/3/1998 | 7/5/1998 | 0.1 |
| SPRUCE | Human | 1998 | 7/2/1998 | 7/2/1998 | 1 |
| MOUNTAIN | | 1998 | 6/30/1998 | 8/14/1998 | |
| SUNDANCE | Natural | 1998 | 2/28/1998 | 3/18/1998 | 0.1 |
| CROSIER | Natural | 1998 | Not Available | 5/15/1998 | 0.2 |
| LIGHTNING | | 1998 | Not Available | 6/5/1998 | |
| SHEEP | Natural | 1998 | Not Available | 5/1/1998 | 0.3 |
| HOME MORAINE | Natural | 1998 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| GREENWOOD | Natural | 1998 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| PINEWOOD | Natural | 1998 | Not Available | 10/27/1998 | 0.1 |
| LOST LAKE | Human | 1998 | Not Available | 9/22/1998 | 0.1 |
| PIERSON PARK | Human | 1998 | Not Available | 9/30/1998 | 0.1 |
| MAXWELL | Natural | 1998 | Not Available | 10/28/1998 | 0.1 |
| TOM BENNETT | Human | 1998 | Not Available | 10/16/1998 | 0.1 |
| MINERAL | Natural | 1998 | Not Available | 10/30/1998 | 0.8 |
| SPRINGS | | 1998 | Not Available | 10/28/1998 | |
| GREYROCK | Human | 1998 | Not Available | 11/17/1998 | 142 |
| DEERRIDGEB | Human | 1998 | Not Available | 12/13/1998 | 58 |
| DEERRIDGEP | Human | 1998 | 3/30/1998 | 4/10/1998 | 45 |
| MCGRAWLEAF | Human | 1998 | Not Available | 7/8/1998 | 0.9 |
| MCGRWRANCH | | 1998 | 8/14/1998 | 8/18/1998 | 0 |
| OLDFALLRIV | | 1998 | 10/14/1998 | 10/15/1998 | 0 |
| MORAINEPKH | Human | 1999 | 6/26/1999 | 6/29/1999 | 6.5 |
| DEERRDGPLS | Human | 1999 | 8/22/1999 | 8/22/1999 | 0.5 |
| HIDENVALY2 | Human | 1999 | 6/19/1999 | 6/20/1999 | 0.1 |
| MORAINEPKC | Human | 1999 | 3/29/1999 | 3/29/1999 | 14.7 |
| DEER RDG 3 | Human | 1999 | 12/4/1999 | 12/13/1999 | 0.2 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|-----------------|---------|------|---------------|------------|----------------|
| MORAINEPF1 | Human | 1999 | 10/9/1999 | 10/10/1999 | 8 |
| MORAINEPKB | Human | 1999 | 10/9/1999 | 10/9/1999 | 15.6 |
| VALHALLA | Human | 1999 | 9/13/1999 | 9/15/1999 | 3 |
| VALHALAP2 | Human | 1999 | 9/2/1999 | 9/3/1999 | 1 |
| SNOWY OWLS | Human | 1999 | 8/26/1999 | 8/29/1999 | 0.1 |
| SHEEPMTN | Natural | 1999 | 8/26/1999 | 8/28/1999 | 0.1 |
| HIGHDRIVE | Natural | 1999 | 8/18/1999 | 8/21/1999 | 0.1 |
| SURPRISE | Human | 1999 | 8/3/1999 | 8/5/1999 | 0.1 |
| PALISADE | Human | 1999 | 7/13/1999 | 7/14/1999 | 0.2 |
| PINGREE HILL | Natural | 1999 | 7/8/1999 | 7/14/1999 | 0.1 |
| HUMMINGBIRD | Natural | 1999 | 7/2/1999 | 7/8/1999 | 0.1 |
| NARROWS | Human | 1999 | 6/21/1999 | 6/23/1999 | 0.1 |
| PIPER MEADOWS | Human | 1999 | 10/25/1999 | 11/3/1999 | 0.2 |
| FIRE | | 1999 | 11/5/1999 | 11/6/1999 | |
| KILLPECKER | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 1/20/1999 | 0.2 |
| LOST LAKE | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 1/22/1999 | 0.1 |
| LONE PALM | Natural | 1999 | Not Available | 1/29/1999 | 0.1 |
| MITCHELL DITCH | Natural | 1999 | Not Available | 3/6/1999 | 0.1 |
| SEAMAN | Natural | 1999 | Not Available | 4/14/1999 | 2.4 |
| HONEY DO | Natural | 1999 | Not Available | 4/14/1999 | 0.5 |
| GREEN RIDGE | Natural | 1999 | Not Available | 4/18/1999 | 1 |
| LEPRICHAUN | Natural | 1999 | Not Available | 4/22/1999 | 0 |
| FISH CREEK | Natural | 1999 | Not Available | 5/12/1999 | 4.2 |
| BUTTON ROCK | Natural | 1999 | Not Available | 5/23/1999 | 2 |
| BEAVER FIRE | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 6/19/1999 | 0.1 |
| ARROW | Natural | 1999 | Not Available | 8/14/1999 | 0.2 |
| NUNN CREEK | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 8/14/1999 | 0.2 |
| SALT CABIN FIRE | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 10/15/1999 | 0.1 |
| VALHALLAP3 | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 10/21/1999 | 0.7 |
| VALHALLAP4 | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 10/21/1999 | 1.2 |
| MORAINPKP1 | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 10/24/1999 | 1 |
| MRAINDUMPP | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 12/14/1999 | 0.3 |
| DEERRIDGE2 | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 9/10/1999 | 126 |
| DEERRIDGE5 | Human | 1999 | 3/30/1999 | 3/30/1999 | 53 |
| MORAINEPK2 | Human | 1999 | 5/24/1999 | 5/25/1999 | 75 |
| GLACIER CR | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 7/26/1999 | 20 |
| NLATRLMRNE | Human | 1999 | Not Available | 7/26/1999 | 1 |
| MORAINEPKP | Human | 2000 | Not Available | 8/3/2000 | 5 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|---------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| MRNPK3PILE | Human | 2000 | 8/11/2000 | 8/13/2000 | 2 |
| Moraine2h | Human | 2000 | 9/12/2000 | 9/12/2000 | 25 |
| Moraine G | Human | 2000 | 9/9/2000 | 9/11/2000 | 40 |
| BEAVERBROK | Human | 2000 | 9/6/2000 | 9/8/2000 | 60 |
| LAWNLAKEPL | Human | 2000 | 9/5/2000 | 9/8/2000 | 0.1 |
| VALHALLAPL | Human | 2000 | 9/6/2000 | 9/8/2000 | 1.5 |
| HIDDENVLLY | Human | 2000 | 9/5/2000 | 9/5/2000 | 1 |
| BEAVBRKPLS | Human | 2000 | 9/5/2000 | 9/6/2000 | 0.1 |
| NRTHFRKPIL | Human | 2000 | 9/1/2000 | 9/3/2000 | 0.2 |
| LIONSCMPFR | Human | 2000 | 8/26/2000 | 8/29/2000 | 0.1 |
| CASTLEMTN. | Natural | 2000 | 8/15/2000 | 8/16/2000 | 0.1 |
| Bighorn Mt | Natural | 2000 | 8/13/2000 | 8/16/2000 | 1.5 |
| DEER FIRE | Natural | 2000 | 8/13/2000 | 8/15/2000 | 1.5 |
| ForesterCk | Natural | 2000 | 8/7/2000 | 8/22/2000 | 1 |
| SHEEP MTN | Natural | 2000 | 8/4/2000 | 8/6/2000 | 0.5 |
| CR 47 | Human | 2000 | 8/3/2000 | 8/4/2000 | 0.1 |
| PIPER MEADOWS | Natural | 2000 | 8/2/2000 | 8/4/2000 | 0.1 |
| GRACE CREEK | Natural | 2000 | 7/26/2000 | 7/31/2000 | 0.1 |
| CHICKEN PARK | Natural | 2000 | 7/26/2000 | 7/28/2000 | 0.2 |
| WALTONIA | Natural | 2000 | 7/26/2000 | 7/28/2000 | 0.1 |
| CHICKEN LEG | Natural | 2000 | 7/26/2000 | 7/28/2000 | 0.1 |
| ELKHORN | Natural | 2000 | 7/25/2000 | 7/25/2000 | 0.1 |
| PINEWOOD | Natural | 2000 | 7/22/2000 | 7/23/2000 | 0.1 |
| SEAMAN | Natural | 2000 | 7/17/2000 | 7/27/2000 | 3 |
| CROSIER MTN | Natural | 2000 | 7/11/2000 | 7/19/2000 | 0.1 |
| ARROWHEAD | Natural | 2000 | 6/25/2000 | 6/27/2000 | 0.1 |
| HOME TO ROOST | Natural | 2000 | 6/8/2000 | 6/8/2000 | 2 |
| NORTH FORK | Human | 2000 | 6/7/2000 | 6/7/2000 | 180 |
| GREY ROCK | Natural | 2000 | 6/5/2000 | 6/10/2000 | 15 |
| SWAMP CREEK | Natural | 2000 | 6/12/2000 | 7/19/2000 | 0.1 |
| DRUMMER FLATS | Natural | 2000 | 5/29/2000 | 6/1/2000 | 0.1 |
| STRATTON PARK | Human | 2000 | 5/28/2000 | 5/30/2000 | 0.2 |
| TURKEY ROOST | Natural | 2000 | 4/29/2000 | 5/1/2000 | 4 |
| LOWER | Natural | 2000 | 4/8/2000 | 4/10/2000 | 0.1 |
| LATITUDE | | 2000 | 2/8/2000 | 2/9/2000 | |
| LADY MOON | Natural | 2000 | 1/22/2000 | 1/28/2000 | 0.1 |
| TWIN CABIN | Natural | 2000 | Not Available | 5/5/2000 | 0.1 |
| SIGNAL | Human | 2000 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|----------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| MAXWELL | Natural | 2000 | Not Available | Not Available | 18 |
| RANCH | | 2000 | Not Available | Not Available | |
| LONG DRAW | Natural | 2000 | Not Available | Not Available | 61 |
| BOSWELL | Natural | 2000 | Not Available | 7/9/2000 | 0.2 |
| KILLPECKER | Natural | 2000 | Not Available | 7/10/2000 | 0.1 |
| ENGLEBERT | Natural | 2001 | 9/21/2001 | 9/22/2001 | 0.1 |
| BEAVER CREEK | Natural | 2001 | 6/18/2001 | 6/19/2001 | 4 |
| BOBCAT | Human | 2001 | 7/7/2001 | 7/15/2001 | 10599 |
| PRAIRIE GULCH | Natural | 2001 | 8/11/2001 | 8/11/2001 | 2.5 |
| PALISADE 2K | Natural | 2001 | 8/28/2001 | 8/30/2001 | 0.5 |
| CACHE LA | Natural | 2001 | 7/6/2001 | 7/7/2001 | 0.1 |
| POUDRE | | 2001 | 10/1/2001 | 10/3/2001 | |
| GREER | Human | 2001 | 8/26/2001 | 8/26/2001 | 1 |
| FROZEN RIVER | Human | 2001 | 8/4/2001 | 8/4/2001 | 0.1 |
| PALISADE | Human | 2001 | 7/3/2001 | 7/5/2001 | 15 |
| HIGHDRTEST | Human | 2001 | 2/2/2001 | 2/2/2001 | 0.2 |
| EMERLDSTMP | | 2001 | 1/6/2001 | 1/6/2001 | 0 |
| BIGHORNFA | | 2001 | 8/2/2001 | 8/3/2001 | 0 |
| AVC F.A. | | 2001 | 7/4/2001 | 7/16/2001 | 0 |
| LONGSPEAK | | 2001 | 7/7/2001 | 7/8/2001 | 0 |
| MCGREGOR | Natural | 2001 | 8/28/2001 | 8/29/2001 | 0.1 |
| MARMOT | Natural | 2001 | 6/22/2001 | 6/22/2001 | 0.1 |
| PINEGREE HILL | Human | 2001 | 6/23/2001 | 6/24/2001 | 0.1 |
| FIRE | | 2001 | 7/12/2001 | 7/12/2001 | |
| WISHFUL | Human | 2001 | 9/1/2001 | 9/6/2001 | 0.1 |
| THINKING | | 2001 | 8/6/2001 | 8/8/2001 | |
| SYLVANDALE | Natural | 2001 | 6/23/2001 | 6/24/2001 | 1.7 |
| KILLER BEE | Natural | 2001 | 7/13/2001 | 7/21/2001 | 0.1 |
| A1A | Natural | 2001 | 6/25/2001 | 6/28/2001 | 0.2 |
| EVELYN | Natural | 2001 | 7/7/2001 | 7/9/2001 | 0.1 |
| SPENCER | Human | 2001 | 7/5/2001 | 7/8/2001 | 0.1 |
| HEIGHTS | | 2001 | 7/5/2001 | 7/7/2001 | |
| BRONCO | Human | 2001 | 6/23/2001 | 6/28/2001 | 0.1 |
| SWAMP CREEK | Human | 2001 | 7/5/2001 | 7/6/2001 | 0.1 |
| INDEPENDENCE | Natural | 2001 | 6/25/2001 | 6/26/2001 | 0.5 |
| PIERSON PARK | Human | 2001 | 7/2/2001 | 7/4/2001 | 0.1 |
| BULWORK | Human | 2001 | 6/24/2001 | 6/25/2001 | 0.1 |
| LOST LAKE FIRE | Human | 2001 | 7/2/2001 | 7/5/2001 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|---------------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| BLACK | Natural | 2001 | 6/22/2001 | 6/24/2001 | 1 |
| MOUNTAIN | | 2001 | 7/6/2001 | 7/11/2001 | |
| SEAMAN | Natural | 2001 | 6/22/2001 | 6/24/2001 | 2.7 |
| BEAR | Natural | 2001 | 6/24/2001 | 6/28/2001 | 0.2 |
| SOUTH LONE | Natural | 2001 | 7/14/2001 | 7/17/2001 | 0.1 |
| PINE | | 2001 | 8/25/2001 | 8/26/2001 | |
| BENNETT CREEK | Human | 2001 | 8/6/2001 | 8/9/2001 | 0.1 |
| BELL ROCK | Natural | 2001 | 6/2/2001 | 6/3/2001 | 0.1 |
| KIM | Natural | 2001 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| FISH STICK | Natural | 2001 | 6/30/2001 | 8/6/2001 | 4 |
| YOUNG GULCH | Human | 2001 | Not Available | 8/6/2001 | 0.1 |
| BELAY | Natural | 2001 | 10/1/2001 | 10/1/2001 | 0.1 |
| POUDRE | Natural | 2001 | 6/14/2001 | 6/18/2001 | 0.1 |
| HERMIT PARK | Natural | 2002 | 11/23/2002 | 11/24/2002 | 0.1 |
| GLENHAVEN | Natural | 2002 | 6/1/2002 | 6/1/2002 | 0.2 |
| BIG THOMPSON | Natural | 2002 | 5/2/2002 | 5/3/2002 | 0.1 |
| BENNETT CREEK | Natural | 2002 | 9/28/2002 | 9/29/2002 | 2.5 |
| DUNRAVEN | Natural | 2002 | 9/20/2002 | 9/22/2002 | 0.1 |
| BRINKER CREEK | Natural | 2002 | 8/29/2002 | 9/2/2002 | 0.5 |
| SOUTH | Natural | 2002 | 8/29/2002 | 9/2/2002 | 0.1 |
| STRINGTOWN | | 2002 | 8/29/2002 | 8/30/2002 | |
| KELLY FLATS | Natural | 2002 | 8/29/2002 | 9/2/2002 | 0.1 |
| FISH CREEK | Natural | 2002 | 8/30/2002 | 9/9/2002 | 0.1 |
| ROARING CREEK | Natural | 2002 | 8/29/2002 | 9/2/2002 | 0.1 |
| GREEN RIDGE | Natural | 2002 | 8/29/2002 | 9/2/2002 | 2.3 |
| PENDERGRASS | Natural | 2002 | 8/24/2002 | 8/26/2002 | 1 |
| SOUTH FORK | Natural | 2002 | 8/23/2002 | 8/26/2002 | 0.2 |
| MILL CREEK | Natural | 2002 | 7/28/2002 | 7/28/2002 | 0.1 |
| POL HILL | Human | 2002 | 7/24/2002 | 8/30/2002 | 0.1 |
| BONNER PEAK | Natural | 2002 | 7/26/2002 | 7/27/2002 | 0.2 |
| GLEN COMFORT | Natural | 2002 | 7/23/2002 | 7/25/2002 | 0.1 |
| DEVIL'S GULCH | Human | 2002 | 7/18/2002 | 7/25/2002 | 0.3 |
| TWINOWLSFA | | 2002 | 7/20/2002 | 7/22/2002 | 0 |
| DARK | Natural | 2002 | 7/17/2002 | 8/20/2002 | 0.5 |
| WUH | Natural | 2002 | 7/12/2002 | 7/14/2002 | 0.1 |
| POWERLINE2 | Human | 2002 | 7/9/2002 | 7/10/2002 | 0.1 |
| LILY LAKE | Human | 2002 | 6/30/2002 | 7/14/2002 | 0.1 |
| PRE-TURKEY | Human | 2002 | 6/28/2002 | 7/26/2002 | 2 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|---------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| BALD MOUNTAIN | Human | 2002 | 6/27/2002 | 6/28/2002 | 0.1 |
| PIERSON PARK | Human | 2002 | 6/22/2002 | 6/24/2002 | 0.1 |
| TRIANGLE | Natural | 2002 | 6/19/2002 | 6/23/2002 | 0.1 |
| MOUNTAIN 2 | | 2002 | 6/19/2002 | 6/22/2002 | |
| BOSWELL | Natural | 2002 | 6/19/2002 | 6/20/2002 | 0.3 |
| YOUNGS GULCH | Natural | 2002 | 6/15/2002 | 6/18/2002 | 0.1 |
| CHICKEN PARK | Natural | 2002 | 6/5/2002 | 6/9/2002 | 0.1 |
| ACME CREEK | Natural | 2002 | 6/7/2002 | 6/8/2002 | 0.1 |
| EAST MCGRAW | Natural | 2002 | 6/1/2002 | 6/6/2002 | 0.6 |
| SEVEN MILE | Natural | 2002 | 5/31/2002 | 6/1/2002 | 7 |
| SOUTH LONE | Natural | 2002 | 4/17/2002 | 5/21/2002 | 0.1 |
| PINE | | 2002 | 2/23/2002 | 2/25/2002 | |
| MARY BETH | Natural | 2002 | Not Available | 2/2/2002 | 0.1 |
| DARKSIDE | Natural | 2002 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.2 |
| MATTERHORN | Natural | 2002 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| KIOWA | Natural | 2002 | 4/24/2002 | 4/24/2002 | 0.1 |
| ROCKY | Natural | 2002 | 6/20/2002 | 9/5/2002 | 1 |
| PINGREE HILL | Natural | 2002 | 6/23/2002 | 9/5/2002 | 0.1 |
| BULL CREEK | Natural | 2002 | 6/27/2002 | 9/5/2002 | 0.2 |
| TANKER 123 | Human | 2002 | 7/25/2002 | 7/27/2002 | 1 |
| CRASH | | 2002 | 8/30/2002 | 9/3/2002 | |
| GPS | Natural | 2002 | 9/24/2002 | 9/24/2002 | 0.1 |
| BIG ELK | Human | 2003 | 7/13/2003 | 7/13/2003 | 4348 |
| POWER LINE | Human | 2003 | 12/16/2003 | 12/18/2003 | 0.3 |
| POWELL HILL | Human | 2003 | 12/2/2003 | 12/4/2003 | 0.1 |
| NORTH BALD | Natural | 2003 | 8/16/2003 | 8/19/2003 | 5 |
| MOUNTAIN | | 2003 | 9/6/2003 | 9/7/2003 | |
| FISH CREEK | Natural | 2003 | 8/15/2003 | 8/17/2003 | 48 |
| KILLPECKER | Natural | 2003 | 7/6/2003 | 7/9/2003 | 0.1 |
| CEDAR CREEK | Natural | 2003 | 8/2/2003 | 8/6/2003 | 0.3 |
| PENNOCK CREEK | Natural | 2003 | 8/25/2003 | 8/29/2003 | 1 |
| BIG ELK | Natural | 2003 | 8/16/2003 | 8/18/2003 | 0.1 |
| MEADOWS | | 2003 | 8/18/2003 | 8/23/2003 | |
| DOUBLE SPOT | Natural | 2003 | 8/7/2003 | 8/8/2003 | 0.1 |
| WINTERSTEEN | Natural | 2003 | 8/6/2003 | 8/9/2003 | 0.1 |
| GREEN | Natural | 2003 | 8/8/2003 | 8/10/2003 | 1 |
| MOUNTAIN | | 2003 | 8/3/2003 | 8/6/2003 | |
| GAP | Natural | 2003 | 7/30/2003 | 8/2/2003 | 0.1 |
| TRIANGLE | Natural | 2003 | 7/29/2003 | 7/30/2003 | 0.2 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|---------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| THOMPSON | Natural | 2003 | 7/29/2003 | 7/30/2003 | 0.1 |
| HEWLITT GULCH | Human | 2003 | 7/26/2003 | 8/1/2003 | 500 |
| PREVENT | Human | 2003 | 7/25/2003 | 8/2/2003 | 190 |
| DEER RDGE | Human | 2003 | 7/22/2003 | 7/25/2003 | 15 |
| DEER RG FA | | 2003 | 7/19/2003 | 7/21/2003 | 0 |
| CRDSMOKE 3 | | 2003 | 7/17/2003 | 7/18/2003 | 0 |
| WEST CREEK | Human | 2003 | 7/17/2003 | 7/19/2003 | 0.1 |
| Chiq'ta Ck | Natural | 2003 | 7/18/2003 | 7/22/2003 | 0.1 |
| UTE TRAIL | Natural | 2003 | 7/16/2003 | 7/19/2003 | 0.1 |
| GLACIER | Natural | 2003 | 7/5/2003 | 7/9/2003 | 0.1 |
| TUXEDO PRK | Human | 2003 | 7/5/2003 | 7/8/2003 | 0.1 |
| E MCGRAW | Natural | 2003 | 5/14/2003 | 5/22/2003 | 0.6 |
| LONE PEAK | Human | 2003 | 6/13/2003 | 6/16/2003 | 0.2 |
| KEG MEADOW | Human | 2003 | 6/13/2003 | 6/18/2003 | 0.1 |
| BIG ELK PARK | Human | 2003 | 5/30/2003 | 6/1/2003 | 0.1 |
| ROUND | Human | 2003 | 7/29/2003 | 8/7/2003 | 1 |
| MOUNTAIN | | 2004 | 3/21/2004 | 3/30/2004 | |
| CASCADE | Natural | 2004 | 7/12/2004 | 8/5/2004 | 0.1 |
| GREEN RIDGE | Natural | 2004 | 6/24/2004 | 6/25/2004 | 0.1 |
| MOODY HILL | Human | 2004 | 1/11/2004 | 1/13/2004 | 0.1 |
| CREEDMORE | Natural | 2004 | 6/9/2004 | 6/11/2004 | 0.1 |
| RIDGE | | 2004 | 6/4/2004 | 6/13/2004 | |
| ALLOTMENT | Natural | 2004 | 6/4/2004 | 6/11/2004 | 0.3 |
| HELLS CANYON | Natural | 2004 | 3/30/2004 | 4/19/2004 | 2 |
| CHAMBERS LAKE | Human | 2004 | 3/29/2004 | 4/6/2004 | 0.1 |
| NORTH FORK | Natural | 2004 | 3/24/2004 | 3/29/2004 | 2 |
| WILLOW CREEK | Natural | 2004 | 3/21/2004 | 3/30/2004 | 0.2 |
| LONG | Natural | 2004 | 3/18/2004 | 3/22/2004 | 1 |
| LAZY D | Natural | 2004 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| PINGREE HILL | Natural | 2004 | Not Available | 2/2/2005 | 0.3 |
| MONUMENT | Natural | 2004 | Not Available | 2/2/2005 | 0.5 |
| BUCK RIDGE #2 | Natural | 2004 | Not Available | 2/2/2005 | 0.1 |
| BUCK RIDGE #1 | Natural | 2005 | 8/16/2005 | 8/20/2005 | 0.1 |
| BENNETT | Natural | 2005 | 12/12/2005 | 12/19/2005 | 0.2 |
| ALEXANDER | Natural | 2005 | 6/28/2005 | 7/3/2005 | 1 |
| SPRING GULCH | Natural | 2005 | 9/27/2005 | 10/15/2005 | 2.5 |
| DRAKE | Natural | 2005 | 10/1/2005 | 10/3/2005 | 0.1 |
| BULL ROCK | Natural | 2005 | 9/25/2005 | 9/28/2005 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|---------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| NUNN | Human | 2005 | 9/15/2005 | 9/17/2005 | 1 |
| COMANCHE | Natural | 2005 | 9/4/2005 | 9/15/2005 | 0.1 |
| ELK RIDGE | Natural | 2005 | 9/5/2005 | 9/9/2005 | 5 |
| MOUNT | Human | 2005 | 8/29/2005 | 8/29/2005 | 1 |
| MARGARET | | 2005 | 8/12/2005 | 8/12/2005 | |
| TRAIL CREEK | Natural | 2005 | 8/9/2005 | 8/13/2005 | 0.1 |
| NARROWS | Human | 2005 | 8/1/2005 | 8/3/2005 | 0.2 |
| PINGREE | Natural | 2005 | 7/31/2005 | 8/2/2005 | 0.2 |
| CHELSEA | Natural | 2005 | 7/31/2005 | 8/1/2005 | 1 |
| PALLISADE | Natural | 2005 | 7/28/2005 | 7/30/2005 | 10.8 |
| LOST FALLS | Natural | 2005 | 7/10/2005 | 7/11/2005 | 0.1 |
| LEFTHAND SPUR | Human | 2005 | 7/23/2005 | 7/24/2005 | 0.2 |
| ROAD | | 2005 | 7/22/2005 | 7/22/2005 | |
| GREY ROCK 2 | Human | 2005 | 7/20/2005 | 8/5/2005 | 28.4 |
| SAINT VRAIN | Natural | 2005 | 7/20/2005 | 7/25/2005 | 0.1 |
| WEST CREEK | Human | 2005 | 7/18/2005 | 7/21/2005 | 0.2 |
| ARROWHEAD | Natural | 2005 | 7/16/2005 | 7/24/2005 | 0.1 |
| YONDER | Natural | 2005 | 7/16/2005 | 7/25/2005 | 1 |
| GREY ROCK | Natural | 2005 | 7/7/2005 | 7/8/2005 | 0.25 |
| PICNIC ROCK | Human | 2005 | 7/6/2005 | 7/7/2005 | 8908 |
| BIG ELK | Natural | 2005 | 7/4/2005 | 7/9/2005 | 0.1 |
| MOODY | Natural | 2005 | 7/2/2005 | 7/9/2005 | 1.2 |
| LEFTHAND SPUR | Human | 2005 | 7/2/2005 | 7/4/2005 | 0.2 |
| ROAD | | 2005 | 6/28/2005 | 6/30/2005 | |
| LAKE FIELD | Human | 2005 | 6/20/2005 | 6/25/2005 | 4 |
| FALSEAL05 | | 2005 | 6/16/2005 | 6/16/2005 | 0 |
| DEERPILES1 | Human | 2005 | 5/21/2005 | 5/21/2005 | 15 |
| DEERPILES2 | Human | 2005 | Not Available | 2/2/2005 | 133 |
| EAGLEPILE1 | Human | 2005 | Not Available | 8/28/2005 | 6 |
| NORTH RIM | Natural | 2005 | Not Available | 12/15/2006 | 0.1 |
| CROSIER | Human | 2005 | Not Available | 12/3/2005 | 0.25 |
| BRIGHT | Natural | 2005 | Not Available | 4/20/2005 | 0.1 |
| SHEEP CREEK | Natural | 2005 | Not Available | 12/7/2005 | 30.5 |
| COMPLEX | | 2005 | Not Available | Not Available | |
| DEER MEADOW | Human | 2005 | 6/30/2005 | 7/1/2005 | 0.1 |
| SWAMP LADY | Human | 2005 | Not Available | Not Available | 1.9 |
| NO BULL | Human | 2005 | 7/21/2005 | 7/21/2005 | 0.1 |
| DEVILS CREEK | Natural | 2005 | 9/23/2005 | 9/26/2005 | 11 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|----------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| S.PANHANDLE CK | Human | 2005 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| EGGERS | Human | 2005 | 10/8/2005 | 10/9/2005 | 0.1 |
| KELLY FLAT | Human | 2005 | 10/15/2005 | 10/15/2005 | 0.1 |
| WET SADDLE | Natural | 2005 | 10/23/2005 | 10/23/2005 | 0.1 |
| BULL CREEK | Natural | 2006 | 6/20/2006 | 6/25/2006 | 0.25 |
| TRELL | Natural | 2006 | 8/6/2006 | 8/8/2007 | 0.1 |
| OLD FLOWERS | Human | 2006 | 5/26/2006 | 5/30/2006 | 0.2 |
| SCOTT | Natural | 2006 | 5/21/2006 | 5/28/2006 | 0.25 |
| PIERSON | Human | 2006 | 7/20/2006 | 7/24/2006 | 0.1 |
| SOUTH LONE | Natural | 2006 | 8/30/2006 | 8/31/2006 | 0.1 |
| PINE | | 2006 | 8/18/2006 | 8/18/2006 | |
| COW RIDGE | Natural | 2006 | 8/11/2006 | 8/21/2006 | 0.1 |
| NORTH BALD | Natural | 2006 | 6/29/2006 | 7/5/2006 | 45 |
| ALEXANDER 2 | Natural | 2006 | 9/12/2006 | 9/22/2006 | 4.4 |
| LOST LAKE | Natural | 2006 | 8/15/2006 | 8/31/2006 | 2 |
| HELL'S CANYON | Natural | 2006 | 8/8/2006 | 8/10/2006 | 5.9 |
| DRAKE | Natural | 2006 | 7/17/2006 | 7/21/2006 | 14 |
| BOBCAT GULCH | Natural | 2006 | 8/17/2006 | 8/20/2006 | 0.1 |
| BLUE SOCK | Human | 2006 | 8/7/2006 | 8/12/2006 | 0.1 |
| TURKEY ROOST | Natural | 2006 | 8/23/2006 | 9/24/2006 | 4.1 |
| BLACK | Natural | 2006 | 5/17/2006 | 5/30/2006 | 1.4 |
| MOUNTAIN | | 2006 | 8/17/2006 | 8/19/2006 | |
| RABBIT CREEK | Natural | 2006 | 7/6/2006 | 7/9/2006 | 0.1 |
| ALEXANDER | Natural | 2006 | 8/15/2006 | 9/1/2006 | 0.3 |
| MOODY HILL | Human | 2006 | 7/24/2006 | 7/27/2006 | 0.4 |
| RIST CANYON | Human | 2006 | 3/3/2006 | 3/13/2006 | 0.1 |
| GREER 19 | Human | 2006 | 5/21/2006 | 5/30/2006 | 0.1 |
| EAGLEPILE2 | Human | 2006 | 6/18/2006 | 6/24/2006 | 12 |
| WillowCrk | Natural | 2006 | 5/21/2006 | 5/24/2006 | 0.1 |
| Emerald Mt | Human | 2006 | 5/22/2006 | 5/25/2006 | 8 |
| Deer Mt RX | Human | 2006 | 5/24/2006 | 5/27/2006 | 15 |
| Pontiac Pt | Human | 2006 | 5/22/2006 | 5/23/2006 | 0.4 |
| Lily Lake | Human | 2006 | Not Available | 1/21/2006 | 0.4 |
| Highlands | | 2006 | Not Available | 12/31/2006 | 0 |
| Moraine130 | Natural | 2006 | Not Available | 1/10/2006 | 0.1 |
| LongGulch | | 2006 | Not Available | 3/23/2006 | 0 |
| Chasm Fall | Human | 2006 | Not Available | 10/19/2006 | 0.1 |
| Black Cyn | Human | 2006 | Not Available | 10/20/2006 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|------------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Big Bend | Natural | 2006 | Not Available | 11/15/2006 | 0.1 |
| Dark Vale | Natural | 2006 | Not Available | 1/7/2006 | 0.1 |
| Dream | Human | 2006 | 4/20/2006 | 4/24/2006 | 0.1 |
| Sock | Human | 2006 | 5/23/2006 | 5/25/2006 | 0.1 |
| Halligan | Natural | 2006 | 5/29/2006 | 5/29/2006 | 30 |
| PINGREE PARK | Human | 2006 | Not Available | 6/22/2006 | 0.1 |
| PINEWOOD | Natural | 2006 | Not Available | 7/1/2006 | 3 |
| SPRINGS | | 2006 | Not Available | 7/6/2006 | |
| QUIGLEY | Natural | 2006 | 8/11/2006 | 8/21/2006 | 5 |
| MOUNTAIN | | 2006 | 8/14/2006 | 8/21/2006 | |
| THOMPSON | Natural | 2006 | 9/13/2006 | 9/16/2006 | 0.2 |
| GREEN RIDGE | Natural | 2007 | 11/3/2007 | 11/7/2007 | 0.1 |
| SALT | Natural | 2007 | 7/17/2007 | 7/19/2007 | 0.1 |
| LILY MTN. | Human | 2007 | 9/20/2007 | 9/23/2007 | 0.1 |
| MILL CREEK | Natural | 2007 | 6/15/2007 | 6/17/2007 | 8 |
| RABBIT GULCH | Natural | 2007 | 7/17/2007 | 7/18/2007 | 0.3 |
| CEDAR CREEK | Natural | 2007 | 6/22/2007 | 6/25/2007 | 4.6 |
| MUMMY | Human | 2007 | 7/19/2007 | 7/22/2007 | 0.1 |
| TRAIL CREEK | Natural | 2007 | 7/17/2007 | 7/19/2007 | 0.4 |
| BULL ROCK | Natural | 2007 | 7/17/2007 | 7/20/2007 | 2.2 |
| FISH CREEK II | Human | 2007 | 8/15/2007 | 8/17/2007 | 1.3 |
| BELL ROCK | Natural | 2007 | 6/21/2007 | 7/2/2007 | 1.2 |
| CROWN POINT | Natural | 2007 | 6/16/2007 | 6/20/2007 | 3 |
| SPRUCE GULCH | Natural | 2007 | 8/3/2007 | 8/4/2007 | 0.1 |
| MILL CREEK 2 | Natural | 2007 | 7/22/2007 | 7/29/2007 | 1.1 |
| JUG GULCH | Natural | 2007 | 7/21/2007 | 7/30/2007 | 15.4 |
| PODUNK | Natural | 2007 | 6/22/2007 | 6/25/2007 | 0.2 |
| SWITCHBACK | Human | 2007 | 7/1/2007 | 7/5/2007 | 9 |
| CAMMON FIRE | Natural | 2007 | 6/28/2007 | 6/29/2007 | 0.1 |
| PRICKLEY PEAR | Natural | 2007 | 5/17/2007 | 5/21/2007 | 0.8 |
| FOX ACRES | Natural | 2007 | 6/21/2007 | 6/24/2007 | 0.1 |
| GREY ROCK | Natural | 2007 | 5/18/2007 | 5/19/2007 | 0.1 |
| POLE HILL | Natural | 2007 | 6/13/2007 | 6/15/2007 | 0.5 |
| TERRY | Natural | 2007 | 6/26/2007 | 6/27/2007 | 0.2 |
| Emerald Mt. 06 | Human | 2007 | Not Available | 7/5/2007 | 20 |
| Deer Mountain 06 | Human | 2007 | 7/17/2007 | 7/19/2007 | 100 |
| Deer Mtn. West | Human | 2007 | 7/17/2007 | 7/17/2007 | 0.3 |
| Burn | | 2007 | 7/22/2007 | Not Available | |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|-----------------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Eagle Cliff 06 | Human | 2007 | Not Available | 9/4/2007 | 8 |
| Moraine Park Ad | Human | 2007 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.3 |
| Site | | 2007 | 11/15/2007 | 11/19/2007 | |
| Glacier Basin Ad | Human | 2008 | 5/8/2008 | 5/12/2008 | 6 |
| Sit | | 2008 | 6/8/2008 | 6/8/2008 | |
| Emer. Mtn. Phase 5 | Human | 2008 | 11/1/2008 | 11/18/2008 | 4 |
| Olympus | Human | 2008 | 11/20/2008 | 11/28/2008 | 0 |
| Hoffmeiste | Human | 2008 | 11/24/2008 | 12/7/2008 | 0.3 |
| Eagle | Natural | 2008 | 10/30/2008 | 10/31/2008 | 0.2 |
| Abandoned | Human | 2008 | 7/21/2008 | 7/24/2008 | 0.1 |
| Campfire | | 2008 | 10/25/2008 | 10/31/2008 | |
| Beaver Mountain | Natural | 2008 | 10/2/2008 | 10/6/2008 | 0.1 |
| ТОМ | Natural | 2008 | 9/22/2008 | 9/23/2008 | 0 |
| Eagle North | Natural | 2008 | 9/29/2008 | 10/4/2008 | 0.1 |
| Lily Mtn | Human | 2008 | 10/2/2008 | 10/5/2008 | 0.1 |
| Bighorn | Natural | 2008 | 10/2/2008 | 10/5/2008 | 0.1 |
| Rabbit Gulch | Natural | 2008 | 6/14/2008 | 6/15/2008 | 0.1 |
| GREY ROCK | Human | 2008 | 9/26/2008 | Not Available | 1.1 |
| NORTH RIM | Natural | 2008 | 7/31/2008 | 9/9/2008 | 0.1 |
| DIAMOND TAIL | Human | 2008 | 9/17/2008 | 9/26/2008 | 0.8 |
| TODD | Human | 2008 | 6/22/2008 | 6/24/2008 | 0.1 |
| RUSTIC | Natural | 2008 | 9/28/2008 | 11/17/2008 | 0.1 |
| HYATT MINE | Human | 2008 | 9/20/2008 | 9/22/2008 | 0.1 |
| STUCK | Natural | 2008 | 7/7/2008 | 7/15/2008 | 0.1 |
| BLACK CREEK | Natural | 2008 | 8/14/2008 | 9/7/2008 | 0.1 |
| WEST CREEK | Natural | 2008 | 6/22/2008 | 6/23/2008 | 0.2 |
| JOSEPHINE | Natural | 2008 | 8/2/2008 | 8/3/2008 | 0.1 |
| GREY ROCK | Natural | 2008 | 8/2/2008 | 8/9/2008 | 3.5 |
| MEADOW | | 2008 | 8/14/2008 | 9/7/2008 | |
| COMMANCHE | Natural | 2008 | 7/1/2008 | 7/19/2008 | 0.7 |
| FISH | | 2008 | 7/5/2008 | 7/19/2008 | |
| JELLYSTONE | Natural | 2008 | 7/26/2008 | 7/28/2008 | 0.01 |
| FIRE | | 2008 | 5/10/2008 | 5/14/2008 | |
| CROSIER MTN. | Natural | 2008 | 1/24/2008 | 1/29/2008 | 8 |
| PENDERGRASS | Natural | 2008 | Not Available | Not Available | 0 |
| PEARL BEAVER | Natural | 2008 | Not Available | 1/7/2009 | 0.1 |
| LOST LAKE | Human | 2008 | 6/18/2008 | Not Available | 1 |
| MANHEAD | Natural | 2008 | Not Available | 7/1/2008 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|-------------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| MOUNTAIN | | 2008 | Not Available | 9/12/2008 | |
| DEADHORSE | Natural | 2008 | 7/13/2008 | 7/27/2008 | 3.6 |
| MOUNTAIN | | 2009 | 11/9/2009 | 11/9/2009 | |
| PINGREE HILL | Human | 2009 | Not Available | 6/30/2009 | 0.9 |
| Dump Fire | Human | 2009 | 9/16/2009 | 9/19/2009 | 0.1 |
| GLACIER BASIN | Human | 2009 | 9/6/2009 | 9/6/2009 | 0.1 |
| DUMP | | 2009 | 8/31/2009 | 9/3/2009 | |
| Deer Ridge Fire | Natural | 2009 | 8/31/2009 | 9/6/2009 | 0.1 |
| MORAINE 115 | Natural | 2009 | 8/9/2009 | 8/9/2009 | 0.1 |
| WEST CREEK | Natural | 2009 | 8/7/2009 | 8/7/2009 | 0.3 |
| INDIAN SPIRIT | Natural | 2009 | Not Available | 7/19/2009 | 0 |
| CROSIER | Natural | 2009 | 7/5/2009 | 7/5/2009 | 0 |
| TWIN OWLS | Natural | 2009 | 9/5/2009 | 9/10/2009 | 0.1 |
| Estes Park Assist | | 2009 | 9/8/2009 | Not Available | 0 |
| Endovalley Fire | Human | 2009 | 9/3/2009 | 9/6/2009 | 0.1 |
| GREYROCK CAMP | Human | 2009 | 7/19/2009 | 7/21/2009 | 0.01 |
| ANSEL WATROUS | Human | 2009 | 7/23/2009 | 7/28/2009 | 0.01 |
| GROUSE CREEK | Natural | 2009 | 4/5/2009 | 4/15/2009 | 0.1 |
| SUMMIT TRAIL | Human | 2009 | Not Available | 2/13/2009 | 0.01 |
| PARADISE | Human | 2009 | 1/20/2009 | 1/21/2009 | 83 |
| 63E | Human | 2009 | 1/13/2009 | 1/22/2009 | 0.05 |
| SOUL SHINE | Human | 2009 | Not Available | 9/29/2009 | 0.61 |
| BIG ELK | Human | 2009 | Not Available | 10/13/2009 | 7 |
| RIVER CROSSING | Natural | 2009 | 7/22/2009 | 9/5/2009 | 0.1 |
| SHEEP | Human | 2009 | 8/26/2009 | 8/29/2009 | 0.01 |
| MILL CREEK | Human | 2009 | Not Available | Not Available | 3 |
| SULZER 2 | Natural | 2009 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.3 |
| MARGARET | Natural | 2009 | Not Available | 9/12/2009 | 0.2 |
| SWAMP LADY | Human | 2009 | 11/7/2009 | 11/8/2009 | 0.1 |
| HEWLETTE | Natural | 2010 | 7/10/2010 | 7/12/2010 | 0.1 |
| GULCH | | 2010 | 6/19/2010 | 6/20/2010 | |
| PENNOCK CREEK | Natural | 2010 | 8/7/2010 | Not Available | 1.2 |
| CREEK | Natural | 2010 | Not Available | 9/1/2010 | 0.1 |
| STARVIEW | Natural | 2010 | 9/26/2010 | 10/13/2010 | 0.3 |
| QUILLAN GULCH | Natural | 2010 | 9/8/2010 | 9/13/2010 | 10 |
| SULZER | Natural | 2010 | 7/10/2010 | 7/12/2010 | 0.1 |
| HELLS CANYON | Natural | 2010 | 7/10/2010 | 7/12/2010 | 0.4 |
| HESSELBARTH | Natural | 2010 | 7/29/2010 | 7/31/2010 | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|----------------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| DUMPSTER | Human | 2010 | 4/28/2010 | 4/29/2010 | 0.1 |
| GREYROCK | Natural | 2010 | 6/29/2010 | 6/29/2010 | 0.1 |
| DIANE | Natural | 2010 | 4/11/2010 | 4/20/2010 | 0.1 |
| FORREST | Natural | 2010 | Not Available | 4/2/2010 | 0.1 |
| RIVERBEND | Natural | 2010 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| YOUNG | Natural | 2010 | 9/14/2010 | Not Available | 0.25 |
| WOODY | Natural | 2010 | 1/31/2010 | 2/1/2010 | 0.1 |
| WINTERSTEEN | | 2010 | Not Available | 7/16/2010 | |
| PA | | 2010 | 6/24/2010 | 12/8/2010 | |
| BURNT CAR | Human | 2010 | 7/29/2010 | 9/3/2010 | 0.34 |
| CROSIER | Human | 2011 | Not Available | 11/18/2011 | 0.34 |
| MOUNTAIN | | 2011 | 8/27/2011 | 8/28/2011 | |
| HOLLOWELL | Natural | 2011 | 3/23/2011 | 3/23/2011 | 0 |
| Beaver Meadows Rx | Human | 2011 | 7/29/2011 | 7/31/2011 | 600 |
| POWERLINE | Natural | 2011 | Not Available | 8/23/2011 | 0 |
| ENDO | Human | 2011 | 8/9/2011 | 8/13/2011 | 0.1 |
| Bier Fire | Natural | 2011 | 9/5/2011 | 9/5/2011 | 0.1 |
| Longs Fire | Human | 2011 | 9/5/2011 | 9/5/2011 | 0.1 |
| LOST LAKE | Human | 2011 | 9/3/2011 | 9/5/2011 | 0.1 |
| BADGE | Natural | 2011 | 8/16/2011 | 8/21/2011 | 0.1 |
| COON | Natural | 2011 | 8/22/2011 | Not Available | 0.1 |
| CAYMEN | Human | 2011 | 8/16/2011 | 8/21/2011 | 0.1 |
| FOX CREEK | Natural | 2011 | 8/19/2011 | 8/21/2011 | 0.25 |
| WEST CREEK | Natural | 2011 | 8/1/2011 | 8/4/2011 | 1 |
| BENNET | Human | 2011 | 7/31/2011 | 7/31/2011 | 0.1 |
| TENT POLE | Human | 2011 | Not Available | 8/1/2011 | 0.1 |
| ELK | Human | 2011 | 7/18/2011 | 7/27/2011 | 0.1 |
| PINGREE PARK | Human | 2011 | 7/2/2011 | 7/3/2011 | 0.1 |
| RD | | 2011 | 6/24/2011 | 6/26/2011 | |
| LARAMIE | Natural | 2011 | Not Available | 6/29/2011 | 0.1 |
| DUNRAVEN | Human | 2011 | 4/1/2011 | 5/10/2011 | 44.4 |
| ZIMMERMAN | Human | 2011 | 7/11/2011 | 7/13/2011 | 0.35 |
| GATEWAY FIRE | Natural | 2011 | Not Available | 6/29/2011 | 0.1 |
| WINTERSTEEN | Natural | 2011 | Not Available | 5/28/2011 | 8.8 |
| LONE TREE III | Human | 2011 | 3/23/2011 | 3/23/2011 | 6.1 |
| GREYROCK | Human | 2011 | 3/14/2011 | 3/29/2011 | 28 |
| MEADOW | | 2011 | Not Available | 2/11/2011 | |
| COMBAT | Human | 2011 | Not Available | 4/5/2011 | 0.01 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|-----------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| SULLIVAN | Human | 2011 | Not Available | 4/13/2012 | 0.15 |
| Upper Beaver | Human | 2011 | Not Available | 4/13/2012 | 150 |
| Meadows | | 2011 | Not Available | 6/5/2011 | |
| G.B. VTS Lot Rx | Human | 2011 | 6/19/2011 | Not Available | 1 |
| Rabbit Ears | Natural | 2011 | 7/22/2011 | Not Available | 0.3 |
| Boyd Gulch | | 2011 | 10/1/2011 | 11/2/2011 | 11 |
| West Creek | Natural | 2012 | Not Available | 8/14/2012 | 0 |
| Fox Creek | Natural | 2012 | 6/9/2012 | 8/14/2012 | 0 |
| Fall River Fire | Natural | 2012 | 5/27/2012 | 5/27/2012 | 0.1 |
| Cub Lake | Human | 2012 | 5/26/2012 | 5/26/2012 | 0.1 |
| SWAMP POL | Human | 2012 | 5/18/2012 | 5/19/2012 | 0 |
| SITE 9 | Human | 2012 | 5/14/2012 | 8/13/2012 | 0 |
| BOSWELL | Natural | 2012 | 11/6/2012 | 11/11/2012 | 10.2 |
| FORT | Human | 2012 | 8/27/2012 | 9/20/2012 | 0.1 |
| WEST WHITE | Human | 2012 | 9/22/2012 | 9/23/2012 | 0.35 |
| PINE | | 2012 | 9/16/2012 | 9/20/2012 | |
| LAKEFIELD 2 | Human | 2012 | 9/21/2012 | 9/22/2012 | 0.1 |
| GALUCHIE 2 | Natural | 2012 | 9/5/2012 | 9/14/2012 | 0.1 |
| GALUCHIE | Natural | 2012 | 9/5/2012 | 9/10/2012 | 0.1 |
| NORTH ST VRAIN | Natural | 2012 | 8/10/2012 | 8/19/2012 | 0.1 |
| FIRE | | 2012 | Not Available | 8/11/2012 | |
| DUTCH GEORGE | Human | 2012 | 8/10/2012 | 8/11/2012 | 0.3 |
| LYON'S GULCH | Human | 2012 | 7/24/2012 | 7/27/2012 | 0.1 |
| SULLIVAN PARK | Human | 2012 | 7/2/2012 | 7/12/2012 | 6.3 |
| Deer Mtn. Rx | Human | 2012 | 6/15/2012 | 6/16/2012 | 60 |
| Endo Valley | | 2012 | 6/10/2012 | 6/19/2012 | 0 |
| RESERVOIR | Human | 2012 | 6/3/2012 | 6/5/2012 | 0 |
| Eagle Cliff | Human | 2012 | 4/29/2012 | 5/15/2012 | 0.1 |
| Forest Canyon | Human | 2012 | 4/24/2012 | 5/2/2012 | 0.1 |
| Cow Creek | Natural | 2012 | 3/26/2012 | 3/31/2012 | 1200 |
| Castle Mountain | Natural | 2012 | Not Available | 4/13/2012 | 0.1 |
| Fire | | 2012 | Not Available | 4/13/2012 | |
| PINGREE | Human | 2012 | Not Available | 4/13/2012 | 3.5 |
| CAMMAN | Human | 2012 | Not Available | 4/13/2012 | 0.01 |
| SPRINGS | | 2012 | Not Available | 4/13/2012 | |
| MM 114 | Human | 2012 | Not Available | 7/1/2012 | 0.01 |
| CAYMAN | Human | 2012 | 6/17/2012 | 6/18/2012 | 0.01 |
| SPRINGS | | 2012 | 7/30/2012 | 7/31/2012 | |
| ELKHORN | Human | 2012 | 4/24/2012 | Not Available | 0.25 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|-------------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| MIDDLE BALD | Human | 2012 | Not Available | 6/8/2012 | 1 |
| MONUMENT | Human | 2012 | 5/14/2012 | Not Available | 0.1 |
| GULCH | | 2012 | Not Available | Not Available | |
| GREEN RIDGE | Human | 2012 | Not Available | Not Available | 0.01 |
| CREEDMORE | Human | 2013 | 5/18/2013 | 5/22/2013 | 0.01 |
| LAKES | | 2013 | 7/10/2013 | 7/19/2013 | |
| FORRESTER | Natural | 2013 | 2/5/2013 | 2/28/2013 | 0.1 |
| CREEK | | 2013 | 9/3/2013 | 9/4/2013 | |
| SPRING GULCH | Natural | 2013 | 9/3/2013 | 9/4/2013 | 0.01 |
| STRATTON | Natural | 2013 | 8/28/2013 | 9/3/2013 | 1.82 |
| WHITE ROCK | Natural | 2013 | 8/5/2013 | 8/10/2013 | 0.1 |
| LOST | Natural | 2013 | 9/1/2013 | 9/2/2013 | 0.1 |
| MANHATTAN 16 | Human | 2013 | 8/12/2013 | 8/14/2013 | 0.01 |
| OVERLOOK | Natural | 2013 | 5/26/2013 | 5/26/2013 | 6.5 |
| COMANCHE | Natural | 2013 | 5/26/2013 | 5/26/2013 | 0.1 |
| LIGHTNING BUST | Natural | 2013 | 9/5/2013 | 9/7/2013 | 0.1 |
| NORTH FORK | Natural | 2013 | 8/7/2013 | 8/8/2013 | 0.75 |
| LADY MOON | Natural | 2013 | 9/6/2013 | 9/7/2013 | 0.3 |
| CRYSTAL | Human | 2013 | 6/2/2013 | 6/14/2013 | 2939 |
| EAGLES NEST | Natural | 2013 | 5/16/2013 | 5/20/2013 | 8.3 |
| OLD SCHOOL | Natural | 2013 | 5/17/2013 | 5/17/2013 | 2.1 |
| JACK'S GULCH | Human | 2013 | 6/2/2013 | 6/2/2013 | 2.6 |
| MM 111 | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| GREY ROCK | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 17 |
| Leiffer Cabin Rx | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 1.5 |
| Lily Lake RX | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.5 |
| West Deer Mtn. RX | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 28 |
| North Deer Mtn. | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 85 |
| RX | | | Not Available | Not Available | |
| Camp Site Six | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0 |
| Buck Creek Fire | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0 |
| Overlook | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0 |
| West Creek | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.2 |
| High Park | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 87263 |
| HIGH PARK | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 87275 |
| SWAMP CREEK | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| LOST LAKE | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| BURNETT GULCH | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date | Out Date | Total Acres |
|---------------------|---------|------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| HEWLETT | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 7685 |
| HUSTED | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 1.9 |
| ROACH | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 117 |
| MOLLY | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| LOST LAKE | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| IRON MOUNTAIN | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| FIRE | | | Not Available | Not Available | |
| NARROWS | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 2.7 |
| MIDDLE BALD | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.2 |
| BENNETT CREEK | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.75 |
| DADD GULCH | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| SEVEN MILE | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| HAYSTACK ROCK | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.35 |
| COMANCHE | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| CHETCO | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| COLUMBINE | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.01 |
| CANYON | | | Not Available | Not Available | |
| SALT CABIN | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.8 |
| PARK | | | Not Available | Not Available | |
| FLOWER | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| GOAT MOUNTAIN | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 8.5 |
| GALUCHIE | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 14 |
| East Portal Rx | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 20 |
| Deer Jct to H.S. Rx | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 15 |
| Upper Bear Lake | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 14 |
| RX | | | Not Available | Not Available | |
| Sleepy Hollow & D | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 72 |
| RX | | | Not Available | Not Available | |
| Moraine Park | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 140 |
| Dump Rx | | | Not Available | Not Available | |
| High Park | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 87000 |
| Book | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| Sundance | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| Goat Mountain | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0 |
| West Alluvial | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| Hewlett | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 7685 |
| High Park Fire | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0 |
| High Park | | | Not Available | Not Available | 0 |
| LITTLE DEER | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |





| Fire Name | Cause | Year | Start Date Out Date | | Total Acres |
|--------------|---------|------|---------------------|---------------|----------------|
| HELL CANYON | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 5.7 |
| ALEXANDER | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 1.1 |
| CEDAR CREEK | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.01 |
| SULZER GULCH | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.01 |
| MOODY | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.2 |
| CHAMBERS | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.01 |
| CROWN POINT | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.01 |
| ZIMMERMAN | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| MANHATTAN 2 | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.01 |
| MANHATTAN | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.01 |
| SHEEP | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| MOUNTAIN | | | Not Available | Not Available | |
| BEAR TRAP | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.01 |
| LOST | Natural | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.01 |
| HOHNHOLZ | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 29.3 |
| Beaver Ponds | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| Moraine | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |
| Many Parks | Human | | Not Available | Not Available | 0.1 |

Inventory Exposed

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which Larimer County depends.

The following two critical facilities tables summarize the exposure data of Wildfire Threat to Critical Facilities by showing the number of critical facilities located within areas of High and Very High wildfire threat levels. The critical facilities have been organized into the following two categories:

- Emergency Services
- Community Services

There are 23 identified county assets located in areas with the highest wildfire threat total. There are, 2 county assets located in areas categorized as having high wildfire threat. The appraisal value of the assets within these very high threat areas is approximately \$13,820,147. The appraisal value of the assets within these high threat areas is approximately \$2,689,558.







Larimer County fire (Source: Poudre Fire Authority)

| Table 27 | . Wildfire | Exposure | Table – | Emergency | Services |
|----------|------------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|
|----------|------------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|

| Critical Facilities: Emergency Services | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| | Fire St | ations | Hospital | | | | |
| Wildfire Threat Level | Count Appraised Value | | count | Appraised Value | | | |
| High | 0 | - | 0 | - | | | |
| Very High | 4 | \$882,202 | 1 | \$1,215,659 | | | |
| Total | 4 | \$882,202 | 1 | \$1,215,659 | | | |

Table 28. Wildfire Exposure Table – Community Services

| Critical Facilities: Community Services | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Community Services | High Wildfire Threat Level (Count) | High Appraised Value | Very High Wildfire Threat Level (count) | Very High Appraised Value | | | |
| Church | 1 | \$1,888,390 | 10 | 4768871 | | | |
| Clubhouse | - | - | 1 | \$32,603 | | | |
| Dormitory | - | | 2 | \$1,086,195 | | | |
| Government Building | - | - | 3 | \$1496199 | | | |
| Post Office | - | - | 1 | \$142700 | | | |




| Critical Facilities: Community Services | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Community Services | High Wildfire Threat Level (Count) | High Appraised Value | Very High Wildfire Threat Level (count) | Very High Appraised Value | | |
| School | - | - | 1 | \$1221793 | | |
| Visitor Center | 1 | \$801,168 | | | | |
| Total | 2 | \$2,689,558 | 18 | \$8,748,361 | | |

Figure 24. Parcels in the highest and 2nd highest Wildfire Risk Index – Larimer County³²



³² Parcels intersecting with the highest the 2nd highest wildfire risk index areas. Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.









Potential Losses

Currently, there is no method for estimating wildfire loss. In most cases, the emergency management community equates potential losses to assets exposed to wildfire as a method of quantifying and comparing potential losses across communities. The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in Larimer County.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Recent wildfires and brush fires across Colorado have forced school closures, disrupted telephone services by burning fiber optic cables, damaged railroads and other infrastructure, and adversely affected tourism, outdoor recreation, and hunting. The likelihood of one of those fires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire

³³ Parcels intersected with the most negative and 2nd most negative WUI Zone. Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide, within Larimer County values present span this entire range.





events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfireprone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within Larimer County that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire. The map of Wildland-Urban Interface Risk illustrates the difference in wildfire risk between jurisdictions within the County. The jurisdictions with the highest WUI Risk Index rating include areas of the Town of Estes Park and portions of unincorporated Larimer County located along the foothills.

Land Use and Development Trends

Future development is an important factor to consider in the context of wildfire mitigation because development and population growth can contribute to increased exposure of people and property to wildfire. During the past few decades, population growth in the Larimer County WUI has increased greatly. Subdivisions and other high-density developments have created a situation where wildland fires can involve more buildings than any amount of fire equipment can possibly protect. By identifying areas with significant potential for population growth and/or future development in high-risk areas, communities can identify areas of mitigation interest and reduce hazard risks associated with increased exposure.

As development expands into wildland areas, people and property are increasingly at risk from wildfire. Wildfire mitigation in the wildland-urban interface has primarily been the responsibility of property owners who choose to build and live in vulnerable zones. In practice, successful wildfire mitigation strategies can be quite involved. The most important aspect



Wildfire mitigation activity in Larimer County Source: Colorado State University

of successful suppression is disruption of the continuity of fuels, achieved by creating breaks or defensible areas. For interface fires, where homes and other structures fill the space, fuel reduction is best accomplished before the fires begin. Larimer County does have land use codes in place that specifically deal with construction in the WUI. Some of these codes include and/or focus on mandatory mitigation measures.

Safety zones can be created around structures by reducing or eliminating brush, trees, and vegetation around a home or facility. FEMA recommends using a 30-foot safety zone; including keeping grass below 2 feet tall and clearing all fallen leaves and branches promptly. Additionally, only fire-resistant or non-





combustible materials should be used on roofs and exterior surfaces. Firebreaks -- areas of inflammable materials that create a fuel break and reduce the ability for fires to spread and roads and pathways -- can be planned and designed to serve as wildfire mitigation.





5.3.6 Flood – Flash and Riverine

| NATURAL HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--|
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 3.40 | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

A flood is a naturally occurring event for rivers and streams and occurs when a normally dry area is inundated with water. Excess water from snowmelt or rainfall accumulates and overflows onto the stream banks and adjacent floodplains. As illustrated in the figure below, floodplains are lowlands, adjacent to rivers, streams, and creeks that are subject to recurring floods. Flash floods, usually resulting from heavy rains or rapid snowmelt, can flood areas not typically subject to flooding, including urban areas. Additionally, extreme cold temperatures can cause streams and rivers to freeze, causing ice jams and creating flood conditions.



Floodplain Terminology

Floods are considered hazards when people and property are affected. Nationwide, hundreds of floods occur each year, making it one of the most common hazards in all 50 states and U.S. territories. Most injuries and deaths from flooding happen when people are swept away by flood currents and most property damage results from inundation by sediment-filled water. Fast-moving water can wash buildings off of their foundations and sweep vehicles downstream. Pipelines, bridges, and other infrastructure can be damaged when high water combines with flood debris. Basement flooding can also cause extensive damage. Flooding can cause extensive damage to crop lands and bring about the loss of livestock. Several factors determine the severity of floods including rainfall intensity and duration, topography, and ground cover.

Riverine flooding originates from a body of water, typically a river, creek, or stream, as water levels rise onto normally dry land. Water from snowmelt, rainfall, freezing streams, ice flows, or a combination





thereof, causes the river or stream to overflow its banks into adjacent floodplains. Winter flooding usually occurs when ice in the rivers creates dams or streams freeze from the bottom up during extreme cold spells. Spring flooding is usually the direct result of melting winter snow packs, heavy spring rains, or a combination of the two.

Flash floods can occur anywhere when a large volume of water flows or melts over a short time period, usually from slow moving thunderstorms or rapid snowmelt. Because of the localized nature of flash floods, clear definitions of hazard areas do not exist. These types of floods often occur rapidly with significant impacts. Rapidly moving water, only a few inches deep, can lift people off their feet, and only a depth of a foot or two, is needed to sweep cars away. Most flood deaths result from flash floods.

Previous flash flooding events have occurred within Larimer County. Although data does not currently exist to perform robust assessments of flash flood risk within Larimer County, local jurisdictions have expressed a desire and a need for data and information specifically related to flash flooding so that appropriate mitigation strategies can be identified and implemented.

Urban flooding is the result of development and the ground's decreased ability to absorb excess water without adequate drainage systems in place. Typically, this type of flooding occurs when land uses change from fields or woodlands to roads and parking lots. Urbanization can increase runoff two to six times more than natural terrain. The flooding of developed areas may occur when the amount of water generated from rainfall and runoff exceeds a storm water system's capability to remove it.

Stream Bank Erosion is measured as the rate of the change in the position or horizontal displacement of a stream bank over a period of time. It is generally associated with riverine flooding and discharge, and may be exacerbated by human activities such as bank hardening and dredging.

Ice Jams are stationary accumulations of ice that restrict flow through a waterway. Ice jams can cause considerable increases in upstream water levels, while at the same time, downstream water levels may drop. Types of ice jams include freeze up jams, breakup jams, or combinations of both. When an ice jam releases, the effects downstream can be similar to that of a flash flood or dam failure. Ice jam flooding generally occurs in the late winter or spring.

Dam Break Flooding

The Dam Safety Branch of the Colorado Division of Water Resources is tasked with tracking dams located across the state. In Larimer County, they have identified 216 dams, of which 91 have existing Emergency Action Plans (EAP). These plans provide details about each dam and include mapping of potential inundation areas should the structure fail. The Dam Safety Branch also classifies each dam's current hazard classification level. The following table shows a breakdown of this information.

| Hazard Classification | Dam Count |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| 1 | 58 |
| 2 | 34 |
| 3 | 93 |
| 4 | 5 |
| Ν | 26 |

Table 29. Dam Hazard Classification Levels





Flooding events are typically measured in terms of magnitude and the statistical probability that they will occur. The 1% annual chance flood event is the standard national measurement for flood mitigation and insurance. A 1% annual chance flood, also known as the '100-year flood', has a 1 in 100 chance of being equaled or exceeded in any 1 year and has an average recurrence interval of 100 years. It is important to note that this recurrence interval is an average; it does not necessarily mean that a flood of such a magnitude will happen exactly every 100 years. Sometimes, only a few years may pass between one 1% annual chance flood and another while two other 1% annual chance floods may be separated by 150 years. The 0.2% annual chance flood event, or the '500-year flood', is another measurement which represents a 0.2% chance (or 1 in 500 chance) of occurring in a given year.

Flood Magnitude and Probability

According to the NFIP's Community Information System (CIS) Larimer County has been mapped for flood hazards and participates in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Details of local jurisdiction participation status are shown in the table below.

| CID | COMMUNITY NAME | COUNTY | INITIAL FIRM IDENTIFIED | CURRENT EFFECTIVE MAP DATE |
|--------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 080101 | Larimer County | Larimer | 04/02/79 | 02/06/13 |
| 080296 | Town of Berthoud | Larimer | 12/19/06 | 02/06/13 |
| 080193 | Town of Estes Park | Larimer | 01/17/79 | 12/19/06 |
| 080102 | City of Fort Collins | Larimer | 12/04/84 | 01/06/12 |
| 080103 | City of Loveland | Larimer | 09/01/78 | 02/06/13 |
| 080005 | Town of Timnath | Larimer | 12/19/06 | 12/19/06 |
| 080104 | Town of Wellington | Larimer | 02/15/79 | 12/19/06 |
| 080264 | Town of Windsor | Larimer and Weld | 09/27/91 | 09/27/91 |

| Table 20 | Communities | Dorticipating | n +h n | | חו |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------|--------|-----------|----|
| Table 30. | Communities | Participating I | n the | FEIVIA NF | IP |

*Participation status current as of May, 04, 2015

Larimer County has a total of 706 NFIP policies. In addition to participating in the NFIP, Larimer County participates in the Community Rating System (CRS). CRS is a voluntary program for NFIP participating communities. The goals of the CRS are to reduce flood damages to insurable property, to strengthen and support the insurance aspects of the NFIP, and to encourage a comprehensive approach to floodplain management.

The CRS was developed to provide incentives in the form of insurance premium discounts to communities that go above and beyond the minimum floodplain management requirements and develop extra measures to reduce flood risk. There are 10 CRS classes and the classification determines the insurance premium discount for policy holders. The discounts range from 5% to a maximum of 45%.

| Class | Discount | Class | Discount | |
|-------|----------|-------|----------|--|
| 1 | 45% | 6 | 20% | |
| 2 | 40% | 7 | 15% | |

| Table 31. CRS Premium Discour | nts |
|-------------------------------|-----|
|-------------------------------|-----|





| Class | Discount | Class | Discount | | | |
|--|----------|-------|----------|--|--|--|
| 3 | 35% | 8 | 10% | | | |
| 4 | 30% | 9 | 5% | | | |
| 5 | 25% | 10 | | | | |
| SFHA (Zones A, AE, A1-A30, V, V1-V30, AO, and AH): Discount varies depending on class. SHFA (Zones A99, AR/A, AR/AE. AR/A1-A30, AR/AH, and AR/AO): 10% discount for Classes 1-6; 5% discount for Classes 7-9.* | | | | | | |

Non-SFHA (Zones B, C, X, D): 10% discount for Classes 1-6; 5% discount for Classes 7-9.

*In determining CRS premium discount, all AR and A99 Zones are treated as non-SFHAs.

All CRS participating communities start out with a Class 10 rating (which provides no premium discount). Class 1 requires the most credit points and offers the largest premium discount. Within the CRS program, there are 18 activities recognized as measures for eliminating local exposure to flooding. Credit points are assigned to each activity, which have been organized under four main categories:

- Public Information
- Mapping and Regulation
- Flood Damage Reduction
- Flood Preparedness

Larimer County entered the CRS in October of 1992. Currently, Larimer County is a Class 10 CRS community. The City of Fort Collins also participates in CRS and is a Class 4 community.

Previous Occurrences

Seasonally, Larimer County is confronted with the possibility of flooding and flood-related hazards. Floods have the potential to inflict tremendous damages with significant losses of life and property. They can also pose a threat to the health, safety, and welfare of Larimer County citizens. Previous flooding events have caused thousands of dollars in damage in just a few hours or days in the region and current development and population growth trends necessitate a heightened awareness that the impact of flooding may likely increase in Larimer County over time. The map below depicts the current special flood hazard areas (SFHA) for Larimer County. The SFHA areas span roads, infrastructure, property, and jurisdictions across the county.









Hazus is a regional multi-hazard loss estimation model developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the National Institute of Buildings Sciences (NIBS). The Hazus delineations developed for this Plan were generated using the fully-automated tools within the software, which use generalized regional regression equations to estimate flows and normal depth calculations to estimate flood depths. Hazus floodplain delineations were post-processed to remove artifacts and flow areas less than 0.5 feet deep. Where Hazus could not determine floodplain delineations, the automated tools within HEC-GeoRAS were used to generate geometry data that was then used in HEC-RAS to model the floodplain. Flows used in HEC-RAS were either taken from the Hazus analysis or were developed using the U.S. Geological Survey's online StreamStats tool to implement the Colorado regional regression equations. HEC-GeoRAS was used to post-process the HEC-RAS model results and produce floodplain delineations.

The type of property damage caused by flood events depends on the depths and velocity of the floodwaters. Faster moving floodwaters can wash buildings off their foundations and sweep cars downstream. Pipelines, bridges, and other infrastructure can be damaged when high waters combine with flood debris. Extensive damage can be caused by basement flooding and landslide damage related to soil saturation from flood events. Seepage into basements is common during flood events. Most flood damage is caused by water saturating materials susceptible to loss (e.g., wood, insulation, wallboard,

³⁴ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain. Source: FEMA, City of Fort Collins, Michael Baker International





fabric, furnishings, floor coverings, and appliances). Homes in flooded areas can also suffer damage to septic systems and drain fields. In many cases, flood damage to homes renders them uninhabitable.

Flood events impact businesses by damaging property and by interrupting business. Flood events can cut off customer access to a business as well as close a business for repairs or permanently. A quick response to the needs of businesses affected by flood events can help a community maintain economic vitality in the face of flood damage. Responses to business damages can include funding to assist owners in elevating or relocating flood-prone business structures.

During flooding events, homes, businesses, and people face the threat of explosions and fires caused by leaking gas lines along with the possibility of being electrocuted. Domestic and wild animals forced out of their homes and brought into contact with humans by floodwaters can also pose a threat. In rural areas, property damage caused by flooding can be devastating to ranchers and farmers. When flooding occurs during the growing season, farmers can suffer widespread crop loss. Stock growers may lose livestock if they are unable to find safety from rising floodwaters. Flooding may also cause damage to pasture land, fences, barns, and out buildings.

Publicly owned facilities are a key component of daily life for all citizens of the county. Public buildings are of particular importance during flood events because they house critical assets for government response and recovery activities. Damage to public water and sewer systems, transportation networks, flood control facilities, emergency facilities, and offices can hinder the ability of the government to deliver services. Loss of power and communications can be expected. Drinking water and wastewater treatment facilities may be temporarily out of operation.

Mitigation against flood events is accomplished through sensible floodplain management and regulations as well as identifying flood prone areas, tributary watersheds that experience instability or sediment loading problems, and channel instability hazards. This involves strategies to modify flooding and to modify infrastructure to decrease the likelihood of damage. To modify the impact of flooding, measures must be taken to decrease susceptibility to flood damage and disruptions. Natural and cultural resources must also be protected and managed. Coordination with mitigation plans by Floodplain Managers will increase effectiveness of flood mitigation projects. City and County Planners will be valuable resources to incorporate flood mitigation plans into their respective plans.

Documentation of flooding in Colorado collected by the National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) and the University of South Carolina's Hazards and Vulnerability Research Institute (HVRI) goes back to 1950. The table below provides a history of major flood events that affected Larimer County between 1950 and 2015.

| Date | Hazard Type | Injuries | Deaths | Property Damage | Crop Damage |
|-----------|-------------|----------|--------|--------------------|-------------|
| 9/14/1996 | Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/2/1997 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$500,000 | 0 |
| 6/13/1997 | Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/28/1997 | Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 32. Larimer County Historical Flood Events (1950 – 2015)





| Date | Hazard Type | Injuries | Deaths | Property Damage | Crop Damage |
|-----------|-------------|----------|--------|--------------------|-------------|
| 7/28/1997 | Flash Flood | 5 | 40 | \$190,000,000 | 0 |
| 8/4/1997 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/1/1998 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/28/1999 | Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/1/1999 | Flood | 0 | 0 | \$200,000 | 0 |
| 8/4/1999 | Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/16/2000 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/12/2001 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/18/2003 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/18/2004 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/3/2005 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/2/2007 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$20,000 | 0 |
| 6/22/2009 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | \$50,000 |
| 7/4/2010 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | \$5,000 |
| 7/6/2012 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 |
| 7/7/2012 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | \$25,000 |
| 7/16/2012 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$15,000 | \$10,000 |
| 7/27/2012 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$15,000 | \$10,000 |
| 7/5/2013 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$25,000 | 0 |
| 7/12/2013 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
| 7/18/2013 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | \$5,000 |
| 7/25/2013 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/6/2013 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| 9/11/2013 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/12/2013 | Flood | 2 | 0 | \$109,000,000 | 0 |
| 9/14/2013 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/23/2014 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | 0 |
| 5/23/2014 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$15,000 | 0 |
| 6/24/2014 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | \$5,000 |
| 7/13/2014 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | \$5,000 |
| 7/14/2014 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
| 7/29/2014 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$25,000 | \$50,000 |
| 7/29/2014 | Flash Flood | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | \$20,000 |
| | TOTAL: | 7 | 40 | \$299,950,000 | \$235,000 |

Source: NOAA (NCDC Storm Events Database)

The most significant flooding event to collectively impact the State of Colorado occurred during September 2013. During the week beginning on September 9th, a slow moving cold front circulated over the state, clashing with warm, humid monsoonal air from the south. While damages are still being assessed for the 2013 flooding event, NOAA's National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) Storm Events Database estimates that Larimer County sustained approximately \$109 million dollars in property damage.









The preceding figure was created utilizing data produced by a team which included Colorado State University, NASA, and USDA, who performed a study attempting to better identify areas which were inundated by the 2013 floods (note the study area, which only covers portions of Larimer County). Maximum flood extent—a key data need for disaster response and mitigation—is rarely quantified due to storm-related cloud cover and the low temporal resolution of optical sensors. While change detection approaches can circumvent these issues through the identification of inundated land and soil from postflood imagery, their accuracy can suffer in the narrow and complex channels of increasingly developed and heterogeneous floodplains. The data depicted above is from a study that explored the utility of the Operational Land Imager (OLI) and Independent Component Analysis (ICA) for addressing these challenges in the unprecedented 2013 Flood along the Colorado Front Range, USA. The approach was able to simultaneously distinguish flood-related water and soil moisture from pre-existing water bodies and other spectrally similar classes within the narrow and braided channels of the study site. Visual assessment against aerial orthophotography showed close agreement with high water marks and scoured riverbanks, and a pixel-to-pixel validation with WorldView-2 imagery captured near peak flow yielded an overall accuracy of 87% and Kappa of 0.73. Additional tests showed a twofold increase in flood class accuracy over the commonly used modified normalized water index. Although flooding beneath moderate and sparse riparian vegetation canopy was captured, dense vegetation cover and paved regions of the

³⁵ Multi-Temporal Independent Component Analysis and Landsat 8 for Delineating Maximum Extent of the 2013 Colorado Front Range Flood.





floodplain were main sources of omission error, and commission errors occurred primarily in pixels of mixed land use and along the flood edge. Nevertheless, the unsupervised nature of ICA, in conjunction with the global availability of Landsat imagery, offers a straightforward, robust, and flexible approach to flood mapping that requires no ancillary data for rapid implementation. Finally, the spatial layer of flood extent and a summary of impacts were provided for use in the region's ongoing hydrologic research and mitigation planning.

Repetitive Loss properties (RL) are structures covered by a contract for flood insurance made available under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) that: (a) have incurred flood-related damage on two occasions, in which the cost of repair, on the average, equaled or exceeded 25% of the market value of the structure at the time of each flood event; and (b) at the time of the second incidence of flood-related damage, the contract for flood insurance contains increased cost of compliance coverage. As of January 2015, there were no repetitive loss properties (RL) within the unincorporated areas of Larimer County.³⁶

A Severe Repetitive Loss property (SRL) is defined as a residential property that is covered under an NFIP flood insurance policy and: a) has at least four NFIP claim payments (including building and contents) over \$5,000 each, and the cumulative amount of such claims payments exceeds \$20,000; or, b) a property for which at least two separate claim payments (building payments only) have been made with the cumulative amount of the building portion of such claims exceeding the market value of the building. For both a) and b) above, at least two of the referenced claims must have occurred within any ten-year period, and must be greater than ten days apart. As of January 2015, there were no severe repetitive loss (SRL) structures located within the unincorporated areas Larimer County.³⁷

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

In addition to increasing drought potential (and therefore increasing runoff), climate change has the potential to intensify rain events and storms in the Colorado region. These events can lead to increased infrastructure damage, injury, illness, and death. Additionally, warmer temperatures in the winters may cause increased precipitation to fall as rain instead of snow in mountain regions of Colorado. This may lead to elevated stream flows and increased flood risk across the state. As climate science and data evolves it will be important for communities in and around Larimer County to address how our changing climate will affect how water moves through local streams and regional landscapes.

Inventory Exposed

The critical facility exposure analysis estimates that there are 19 critical facilities in Larimer County that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of these exposed structures is approximately \$22.6 million.

³⁷ Source: Colorado DHSEM (FEMA FMA-RL-SRL-GSTF Document)





³⁶ Source: Colorado DHSEM (FEMA FMA-RL-SRL-GSTF Document)

The tables below summarize the results of the critical facility flood exposure analysis.

| | | City Facility | County Facility | | |
|---------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | |
| Within SFHA | 11 | \$17,255,630 | 8 | \$5,364,877 | |
| Total | 829 | \$3,818,314,182 | 108 | \$138,338,155 | |
| % Flood Prone | 1% | < 1% | 7% | 4% | |

Table 33. Flood Prone Critical Facilities – City and County Facilities

Table 34. Flood Prone Critical Facilities – Emergency Services

| | | Armory | Nu | rsing Home | Fi | ire Station | Govern | ment Building |
|------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|--------------------|----------|--------------------|
| | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value |
| Within SFHA | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - |
| Total | 3 | \$2,428,413 | 17 | \$58,189,784 | 37 | \$26,172,358 | 19 | \$127,627,256 |
| % Flood Prone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Grou | p Care Home | Home | for the Elderly | | Hospital | Jail-Cor | rection Facility |
| | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value |
| Within SFHA | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - |
| Total | 6 | \$12,330,207 | 36 | \$193,243,738 | 8 | \$400,909,748 | 1 | \$19,408,740 |
| % Flood Prone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | La | boratories | Med | ical Facilities | Sur | Surgical Center | | |
| | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | | |
| Within SFHA | 2 | \$1,510,630 | 2 | \$245,702 | 0 | \$ - | | |
| Total | 11 | \$28,998,250 | 355 | \$439,107,686 | 2 | \$4,767,190 | | |
| % Flood Prone | 18% | 5% | < 1% | < 1% | 0 | 0 | | |

Table 35. Flood Prone Critical Facilities – Community Services

| | Church | | unity Recreation Center | Commuter Terminal, Airline, Bus | | |
|-------|-----------------|-------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | |





| Within SFHA | 8 | \$9,002,069 | 1 | \$883,253 | 0 | \$ - | |
|---------------|--------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Total | 178 | \$276,065,031 | 10 | \$21,275,404 | 4 | \$4,420,883 | |
| % Flood Prone | 4.5% | 3.3% | 1% | 4% | 0 | 0 | |
| | Day | Care Center | Distribution Warehouse | | Dormitory Residence Halls | | |
| | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | |
| Within SFHA | 0 | \$ - | 1 | \$608,140 | 0 | \$ - | |
| Total | 31 | \$20,743,280 | 40 | \$54,059,475 | 14 | \$652,663,012 | |
| % Flood Prone | 0 | 0 | 2.5% | 1% | 0 | 0 | |
| | Kennel | | | Library | Mau | soleums | |
| | Count | Count | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | |
| Within SFHA | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | |
| Total | 4 | \$1,292,065 | 7 | \$29,300,999 | 1 | \$722,100 | |
| % Flood Prone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | Mortuary | Municipal Service Garage | | Pos | t Office | |
| | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | |
| Within SFHA | 0 | \$ - | 2 | \$178656 | 1 | \$71,900 | |
| Total | 4 | \$2,914,840 | 2 | \$178656 | 12 | \$ 17,754,059 | |
| % Flood Prone | 0 | 0 | 100% | 100% | 8% | < 1% | |
| | | School | Su | ıpermarket | Visitors Center | | |
| | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | Count | Appraised Value | |
| Within SFHA | 2 | \$10,120,157 | 0 | \$- | 0 | \$ - | |
| Total | 120 | \$1,493,674,645 | 11 | \$50,628,871 | 3 | \$3,384,445 | |
| % Flood Prone | 2% | < 1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Potential Losses

The methodology used to determine potential losses to flooding was conducted using FEMA's Hazus loss estimation software. For this Plan, a 100-year flood scenario was modeled for the County. The results are presented below.

HAZUS 100-YEAR FLOOD SCENARIO

In addition to the SFHA boundaries, the flood risk analysis for this Plan integrates DFIRM depth grids, a digital dataset that shows flood depths at various locations within the floodplain. This enhanced data input allows Hazus to more accurately approximate floodplain boundaries and their associated flood depths for a 100-year flood event.





Due to the availability of LiDAR elevation data, as well as complete countywide floodplain coverage, a detailed depth grid was locally developed for this planning effort. This depth grid was developed by combining the effective FEMA 100 year floodplains with several Urban Drainage Flood Control District FHADs (Flood Hazard Area Delineations) that covered the area of analysis. The resulting floodplain represents the most detailed and temporally accurate depiction of the current flood hazards in Larimer County. A water surface elevation surface was created from the aforementioned floodplains and this surface was intersected with the most accurate elevation data available (2013 LiDAR and NED data) to obtain a flood depth surface. The map below shows the SFHA and the associated flood depths within Larimer County generated for the 100-year risk analysis. Note that the maximum flood depth is skewed by the presence of Horsetooth Reservoir (the dark blue area on the following figure).



Figure 28. 1% Annual Chance Flood Depth Grid – Larimer County³⁸

The flood depth grid and the parcel centroid points served as the primary inputs into Hazus. The parcel centroid points were produced by utilizing parcel and assessor data provided by Larimer County GIS. This

³⁸ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data. Source: FEMA, City of Fort Collins, Michael Baker International





data was converted to parcel centroid (point) data and spatially corrected to ensure geographical accuracy of the points and the associated structures in all areas within the designated 100-year floodplain. In some cases there were multiple, distinctly different, structures within a single designated parcel. In these cases, points were generated on top of each individual structure and the total appraised value of the parcel was divided up equally among the structures. Important attributes such as year built and land use were missing for many parcels throughout the county. In these cases the average value of the associated census block was used in the risk assessment.

A 100-year flood scenario was defined in Hazus and losses were calculated for each point that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). The map below shows the results of the Hazus 100-year flood scenario economic loss analysis for Larimer County.









The map of total building losses illustrates a clear loss pattern in which damages are clustered around the most populated areas of the county. These places represent areas where resources and people are concentrated, making those areas of high potential loss and clear priority areas for focused mitigation action.

Hazus estimates for Larimer County estimate that for a 100-year flood event, approximately 1,997 buildings will be at least moderately damaged. The total economic loss estimated for the 100-year flood is over \$145 million dollars. A number of variables are included in Hazus analyses in order to arrive at the estimated values of loss due to flooding. For this reason, it is important to note that the Hazus loss





³⁹ Parcels FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses.

estimates detailed below should not be used as a precise measure, but rather viewed from the perspective of the potential magnitudes of expected losses.

When calculating building losses Hazus breaks loss values into two categories: direct economic losses and indirect economic losses. Direct economic losses are the estimated costs to repair or replace the damage caused to a building and its contents. These values are organized in terms of Building Losses and Building Content Losses. Indirect economic losses include Inventory Losses and other losses associated with business interruption and the inability to operate a business because of the damage sustained during the flood.

The total building losses for the 100-year flood event were estimated to be over \$63.5 million. This represents over 43% of total economic losses in the county. Building content losses were estimated to be over \$56.9 million, representing roughly 39% of total economic losses. Inventory losses were estimated to be over \$24.6 million. This represents roughly 17% of total economic losses due to the 100-year flood modeled in the Hazus scenario.

The table below provides a summary of the economic losses associated with building damage by jurisdiction. Only those jurisdictions with expected losses are included in the table (unlisted jurisdictions do not have structures that are expected to sustain damage from the 100-year flood scenario).

| Jurisdiction | Total Parcel Count | Number of Damaged Parcels | Building Losses | Building Content Losses | Inventory Losses | Total Losses |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Town of Berthoud | 2,595 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Berthoud Fire Department District | 4,522 | 14 | \$629,890 | \$424,740 | \$189,530 | \$1,244,160 |
| Crystal Lake Volunteer Fire District | 869 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Colorado State University | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Town of Estes Park | 4,537 | 42 | \$1,805,100 | \$1,462,910 | 0 | \$3,268,000 |
| Estes Park Medical Center | | | | | | |
| Estes Valley Fire Protection District | 7,680 | 106 | \$4,210,630 | \$2,965,690 | \$240,910 | \$7,417,230 |
| Estes Valley Recreation and Park District | 12,112 | 163 | \$5,332,240 | \$3,762,720 | \$561,040 | \$9,655,990 |
| City of Fort Collins | 51,961 | 1,082 | \$34,471,150 | \$30,343,890 | \$14,979,360 | \$79,794,390 |
| Glacier View Volunteer Fire District | 777 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Town of Johnstown | 801 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Livermore Volunteer Fire District | 708 | 5 | \$211,690 | \$178,290 | \$171,350 | \$561,330 |
| City of Loveland | 26,705 | 42 | \$1,433,410 | \$1,797,000 | \$388,140 | \$3,618,550 |

Table 36. Economic Loss Estimates by Jurisdiction (Hazus 100-year Flood Scenario)*







| Jurisdiction | Total Parcel Count | Number of Damaged Parcels | Building Losses | Building Content Losses | Inventory Losses | Total Losses |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Loveland Fire and Rescue District | 26,705 | 42 | \$1,433,410 | \$1,797,000 | \$388,140 | \$3,618,550 |
| Northern CO Water Conservation District | 16,258 | 287 | \$9,107,470 | \$6,342,390 | \$1,650,500 | \$17,100,350 |
| Pinewood Springs Volunteer Fire District | 396 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Platte River Power Authority | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Poudre Canyon Volunteer Fire District | 535 | 76 | \$2,791,300 | \$2,711,720 | 0 | \$5,503,030 |
| Poudre Fire Authority District | 65,418 | 1,347 | \$41,691,920 | \$35,131,380 | \$16,470,500 | \$93,293,800 |
| Thompson Valley EMS | 51,996 | 242 | \$6,361,210 | \$6,623,230 | \$3,071,220 | \$16,055,660 |
| Town of Timnath | 997 | 1 | \$790 | \$1,580 | \$3,160 | \$5,530 |
| Upper Thompson Sanitation District | 6,381 | 56 | \$1,443,670 | \$1,072,730 | \$14,740 | \$2,531,130 |
| Town of Wellington | 2,839 | 114 | \$3,310,550 | \$4,547,330 | \$514,300 | \$8,372,170 |
| Wellington Fire District | 4,154 | 183 | \$7,259,940 | \$8,748,890 | \$4,696,310 | \$20,705,130 |
| Town of Windsor | 2,457 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Windsor Severance Fire District | 2,457 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unincorporated Larimer County | 10,534 | 223 | \$22,497,780 | \$18,763,000 | \$8,791,650 | \$50,052,440 |
| Total | 126,553 | 1,997 | \$63,518,780 | \$56,915,710 | \$24,676,610 | \$145,111,080 |

*Many of the special districts overlap the incorporated jurisdictions. Unincorporated Larimer county data includes the special jurisdiction data where the area limits coincide. The same goes for the incorporated jurisdictions of the Towns of Berthoud, Estes Park, Johnstown, Timnath, Wellington, and Windsor, and the Cities of Fort Collins and Loveland.

*Loss estimates have been rounded to the nearest \$10, \$1,000, and \$1,000,000

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in Larimer County provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the County and its municipalities will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in Larimer County. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities throughout the county remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings. While the potential for flooding is always present, Larimer County has existing land-use policies and regulations for development to help lessen potential damage due to floods.





The exposure data provided provides the clearest picture of potential losses to flood in the Larimer County. There are 82 critical facilities located in areas the special flood hazard area. The appraisal value of the critical facilities within SFHA is over \$244.59 million dollars. The appraisal value of the structures within the SFHA is over \$11.2 billion dollars. The following figure shows parcels located in the SFHA.



Figure 30. Flood Exposure – Larimer County⁴⁰

Land Use and Development Trends

As population continues to increase in Larimer County, future development trajectories can be expected to put more people and property, both private and public, at risk of flooding. It is essential that zoning and land use plans take into account not only the dollar amount of damage that buildings near waterways could incur, but also the added risk of floodplain development activity that alters the natural floodplain of the area (for example, narrowing the floodplains by building new structures close to rivers and streams). The county as a whole should plan for the likelihood of increased exposure of property and humans to flood events.





⁴⁰ Parcels that intersect the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain. Source: Larimer County, FEMA, Michael Baker International

The previous Table presented estimated losses summarized by jurisdiction. It shows a large range of expected damaged buildings due to a 1% annual chance flood event. Portions of Poudre Fire Authority District within Larimer County were estimated to have 1,347 structures damaged. While affecting 2% of the building stock in that area, the losses were expected to total over \$93.2 million. Wellington Fire District had 183 structures estimated to be damaged, with total losses of \$20.7 million dollars.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in Larimer County. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities throughout the County remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings. While the potential for flooding is always present, Larimer County has existing land-use policies and regulations for development to help lessen potential damage due to floods.

Existing floodplain management ordinances are intended to addresses methods and practices to minimize flood damage to new and substantial home improvement projects as well as to address zoning and subdivision ordinances and state regulations. Additionally, Larimer County is a National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) participant and continues to support floodplain management activity at the county and local scale.

The greatest protection against flooding is afforded by quality construction and compliance with local ordinances which exceed NFIP requirements. Code adoption by local jurisdictions, compliance by builders, and local government inspection of new homes can greatly reduce the risk of flooding. Moving forward, Larimer County will continue to support monitoring, analysis, modeling, and the development of decision-support systems and geographic information applications for floodplain management activities.

In addition to land-use planning, zoning, and codes applicable to new development, flood mitigation measures include structural and non-structural measures to address susceptibility of existing structures. Flood mitigation measures such as acquisition, relocation, elevation-in-place, wet/dry flood proofing, and enhanced storm drainage systems all have the potential to effectively reduce the impact of flood in Larimer County.





5.3.7 Hazmat – Fixed and Transport

| NATURAL HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| HazMat – Fixed and | | | | | | |
| Transport | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.50 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

A hazardous material (also known as HAZMAT) is defined by the U.S. Department of Transportation as "a threat that poses an unreasonable risk to health and safety of operating or emergency personnel, the public, and/or the environment if not property controlled during handling, storage, manufacturing, processing, packaging, use, disposal, or transportation."

Hazardous materials are defined and regulated in the United States primarily by laws and regulations administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Each has its own definition of a "hazardous material."

For the purpose of tracking and managing hazardous materials, the DOT divides regulated hazardous materials into nine classes:

| Hazard Class | Description | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | 1.1 mass explosion hazard | | |
| | 1.2 projectile hazard | | |
| Class 1: Explosivos | 1.3 minor blast/projectile/fire | | |
| Class 1. Explosives | 1.4 minor blast | | |
| | 1.5 insensitive explosives | | |
| | 1.6 very insensitive explosives | | |
| | 2.1 flammable gases | | |
| Class 2: Compressed Gases | 2.2 non-flammable compressed | | |
| | 2.3 poisonous | | |
| Class 2: Elammable Liquids | Flammable (flash point below 141°) | | |
| Class 5. Flattinable Liquids | Combustible (flash point 141°-200° | | |
| | 4.1 flammable solids | | |
| Class 4: Flammable Solids | 4.2 spontaneously combustible | | |
| | 4.3 dangerous when wet | | |
| Class 5: Oxidizers and | 5.1 Oxidizer | | |
| Organic Peroxides | 5.2 Organic Peroxide | | |
| Class 6: Toxic Matorials | 6.1 Material that is poisonous | | |
| | 6.2 Infectious Agents | | |

Table 37. Hazardous Materials -- Classes and Descriptions





| Hazard Class | Description |
|-------------------------------|---|
| | Radioactive I |
| Class 7: Radioactive Material | Radioactive II |
| | Radioactive III |
| Class 8: Corrective Material | Destruction of the human skin |
| | Corrode steel at a rate of 0.25 inches per year |
| | A material that presents a hazard during |
| Class 9: Miscellaneous | shipment but does not meet the definition of |
| | the other classes |

Hazardous materials that are being transported must have specific packaging and labeling. Specific safety regulations also apply when handling and storing hazardous materials at fixed facilities. In general, there are three recognized sources for HAZMAT incidents within the County: delivery lines, fixed storage facilities and use locations, and transportation lines. Once a HAZMAT incident occurs, the area impacts will depend on the natural of the chemical and climate conditions. All areas should be considered at risk. However, some areas, such as those close to aquifers and other water supplies can expect greater impacts if a spill occurred in the area.

Transportation of hazardous materials through Larimer County happens at all times of day by way of rail, road, and air. Roadway transport account for the largest amount of hazardous materials moving though the county. That said, rail cars are able to carry much larger quantities of hazardous materials than trucks of cars and can be associated with a greater risk.

Title 42, Article 20 of the Colorado Revised Statutes governs the routing of hazardous materials by motor vehicles on all public roads in the state. CDOT Policy Directive 1903.0 (effective 5/20/2010), and CDOT Procedural Directive 1903.1 (effective 2/3/2011), govern CDOT's role in the designation of hazmat routes. In order to designate a state highway in Colorado as hazmat route, CDOT staff members, local governments, or private entities must request the Mobility Section of the Division of Transportation Development to perform an analysis of the route. To perform this analysis the Mobility Section convenes a "Hazmat Advisory Team" to determine if the proposed route meets the required criteria. If the required criteria are met and approved by the Transportation Commission, CDOT will file a petition with the Colorado State Patrol for approval. Once the Colorado State Patrol approves the petition, the route is designated a hazmat route.

The required criteria that the route must meet before it is brought before the Transportation Commission are as follows:

- The route(s) under consideration are feasible, practicable, and not unreasonably expensive for such transportation.
- The route(s) is continuous within a jurisdiction and from one jurisdiction to another.
- The route(s) does not unreasonably burden interstate or intrastate commerce.
- The route(s) designation is not arbitrary or intended by the petitioner merely to divert the transportation of hazardous materials to other communities.
- The route(s) designation will not interfere with the pickup or delivery of hazardous materials.





- The route(s) designation is consistent with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations; and
- The route(s) provides greater safety to the public than other feasible routes. Considerations include but are not limited to:
 - AADT, crash and fatality rates
 - Population within a one-mile swath of each side of the highway
 - Locations of schools, hospitals, sensitive environmental areas, rivers, lakes, etc.
 - o Emergency response capabilities on the route
 - Condition of the route, i.e., vertical and horizontal alignment, pavement condition, level of access to the route, etc.

Colorado State Patrol Hazardous Materials Unit

(303) 273-1900 http://csp.state.co.hazmat.html Troop 8-C is the Hazardous Materials Section of the Colorado State Patrol. Their mission is to contribute to the safety of hazardous materials transportation in order to protect citizens and the environment. Twenty-eight troopers trained a Hazardous Materials Technicians are deployed throughout the state.

Local Hazardous Materials Response Teams (most often housed in local fire departments and fire protection districts) are the designated emergency response authority for hazardous substance incidents in all areas of Larimer County except on highways, where the State Patrol has jurisdiction.

For security reasons, it is not within the scope of this plan to map the locations of all industrial and commercial fixed sites.

The following CDOT map shows the state's designated nuclear, hazardous materials, and gasoline, diesel fuel, and liquid petroleum gas routes, many of which pass through the western portion of Larimer County.







Figure 31. Colorado Hazardous and Nuclear Materials Route Restrictions



Previous Occurrences

Based on data collected by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's (PHMSA) Incident Reports Database, there have been a total of 204 HAZMAT incidents reported in Larimer County between 1971 and 2015. The large majority of these incidents occurred while the materials were moving along a highway (either in transit, loading, or unloading).





Inventory Exposed

We can't accurately predict when or where a HAZMAT incident may occur. Therefore, for the purpose of this plan, all existing and future buildings, facilities, and populations in Larimer County are considered to be equally exposed and couple potentially be impacted. This includes 324,122 people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County.

When hazardous materials are being transported they are particularly vulnerable to transportation related accidents, misuse, or terrorist threats. Most hazardous materials are transported in large quantities in order to reduce costs and security is difficult to maintain around moving vehicles that cross jurisdictional boundaries. When transported close to populated areas or critical infrastructure, HAZMAT releases can have serious consequences. The inventory that is most often exposed to HAZMAT risks are railways, roadways, and fixed facilities that contain hazardous materials, and all assets that lie within a mile of the potential release areas.

Potential Losses

HAZMAT related events occur throughout Larimer County every year. The intensity and magnitude of these incidents depend on weather conditions, the location of the event, the time of day, and the process by which the materials are released. *Was is raining when the event happened? Were the hazardous materials being transported by rail when they were released or were they at a fixed facility? Did the spill happen during rush hour traffic or in the middle of the night?* All of these considerations matter when determining the risk and potential damages associated with a HAZMAT incident.

HAZMAT events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. Moreover, HAZMAT incidents can cause serious environmental contamination to non-renewable resources such as air, ground, and water sources.





Probability of Future Occurrences

As with most hazards that have limited spatial predictability or warning time, the probability of future occurrences of HAZMAT events is difficult to predict. However, as development continues to encroach into existing industrial areas and becomes more dense along high-risk designated hazardous materials transportation routes, the risk of future occurrences becomes greater. Even if the frequency of HAZMAT spills remains the same over time, population growth will increase the probability of a disaster event.

Land Use and Development

As Larimer County continues to experience population growth and development over time, it is anticipated that there will be increased exposure to potential life loss, injuries, and environmental damage resulting from a hazardous materials incident. Serious considerations must be made concerning land use and regulations as increasing development pressures push residential and commercial investment closer to railways and identified hazardous and nuclear materials routes.





5.3.8 Landslide / Rockslide

| NATURAL HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING | |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--|
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.50 | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

Landslides are one of the most common geologic hazards in Colorado and are characterized by the downward and outward movement of loose material on slopes. They include a wide range of ground movement, such as rock falls, deep failure of slopes, and shallow debris flows. Although gravity acting on and over steepened slopes is the primary reason for a landslide, landslides are often prompted by the occurrence of other disasters such as seismic activity of heavy rain fall. Other contributing factors include the following:

- Erosion by rivers creating over-steepened slopes
- Rock and soil slopes weakened through saturation by snowmelt or heavy rains
- Earthquakes creating stresses that make weak slopes fail
- Excess weight from accumulation of rain or snow, stockpiling of rock or ore, from waste piles, or from manmade structures stressing weak slopes
- Floods or long duration precipitation events creating saturated, unstable soils that are more susceptible to failure

Slope material often becomes saturated with water and may develop a debris or mudflow. If the ground is saturated, the water weakens the soil and rock by reducing cohesion and friction between particles. Cohesion, which is the tendency of soil particles to "stick" to each other, and friction affect the strength of the material in the slope and contribute to a slope's ability to resist down slope movement. Saturation also increases the weight of the slope materials and, like the addition of material on the upper portion of a slope, increases the gravitational force on the slope. Undercutting of a slope reduces the slope's resistance to the force of gravity by removing much-needed support at the base of the slope. Alternating cycles of freeze and thaw can result in a slow, virtually imperceptible loosening of rock, thereby weakening the rock and making it susceptible to slope failure. The resulting slurry of rock and mud can pick up trees, houses, and cars, and block bridges and tributaries, causing flooding along its path. Additionally, removal of vegetation can leave a slope much more susceptible to superficial landslides because of the loss of the stabilizing root systems

Geologists identify active landslides and areas subject to slope instability so that they may be avoided or mitigated. Together, geologists and civil engineers develop and implement measures to improve the stability of slopes, repair existing landslides, and prevent damage from future landslides. Slope stability can be improved by removing material from the top of the slope, adding material or retaining structures to the base of the slope, and reducing the degree of saturation by improving drainage within the slope





Previous Occurrences

According to the Colorado Geological Survey there are 186 historical landslides in Larimer County. The following table lists major landslide incidents in Larimer County between 1989 and 2004 according to the Colorado Department of Transportation.

| Date | Location | Length of Incident | Description |
|-----------|------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 7/25/2004 | Highway 14 | closed – 24 hours | rockslide |
| 7/14/2004 | Highway 14 | closed – 24 hours | rockslide |
| 4/5/2002 | Highway 34 | closed – 24 hours | rockslide |
| 6/19/1999 | Highway 14 | closed – 21 days | large rock/landslide |
| 2/23/1993 | Highway 14 | closed – 72 hours | avalanche/rockslide |
| 8/1/1989 | Highway 34 | closed – 8 hours | rockslide |

Inventory Exposed

There are a number of locations across Larimer County that are vulnerable to landslides and rockslides. As population growth brings new development into available land in the county, more inventory assets may become exposed to landslides and rockslides hazards. The following figures show historical and potential landslide and rockslide areas in Larimer County. The western mountainous portion of Larimer County are more susceptible to Landslides and Rockslides







Figure 32. Potential Landslide Areas – Larimer County⁴¹

⁴¹ Historical and potential landslide areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.









Potential Losses

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 6 critical facility and 1,419 structures in Larimer County that are prone to landslides (not including the total miles of landslide prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$45 million dollars and the exposed structures is over \$139 million dollars.

⁴² Potential rock fall areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.









The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 12 critical facility and 6,506 structures in Larimer County that are prone to rockslides (not including the total miles of rockslide prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$11.3 million dollars and the exposed structures is over \$1.1 billion dollars.

⁴³ Parcels intersecting potential & historical landslide areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.









Probability of Future Occurrences

Due to the uncertainty associated with existing data, it is challenging to accurately calculate probability for future events related to landslide and rockslide hazards. It can be assured however, that these hazards will continue to alter the landscape of Larimer County in the future.

Overall, the probability of future occurrences of rockslide and landslide events in Larimer County is moderate. Many areas in the western portion of the county are prone to these types of hazard events due to their proximity to previous landslide events, their location at the base or top of steep slopes and drainage basins, or their location on infill or steep slope cuts. Individual assessments of landslide-prone areas are recommended in the future. Moreover, as development and population increase in the county, increasing numbers of structures (and people) will be exposed to future landslide and rockslide events.

⁴⁴ Parcels that intersect potential rock fall areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.





Future Land Use and Development Trends

Rapid and sustained population growth across Colorado and the Front Range has contributed to increasing trends in geologic hazard risk, exposure, and vulnerability across Larimer County. There have been property and infrastructure damages associated with these hazards within the county and landslides and rockslides have been categorized as a high risk hazard. Moreover, the the natural process of landslides and rockslides will continue over time.

Based on past and projected population growth, it is very likely that future development will lead to the intersection of landslides and rockslides-prone areas. As development pressures continue in undeveloped areas of the county, vulnerability to landslides and rockslides may increase across Larimer County.

Typically, the process of landslides and rockslides do not limit land use, especially if efforts are made to minimize it. Landslide and rockslide impacts can be reduced and controlled by road bank slope design, surface drainage management, and re-vegetation or disturbed lands. Ground modification and structural solutions can help mitigate the threats of localize landslides and rockslides. Proper drainage and water management are also important to prevent increasing vulnerability to landslide and rockslide hazards.





5.3.9 Spring / Summer Storm

| NATURAL HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Spring / Summer Storm | | | | | | |
| (Hail, Thunderstorm, | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.90 |
| Wind Storm, Lightning) | | | | | | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

Spring is the season of the year that involves the transition period from winter to summer. As a result of this transition period, temperatures can swing back and forth causing extreme weather changes. Severe weather events occurring in the spring include heavy snow, thunderstorms, lightning, hail, strong winds, tornadoes and flooding. Summer storms consist typically of thunderstorms, lightning, and hail.

Lightning strikes can all be hazardous under the right conditions and locations. Large hail can damage crops, dent vehicles, break windows, and injure or kill livestock, pets, and people. Strong winds can take down trees and damage property and infrastructure.

The typical thunderstorm is 15 miles in diameter and lasts an average of 30 minutes. Of the estimated 100,000 thunderstorms that occur each year in the United States, about 10 percent are classified as severe. The National Weather Service considers a thunderstorm severe if it produces hail at least 3/4 inch in diameter, winds of 58 MPH or stronger, or a tornado. Every thunderstorm needs three basic components: (1) moisture to form clouds and rain, (2) unstable air which is warm air that rises rapidly, and (3) lift, which is a cold or warm front capable of lifting air to help form thunderstorms.

Thunderstorms can occur during strong winds, heavy rains, sleet, hail, snow, or even no precipitation at all. Thunderstorms are characterized by the presence of lightning and its audio effect on the Earth's atmosphere. Thunderstorms experience fast upward movement of warm air that contains moisture. When the air moves upwards it begins to cool and condense forming cumulonimbus clouds. Once the air cools enough to reach saturation water droplets and ice form and begin to fall. These falling droplets and ice create a downdraft of cold air, intern causing rain, strong winds, and occasionally fog.

There are four types of thunderstorms: supercell, multicell lines, multicell cluster, and single cell. The strongest type of thunderstorm is the super cell and is associated with severe weather. Supercells are deep constantly rotating current of rising air called a mesocyclone.

Lightning, although not considered severe by the National Weather Service definition, can accompany heavy rain during thunderstorms. Lightning develops when ice particles in a cloud collide with other particles. These collisions cause a separation of electrical charges. Positively charged ice particles rise to the top of the cloud and negatively charged ones fall to the middle and lower sections of the cloud. The negative charges at the base of the cloud attract positive charges at the surface of the Earth. Invisible to the human eye, the negatively charged area of the cloud sends a charge called a stepped leader toward the ground. Once it gets close enough, a channel develops between the cloud and the ground. Lightning is the electrical transfer through this channel. The channel rapidly heats to 50,000 degrees Fahrenheit




and contains approximately 100 million electrical volts. The rapid expansion of the heated air causes thunder.

The following Figure depicts average cloud-to-ground lightning incidence in the US (or lightning flash densities) between 1997 and 2012.



Figure 36. Average Lightning Flash Density in the U.S.⁴⁵

Although the state of Colorado ranks 32nd in terms of its cloud-to-ground lightning flash densities between 1997-2012, the state ranks 2nd in the country in terms of death rate from lightning per million people (between 2003 - 2012). Colorado's lightning death rate per million people from 2003-2012 is 0.51, second only to the state of Wyoming.

The following figure shows lightning flash densities for the State of Colorado for the years 1994 through 2014. Produced by National Weather Service, using data from Vaisala, the image is the result of contouring over 8 million cloud-to-ground lightning flashes for the State of Colorado and averaging annually. The result of the analysis is a picture of average lightning flashes/km² per year from 1994 through 2014 (the year 2000 was not included in the dataset).



⁴⁵ Source: <u>http://www.lightningsafety.noaa.gov/statistics.htm</u>



Figure 37. Colorado Lightning Flash Density Map

In general, the flash density map shows a wide range of values across the State of Colorado, ranging from less than 0.5 flashes/year/km² over the south central portion of the state to over 6.5 flashes/year/km² over the east central part of the state. The higher density of lightning flashes located in the central area of the state is driven by the topography of the area. Where the higher terrain of the Plains intersects with the Rocky Mountains conditions are ripe for lightning events. Here, moist air from lower altitudes initiates and sustains convection systems as they move off of the mountain slopes, generating thunderstorms.

Hail is precipitation that is formed when updrafts in thunderstorms carry raindrops upward into extremely cold areas of the atmosphere. The super cooled raindrops grow into balls of ice, which pose a hazard to property, people, livestock, and crops when they fall back to the earth.

Severe winter weather can cause hazardous driving conditions, communications and electrical power failure, community isolation, and can adversely affect business continuity. This type of snow-related weather may include one or more of the following winter factors:

Severe Wind events typically develop with strong pressure gradients and gusty frontal passages. The closer and stronger two systems (one high pressure, one low pressure) are, the stronger the pressure gradient, and therefore, the stronger the winds are.

Although severe wind events often garner less attention in the local media than tornadoes do, damaging **straight line winds** (or downbursts) can injure and kill animals and humans. Straight-line winds, which can cause more widespread damage than a tornado, occur when air is carried into a storm's updraft, cools rapidly, and comes rushing to the ground. Cold air is denser than warm air, and therefore, wants to fall to the surface. On warm summer days, when the cold air can no longer be supported up by the storm's





updraft, or when an exceptional downdraft develops, the air crashes to the ground in the form of strong winds. These winds are forced horizontally when they reach the ground and can cause significant damage. These types of strong winds can also be referred to as straight-line winds. Downbursts with a diameter of less than 2.5 miles are called microbursts and those with a diameter of 2.5 miles or greater are called macrobursts. A "derecho" is a series of downbursts associated with a line of thunderstorms.

Previous Occurrences

Thunderstorm

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 17 injuries and 2 deaths in Larimer County due to thunderstorm wind. There have been 117 thunderstorm wind events reported in Larimer County between 1955 and 2014. Of the 117 incidents, 5 reported property losses totaling \$76,500 and no crop losses. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.

| Date | Location | Death | Injury | Damage to | Damage to |
|-----------|---------------|-------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Bate | Location | Death | ingury | Property | Crops |
| 7/3/1960 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/4/1963 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/23/1968 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/27/1970 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/1/1974 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/5/1976 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/10/1977 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/17/1977 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/29/1978 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/30/1979 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/2/1980 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/19/1980 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/16/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/21/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/21/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/2/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/7/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/11/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/21/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/24/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/23/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/26/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/23/1981 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/19/1982 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/29/1982 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/18/1983 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/18/1983 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/18/1983 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/18/1983 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 38. Historical Thunderstorm Wind Events in Larimer County







| Date | Location | Death | Injury | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------|--------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 5/12/1984 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/14/1984 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/24/1984 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/3/1985 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/24/1985 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/7/1985 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/2/1986 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/17/1986 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/3/1986 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/4/1986 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/13/1986 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/19/1987 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/11/1987 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/26/1987 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/27/1988 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/7/1988 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/25/1988 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/3/1988 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/28/1989 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/27/1989 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/8/1989 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/1/1990 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/19/1991 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/19/1991 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/20/1991 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/12/1991 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/24/1992 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/5/1993 | Carr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/28/1993 | Punkin Center | 0 | 0 | \$50,000 | 0 |
| 8/15/1993 | Fort Collins | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/7/1993 | Loveland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/28/1994 | Not available | 0 | 8 | 500 | 0 |
| 5/28/1994 | Loveland | 0 | 1 | 500 | 0 |
| 6/6/1994 | Loveland | 0 | 0 | 500 | 0 |
| 6/13/1994 | Rustic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/1/1994 | Fort Collins | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/10/1994 | Fort Collins | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/16/1994 | Loveland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/16/1994 | Horsetooth Bay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/10/1994 | Fort Collins | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/22/1994 | Kings Canyon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/5/1995 | Rand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/17/1995 | Fort | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/17/1995 | South Fort Collins/No | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Death | Injury | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|-----------|---------------------|-------|--------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 7/17/1995 | Bellview | 0 | 0 | 0 | . 0 |
| 7/20/1995 | Hohnholz Ranch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/20/1995 | Red Feather Lakes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/20/1995 | West Fort Collins | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/22/1995 | Red Feather Lakes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/5/1995 | Fort Morgan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/12/1996 | BERTHOUD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/27/1996 | WELLINGTON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/28/1996 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/17/1998 | RUSTIC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/30/1998 | LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/14/1999 | CAMPION | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/21/1999 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/2/1999 | CAMPION | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/27/1999 | WELLINGTON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/5/2000 | FT COLLINS/LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/28/2001 | LOVELAND | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/8/2005 | MASONVILLE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/3/2005 | LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/25/2005 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/28/2005 | BERTHOUD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/28/2005 | LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/2/2005 | LOVELAND | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/3/2005 | BERTHOUD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/12/2007 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/22/2008 | WELLINGTON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/2/2008 | LOVELAND ARPT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/13/2008 | MOUNTAIN VIEW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/13/2008 | MOUNTAIN VIEW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/14/2008 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/26/2009 | CAMPION | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/26/2009 | FT COLLINS/LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | \$25,000 | 0 |
| 7/27/2009 | FT COLLINS/LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/26/2010 | TIMNATH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/22/2010 | BERTHOUD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/20/2010 | BERTHOUD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/29/2011 | GLENDEVEY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/24/2011 | MOUNTAIN VIEW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/28/2013 | DRAKES | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/28/2013 | DRAKES | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/28/2013 | DRAKES | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/28/2013 | HARMONY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/22/2014 | Not available | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/23/2014 | FT COLLINS/LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Death | Injury | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------|----------|-------|--------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| | Total: | 2 | 17 | \$76,500 | 0 |

*Source: NOAA; NCDC Storm Events Database

Lightning

According to the best available data there have been 43 lightning events in Larimer County between 1996 and 2014. There have been 55 reported injuries, 8 deaths, \$217,000 worth of property damage, and \$15,000 worth of crop damage. On July 11th and 12th, 2014 two people were killed by separate lightning strikes in Rocky Mountain National park along Trail Ridge Road. In addition to the two deaths, 21 people



were taken to the hospital because of lightning strikes. The national park outside of the Town of Estes Park attracts about 3 million visitors per year. Due to its high elevations and frequent thunderstorms in the summer, there is a high risk of lightning strikes. The events are summarized in the table below. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is a great potential for lightning events to occur at any given time, especially during the summer months when county residents are likely to be working and playing outdoors.

| Date | Location | Death | Injury | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|-------------------|-------|--------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 5/9/1996 | LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/4/1996 | FORT COLLINS | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/10/1996 | FORT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | 0 |
| 7/23/1996 | LOVELAND | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/2/1996 | FORT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | \$50,000 | 0 |
| 8/15/1996 | RED FEATHER LAKES | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/16/1996 | RUSTIC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/16/1996 | FORT COLLINS | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/2/1997 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/14/1997 | LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | \$4,000 | 0 |
| 5/22/1998 | LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/9/1998 | ESTES PARK | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/19/1999 | LIVERMORE | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/21/1999 | ESTES PARK | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

Table 39. Lightning Strikes in Larimer County*







| Date | Location | Death | Iniury | Damage to | Damage to |
|------------|---------------------|-------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | ,, | Property | Crops |
| 8/7/1999 | ESTES PARK | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/1/1999 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/17/2000 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/3/2000 | ESTES PARK | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/15/2001 | LOVELAND | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/17/2003 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/31/2003 | LOVELAND | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/26/2003 | POUDRE PARK | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/3/2003 | RED FEATHER LAKES | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/18/2003 | FT COLLINS/LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/19/2005 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/3/2005 | LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/3/2005 | LOVELAND | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/29/2007 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | \$2,000 | 0 |
| 5/29/2007 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | \$35,000 | 0 |
| 10/13/2007 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | \$1,000 | 0 |
| 6/3/2008 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | \$4,000 | 0 |
| 7/8/2008 | DEER RIDGE | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/24/2008 | FT COLLINS | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/20/2010 | BERTHOUD | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 |
| 7/22/2010 | LOVELAND | 0 | 0 | \$100,000 | 0 |
| 5/20/2011 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | \$1,000 | 0 |
| 6/16/2011 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | \$5,000 | 0 |
| 7/6/2011 | ESTES PARK | 0 | 0 | \$5,000 | 0 |
| 7/5/2013 | FT COLLINS | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$5,000 |
| 7/18/2013 | DEER RIDGE | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/18/2013 | WELLINGTON | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/11/2014 | DEER RIDGE | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| 7/12/2014 | DEER RIDGE | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total: | 8 | 55 | \$217,500 | \$15,000 |

*Source: NOAA; NCDC Storm Events Database

<u>Hail</u>

According to the best available data there are no reported injuries or deaths in Larimer County due to hail. There have been 443 hail events reported in Larimer County between 1955 and 2014. Of the 443 incidents, 10 reported property losses totaling \$2,560,000 and 12 reported crop losses totaling \$1,835,500. The events with loss to property in Larimer County between 1994 and 2009 are summarized in the table below. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.

Table 40. Historic Hail Events reporting loss in Larimer County

| Date | Location | Hail Size Diameter (in) | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 7/16/1994 | Virginia Dale | 1.75 | 0 | \$50000 |
| | | | | |





| 7/16/1994 | Virginia Dale | 1.75 | 0 | \$50000 |
|-----------|---------------|--------|-------------|-------------|
| 7/16/1994 | Virginia Dale | 2 | \$500000 | \$50000 |
| 7/16/1994 | Virginia Dale | 1.75 | \$50000 | \$50000 |
| 7/16/1994 | Fort Collins | 0.75 | \$5000 | \$500 |
| 7/16/1994 | Wellington | 2.75 | \$500000 | \$500000 |
| 7/16/1994 | Wellington | 2.5 | \$500000 | \$50000 |
| 7/16/1994 | Wellington | 1.75 | \$50000 | \$50000 |
| 7/16/1994 | Wellington | 2.5 | \$500000 | \$5000 |
| 7/16/1994 | Fort Collins | 1.5 | \$50000 | \$5000 |
| 7/16/1994 | Loveland | 1.75 | \$5000 | 0 |
| 8/10/1994 | Laporte | 2 | \$400000 | 0 |
| 6/22/2009 | WELLINGTON | 1 | 0 | \$25000 |
| 7/20/2009 | DRAKES | 2 | 0 | \$1000000 |
| | | Total: | \$2,560,000 | \$1,835,500 |

Figure 38. Historical Hail Events (1955 – 2014) – Larimer County



<u>Windstorm</u>





Page 188

Data from NOAA's NCDC Storm Events Database was used to complete the risk assessment for straightline wind events in Larimer County. These events are defined as winds with speeds of at least fifty knots (58 mph), or winds of any speed (non-severe winds under fifty knots) that result in a fatality, injury and/or damage. The following Table summarizes severe wind history and damage totals in Larimer County from 1996 to 2014.





| DATE | MAGNITUDE (KNOTS) ⁴⁶ | DEATHS | INJURIES | PROPERTY DAMAGE | CROP DAMAGE |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1/3/1996 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/3/1996 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/11/1996 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/20/1996 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/27/1996 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/23/1996 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/19/1996 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/19/1996 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/24/1996 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/24/1996 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/24/1996 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/29/1996 | 87 | 0 | 0 | \$5,200,000 | 0 |
| 10/29/1996 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/18/1996 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/1/1996 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/2/1996 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/2/1996 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/4/1996 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/4/1996 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/4/1996 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/7/1996 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/15/1996 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/17/1996 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/27/1996 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/4/1997 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/4/1997 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/21/1997 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/23/1997 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/24/1997 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/27/1997 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/27/1997 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/11/1997 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 41. Severe Wind Event History in Larimer County (1996 – 2014)

⁴⁶ 1 knot = 1.15 mph





| DATE | MAGNITUDE (KNOTS) ⁴⁶ | DEATHS | INJURIES | PROPERTY DAMAGE | CROP DAMAGE |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------------|----------------|
| 10/31/1997 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/31/1997 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/3/1997 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/27/1997 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/27/1997 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/15/1998 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/17/1998 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/25/1998 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/13/1998 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/13/1998 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/28/1998 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/10/1998 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/18/1998 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/21/1998 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/25/1998 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/26/1998 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/27/1998 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/27/1998 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/30/1998 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/30/1998 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/5/1999 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/5/1999 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/10/1999 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/14/1999 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/18/1999 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/26/1999 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/2/1999 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/2/1999 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/7/1999 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/17/1999 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/17/1999 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/22/1999 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/22/1999 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/22/1999 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/8/1999 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/8/1999 | 100 | 0 | 0 | \$7,200,000 | 0 |





| DATE | MAGNITUDE (KNOTS) ⁴⁶ | DEATHS | INJURIES | PROPERTY DAMAGE | CROP DAMAGE |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------------|----------------|
| 4/9/1999 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/9/1999 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/6/1999 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/25/1999 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/18/1999 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/18/1999 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/18/1999 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/25/1999 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/25/1999 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/25/1999 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/25/1999 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/25/1999 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/25/1999 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/15/1999 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/15/1999 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/16/1999 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/16/1999 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/18/1999 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/3/2000 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/3/2000 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/7/2000 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/7/2000 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/10/2000 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/15/2000 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/15/2000 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/25/2000 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/25/2000 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/26/2000 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/5/2000 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/7/2000 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/7/2000 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/5/2000 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/5/2000 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/18/2000 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/17/2000 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/13/2000 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| DATE | MAGNITUDE (KNOTS) ⁴⁶ | DEATHS | INJURIES | PROPERTY DAMAGE | CROP DAMAGE |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------------|----------------|
| 6/13/2000 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/30/2000 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/15/2000 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/16/2000 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/16/2000 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/17/2000 | 52 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/2/2001 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/4/2001 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/4/2001 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/20/2001 | 61 | 0 | 0 | \$36,000 | 0 |
| 6/13/2001 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/31/2001 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/5/2001 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/5/2001 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/12/2002 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/13/2002 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/19/2002 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/19/2002 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/20/2002 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/20/2002 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/8/2002 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/8/2002 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/9/2002 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/9/2002 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/14/2002 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/8/2002 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/28/2002 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/15/2003 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/30/2003 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/30/2003 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/9/2003 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/5/2003 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/5/2003 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/15/2003 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/29/2003 | 62 | 0 | 0 | \$979,000 | 0 |
| 11/11/2003 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| DATE | MAGNITUDE (KNOTS) ⁴⁶ | DEATHS | INJURIES | PROPERTY DAMAGE | CROP DAMAGE |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------------|----------------|
| 11/11/2003 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/6/2004 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/6/2004 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/10/2004 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/29/2004 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/20/2004 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/3/2005 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/14/2005 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/30/2005 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/5/2005 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/23/2005 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/29/2005 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/8/2006 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/12/2006 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/18/2006 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/2/2006 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/16/2006 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/14/2006 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/14/2006 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/7/2007 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/7/2007 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/16/2007 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/16/2007 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/6/2007 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/6/2007 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/19/2007 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/27/2007 | 69 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/4/2007 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/23/2007 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/29/2007 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/5/2008 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/8/2008 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/2/2008 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/11/2008 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8/2/2008 | 52 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/13/2008 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| DATE | MAGNITUDE (KNOTS) ⁴⁶ | DEATHS | INJURIES | PROPERTY DAMAGE | CROP DAMAGE |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 12/25/2008 | 70 | 0 | 0 | \$50,000 | 0 |
| 12/29/2008 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/29/2008 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/31/2008 | 77 | 0 | 0 | \$25,000 | 0 |
| 1/1/2009 | 77 | 0 | 0 | \$25,000 | 0 |
| 1/7/2009 | 65 | 0 | 0 | \$5,000 | 0 |
| 1/7/2009 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/27/2009 | 87 | 0 | 0 | \$25,000 | 0 |
| 2/9/2009 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/11/2009 | 65 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/30/2009 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/1/2009 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/13/2010 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/4/2010 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/4/2010 | 58 | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | \$50 <i>,</i> 000 |
| 5/24/2010 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/25/2010 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/13/2011 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/22/2011 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/22/2011 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/3/2011 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/16/2011 | 43 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/6/2011 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/12/2011 | 45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/12/2011 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/31/2011 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/31/2011 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/31/2011 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/17/2012 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/17/2012 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/18/2012 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/19/2012 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/20/2012 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/20/2012 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/21/2012 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/21/2012 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| DATE | MAGNITUDE (KNOTS) ⁴⁶ | DEATHS | INJURIES | PROPERTY DAMAGE | CROP DAMAGE |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------------|----------------|
| 2/29/2012 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/4/2012 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/15/2012 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/17/2012 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/11/2013 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/17/2013 | 67 | 0 | 0 | \$10,000 | 0 |
| 12/2/2013 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/24/2013 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/24/2013 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/29/2014 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/12/2014 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/14/2014 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/16/2014 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/16/2014 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/17/2014 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/20/2014 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/31/2014 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/10/2014 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/25/2014 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | TOTAL | 0 | 11 | \$13,565,000 | \$50,000 |

*Source: NOAA; NCDC Storm Events Database

Based on data provided by NCDC's Storm Events Database, 231 severe wind events have occurred in Lamer County between 1996 and 2014. There have been no deaths, 11 injuries, \$13,565,000 in property damage, and \$50,000 in crop damage. The following Figure provides a geospatial view of these historical severe wind events in Larimer County between 1996 and 2014. Severe winds affect all portions of the County.









CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

As a result of global climate change, the United States is already experiencing more intense precipitation. As Larimer County prepares for regional changes in climate, it will be important to consider scenarios in which larger amounts of precipitation will fall over shorter periods of time. The impacts have the potential to affect infrastructure, public safety, and the local economy in a diversity of (potentially) negative ways.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in Larimer County can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes 324,122 people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and





⁴⁷ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

flooding. Most structures, including the County's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of Larimer County and its jurisdictions including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for Larimer County. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Larimer County will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in Larimer County at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of Larimer County and its

Page 198





municipalities experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 231 severe wind events since 1996, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Land Use and Development

All future structures built in Larimer County will likely be exposed to spring and summer extremes and damage. Since the previous statement is assumed to be uniform countywide, the location of development does not increase or reduce the risk necessarily. Larimer County and its jurisdictions must adhere to building codes, and therefore, new development can be built to current standards to account for adverse weather. Additionally, as homes go up in more remote parts of the county, accessing those rural residents may become impossible should sheltering or emergency services be needed in an extreme event.

All future structures built in Larimer County will likely be exposed to severe wind damage. As with other large extent hazards, increased development trends within Planning Reserve Areas and along the I-25 corridors will increase the vulnerability of these areas. Larimer County and its jurisdictions must continue to adhere to building codes and to facilitate new development that is built to the highest design standards to account for heavy winds.

Due to the nature of severe wind events, not all jurisdictions within Larimer County are expected to be impacted equally. For example, older homes, which are often subject to less advanced building codes, suffer increased vulnerability to wind over time. Mobile homes, which are most often occupied by low-income, socially vulnerable residents, are the most dangerous places during a windstorm. As communities across Larimer County continue to grow, it is important that local agencies monitor the inventory and locations of mobile homes, particularly in areas of high wind risk. Moreover, when discussing mitigation actions for straight-line winds, communities or geographic locations with large numbers of mobile homes deserve added attention.





5.3.10 Tornado

| NATURAL HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING | |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--|
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.70 | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

Tornadoes in Colorado are most often generated by thunderstorm activity when cool, dry air intersects and overrides a layer of warm, moist air forcing the warm air to rise rapidly. The damage caused by a tornado is a result of high wind velocities and wind-blown debris. According to the National Weather Service, tornado wind speeds can range between 30 to more than 300 miles per hour. They are more likely to occur during the spring and early summer months of March through June and are most likely to form in the late afternoon and early evening. Most tornadoes are a few dozen yards wide and touchdown briefly, but even small, short-lived tornadoes can inflict tremendous damage. Destruction ranges from minor to catastrophic depending on the intensity, size, and duration of the storm. Structures made of light materials such as mobile homes are most susceptible to damage. Each year, an average of over eight hundred tornadoes is reported nationwide, resulting in an average of eighty deaths and fifteen hundred injuries (NOAA, 2002). The majority of Colorado tornadoes occur in the eastern plains, including all areas of Larimer County.

Tornadoes were previously classified by their intensity using the Fujita (F) Scale, with FO being the least intense and F6 being the most intense. The Fujita Scale (seen in the table below) is used to rate the intensity of a tornado by examining the damage caused by the tornado after it has passed over a manmade structure.

| | Fujita Scale | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| F-Scale Number | Intensity Phrase | Wind Speed | Type of Damage | | | |
| FO | Gale | 40-72 | Some damage to chimneys; breaks branches off trees; pushes over | | | |
| 10 | tornado | mph | shallow-rooted trees; damages signboards. | | | |
| F1 | Moderate tornado | 73-112 mph | The lower limit is the beginning of hurricane wind speed; peels surface off roofs; mobile homes pushed off foundations or overturned; moving autos pushed off the roads; attached garages may be destroyed. | | | |
| F2 | Significant tornado | 113-157 mph | Considerable damage. Roofs torn off frame houses; mobile homes demolished; boxcars pushed over; large trees snapped or uprooted; light object missiles generated. | | | |

| Table 42. Fujita Tornado Damag | e Scale ⁴⁸ |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|

⁴⁸ Information provided by NOAA at <u>http://www.spc.noaa.gov/faq/tornado/f-scale.html</u>





| | Fujita Scale | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|--|
| F-Scale Number | Intensity Phrase | Wind Speed | Type of Damage | | | |
| F3 | Severe tornado | 158-206 mph | Roof and some walls torn off well-constructed houses; trains overturned; most trees in forest uprooted | | | |
| F4 | Devastati ng tornado | 207-260 mph | Well-constructed houses leveled; structures with weak foundations blown off some distance; cars thrown and large missiles generated. | | | |
| FS | Incredible tornado | 261-318 mph | Strong frame houses lifted off foundations and carried considerable distances to disintegrate; automobile sized missiles fly through the air in excess of 100 meters; trees debarked; steel reinforced concrete structures badly damaged. | | | |
| F6 | Inconceiva ble tornado | 319-379 mph | These winds are very unlikely. The small area of damage they might produce would probably not be recognizable along with the mess produced by F4 and F5 wind that would surround the F6 winds. Missiles, such as cars and refrigerators would do serious secondary damage that could not be directly identified as F6 damage. If this level is ever achieved, evidence for it might only be found in some manner of ground swirl pattern, for it may never be identifiable through engineering studies | | | |

On February 1, 2007, the Fujita scale was decommissioned in favor of the more accurate Enhanced Fujita Scale (aka the EF Scale). The EF-Scale measures tornado strength and associated damages and classifies tornadoes into six intensity categories, as shown in the following table. The scale was revised to reflect better examinations of tornado damage surveys, so as to align wind speeds more closely with associated storm damage. The new scale takes into account how most structures are designed, and is thought to be a much more accurate representation of the surface wind speeds in the most violent tornadoes.





| Table 43. | Enhanced | Fujita | (EF) |) Scale ⁴⁹ |
|-----------|----------|--------|------|-----------------------|
|-----------|----------|--------|------|-----------------------|

| Enhanced Fujita (EF) Scale | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Enhanced Fujita Category | Wind Speed (mph) | Potential Damage | | | |
| EFO | 65-85 | Light damage: Peels surface off some roofs; some damage to gutters or siding; branches broken off trees; shallow-rooted trees pushed over. | | | |
| EF1 | 86-110 | Moderate damage: Roofs severely stripped; mobile homes overturned or badly damaged; loss of exterior doors; windows and other glass broken. | | | |
| EF2 | 111-135 | Considerable damage : Roofs torn off well-constructed houses; foundations of frame homes shifted; mobile homes completely destroyed; large trees snapped or uprooted; light-object missiles generated; cars lifted off ground. | | | |
| EF3 | 136-165 | Severe damage: Entire stories of well-constructed houses destroyed; severe damage to large buildings such as shopping malls; trains overturned; trees debarked; heavy cars lifted off the ground and thrown; structures with weak foundations blown away some distance. | | | |
| EF4 | 166-200 | Devastating damage : Well-constructed houses and whole frame houses completely leveled; cars thrown and small missiles generated. | | | |
| EF5 | >200 | Incredible damage: Strong frame houses leveled off foundations and swept away; automobile-sized missiles fly through the air in excess of 100 m (109 yds.); high-rise buildings have significant structural deformation; incredible phenomena will occur. | | | |

The Storm Prediction Center has developed damage indicators to be used with the Enhanced Fujita Scale for different types of buildings. These indicators can be also be used to classify any high wind event. Indicators for different building types are shown in the following tables.



⁴⁹ Source: <u>http://www.spc.noaa.gov/faq/tornado/ef-scale.html</u>

| DAMAGE DESCRIPTION | WIND SPEED RANGE (Expected in Parentheses) |
|---|--|
| Threshold of visible damage | 59-88 MPH (72 MPH) |
| Loss of roof covering (<20%) | 72-109 MPH (86 MPH) |
| Damage to penthouse roof & walls, loss of rooftop HVAC equipment | 75-111 MPH (92 MPH) |
| Broken glass in windows or doors | 78-115 MPH (95 MPH) |
| Uplift of lightweight roof deck & insulation, significant loss of roofing material (>20%) | 95-136 MPH (114 MPH) |
| Façade components torn from structure | 97-140 MPH (118 MPH) |
| Damage to curtain walls or other wall cladding | 110-152 MPH (131 MPH) |
| Uplift of pre-cast concrete roof slabs | 119-163 MPH (142 MPH) |
| Uplift of metal deck with concrete fill slab | 118-170 MPH (146 MPH) |
| Collapse of some top building envelope | 127-172 MPH (148 MPH) |
| Significant damage to building envelope | 178-268 MPH (210 MPH) |

Table 44. Institutional Buildings

Source: Storm Prediction Center, 2009

Table 45. Educational Institutions (Elementary Schools, High Schools)

| DAMAGE DESCRIPTION | WIND SPEED RANGE (Expected in Parentheses) |
|---|---|
| Threshold of visible damage | 55-83 MPH (68 MPH) |
| Loss of roof covering (<20%) | 66-99 MPH (79 MPH) |
| Broken windows | 71-106 MPH (87 MPH) |
| Exterior door failures | 83-121 MPH (101 MPH) |
| Uplift of metal roof decking; significant loss of roofing material (>20%); loss of rooftop HVAC | 85-119 MPH (101 MPH) |
| Damage to or loss of wall cladding | 92-127 MPH (108 MPH) |
| Collapse of tall masonry walls at gym, cafeteria, or auditorium | 94-136 MPH (114 MPH) |
| Uplift or collapse of light steel roof structure | 108-148 MPH (125 MPH) |
| Collapse of exterior walls in top floor | 121-153 MPH (139 MPH) |
| Most interior walls of top floor collapsed | 133-186 MPH (158 MPH) |





| DAMAGE DESCRIPTION | WIND SPEED RANGE (Expected in Parentheses) |
|---|---|
| Total destruction of a large section of building envelope | 163-224 MPH (192 MPH) |

Source: Storm Prediction Center, 2009

| Table 46 | Metal | Building | Systems |
|----------|-------|----------|---------|
|----------|-------|----------|---------|

| DAMAGE DESCRIPTION | WIND SPEED RANGE (Expected in Parentheses) |
|--|--|
| Threshold of visible damage | 54-83 MPH (67 MPH) |
| Inward or outward collapsed of overhead doors | 75-108 MPH (89 MPH) |
| Metal roof or wall panels pulled from the building | 78-120 MPH (95 MPH) |
| Column anchorage failed | 96-135 MPH (117 MPH) |
| Buckling of roof purlins | 95-138 MPH (118 MPH) |
| Failure of X-braces in the lateral load resisting system | 118-158 MPH (138 MPH) |
| Progressive collapse of rigid frames | 120-168 MPH (143 MPH) |
| Total destruction of building | 132-178 MPH (155 MPH) |

Source: Storm Prediction Center, 2009

| Table 47. | Electric | Transm | ission | Lines |
|-----------|----------|---------|---------|-------|
| | LICCUIC | irunsin | 1331011 | LINCS |

| DAMAGE DESCRIPTION | WIND SPEED RANGE (Expected in Parentheses) |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Threshold of visible damage | 70-98 MPH (83 MPH) |
| Broken wood cross member | 80-114 MPH (99 MPH) |
| Wood poles leaning | 85-130 MPH (108 MPH) |
| Broken wood poles | 98-142 MPH (118 MPH) |

Source: Storm Prediction Center, 2009

Previous Occurrences

Colorado, lying just west of "tornado alley," is fortunate to experience less frequent and intense tornadoes than its neighboring states to the east. However, tornadoes remain a significant hazard in the region. Tornadoes are the most intense storm on earth having been recorded at velocities exceeding 315 mph. The phenomena results in a destructive rotating column of air ranging in diameter from a few yards to greater than a mile, usually associated with a downward extension of cumulonimbus clouds.

All portions of Larimer County have the potential to be affected by tornadoes; however, eastern portions have a greater potential. Historically, tornadoes have been relatively small on the EF Scale but F1





tornadoes can still produce dangerous winds up to 112mph. High winds can cause damage to buildings (tearing shingles from roofs, tearing awnings, collapsing structures, etc.).

The following Table summarizes tornado history and damage data for Larimer County from 1954 – 2015 collected by the NOAA Storm Prediction Center.





| DATE | EF SCALE | INJURIES | DEATHS | ESTIMATED PROPERTY DAMAGE | ESTIMATED CROP DAMAGE |
|-----------|----------|----------|--------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 8/7/1954 | unknown | 0 | 0 | \$2,500 | unknown |
| 5/29/1957 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$250 | unknown |
| 5/30/1957 | F2 | 0 | 0 | \$2,500 | unknown |
| 7/7/1963 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$2,500 | unknown |
| 6/23/1965 | F0 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 6/4/1976 | F2 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 7/22/1979 | F0 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 5/24/1980 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$2,500 | unknown |
| 6/25/1982 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$30 | unknown |
| 7/7/1983 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$30 | unknown |
| 8/2/1985 | F1 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 6/18/1987 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$25,000 | unknown |
| 8/7/1987 | F1 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 6/15/1988 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$2,500 | unknown |
| 6/25/1988 | F1 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 8/7/1988 | FO | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 5/31/1989 | FO | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 6/6/1990 | FO | 0 | 0 | \$2,500 | unknown |
| 6/9/1990 | F1 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 6/9/1990 | F2 | 0 | 0 | \$25,000 | unknown |
| 7/8/1990 | FO | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 6/22/1991 | FO | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 5/28/1993 | FO | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 8/5/1993 | FO | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 7/16/1994 | F0 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 7/16/1994 | FO | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 7/16/1994 | F0 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 5/6/1995 | F0 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 5/9/2002 | FO | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 7/25/2005 | FO | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 5/22/2008 | EF1 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| 6/4/2015 | EF3 | 0 | 0 | unknown | unknown |
| тот | ALS: | 0 | 0 | \$65,300 | unknown |

Table 48. Tornado History in Larimer County (1954-2015)

*Source: NOAA; NCDC Storm Events Database





NCDC's Storm Events Database estimates that 32 tornadoes have touched down in, or moved through, Larimer County between 1954 and 2015. The following Figure depicts historical tornado tracks and events in and around Larimer County. The map illustrates where tornadoes have touched down (and traveled) between 1954 and 2015. It is important to note that although all portions of the County are susceptible to tornado hazard, areas of the county located in the plains in the eastern portion of the county are more susceptible than those located in the western mountainous region.





Inventory Exposed

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:



⁵⁰ Historical tornado events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1950 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

All assets located in Larimer County can be considered at risk from severe wind and tornadoes. This includes 324,122 people, or 100% of the County's population and all buildings and infrastructure within the County.⁵¹ Most structures, including the county's critical facilities, should be able to withstand and provide adequate protection from tornadoes. Those facilities with back-up generators should be fully equipped to handle tornado events should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Generally, tornadoes destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists tornado hazards, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Over the last 61 years there have been no deaths reported in Larimer County due to a tornado event. During the same time period, there have been no reported injuries from tornadoes. Monetary losses to property and crops are largely unknown.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Reported tornadoes over the past 61 years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of frequency for such events. The probability of the County and its municipalities experiencing a tornado associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify. Historic tornado frequencies suggest that there is roughly a 100% chance of this type of event occurring somewhere in within the county boundaries each year.

Land Use and Development

All future structures built in Larimer County could likely be exposed to tornado damage. As with other large extent hazards, increased development trends within Planning Reserve Areas and along the I-25 corridor will increase the vulnerability of these areas. Larimer County and its jurisdictions must continue to adhere to building codes and to facilitate new development that is built to the highest design standards to account for tornadoes.

Due to the nature of tornadoes, not all jurisdictions within Larimer County are expected to be impacted equally. For example, older homes, which are often subject to less advanced building codes, suffer increased vulnerability to wind and tornadoes over time. Mobile homes, which are most often occupied by low-income, socially vulnerable residents, are the most dangerous places during a tornado. Studies





⁵¹ 2010 Census

indicate that 45% of all fatalities during tornadoes occur in mobile homes, compared to 26% in traditional site-built homes.⁵²





⁵² Ashley, W.S., A.J. Krmenec, and R. Schwantes, 2008: Vulnerability due to nocturnal tornadoes. *Weather and Forecasting*, 23, 795 – 807.

5.3.11 Utility Disruption

| NATURAL HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--|
| Utility Disruption | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.30 | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4) | | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

Utility disruption is defined as the interruption or loss of electricity, gas, communications, or water to a facility of a community for a period of time that compromises the integrity of the location, threatens human life, safety, and health, or interferes with vital services. Utility disruption may occur as a secondary effect of another hazard, or as the result of construction, accident, or terrorism. Severe summer and winter storms, and tornadoes and floods can bring trees and tree limbs down onto power lines. These events also cause serious safety hazards to the general public and emergency responders. For the purpose of the 2016 plan attention has been given to the following utility sources:

- Electricity
- Natural Gas
- Communications
- Water

Extended electrical outages can directly impact other utility systems, particularly water and wastewater systems. In areas where telephone service is provided by above-ground lines that share poles with electrical distribution lines, telecommunications providers may not be able to make repairs to the telephone system until electrical utilities restore power lines to a safe condition. Electrical outages can also adversely affect the availability of fueling facilities that require electrical power to physically move the fuel. The impacts of electric utility disruptions are felt most significantly by the general public during the winter and the summer due to heating and cooling demands. However, any extended electric disruption can lead to local economic losses when computers, lighting, refrigeration, gas pumps, and other equipment are without power during business hours.

The majority of homes in Larimer County are heated with natural gas. However, propane is a common heating fuel in the rural parts of the county. A large diameter natural gas pipeline travels through Larimer County along the Interstate 25 corridor. The distribution of natural gas through this pipeline could potentially be disrupted by an earthquake, construction accident, transportation accident, or serious fire along the corridor. The impacts of gas utility disruption can be severe in rural areas where a single-source heating is the norm.

Disruptions of communication systems happen frequently, especially now that society is more dependent on multiple means of communication. For example, when telephone lines are out of service, credit card and many internet transactions cannot be made. The potential loss of cellular phone communication has occurred in localized events but it has not yet been regionally experienced. Severe storms or atmospheric/solar activity have the potential to impact radio communications. Typically, local and regional communications plans address the need for redundancy within the local, regional, and state-wide communication systems.





Finally, the disruption of water utilities and systems often requires notification of the public and businesses in order to: curtail usage; boil available water; use bottled water; etc. This may also impact local firefighting activities.

Previous Occurrences

The county does not currently track incidences of utility disruption.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in Larimer County are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes 324,122 people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County.

Utility disruption events of most concern include those large-scale disruption events that could potentially last for more than three days. Events of this magnitude could cause major disruptions to vital services, some of which would include hospitals, fuel suppliers, food suppliers, and the agricultural community.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.

Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around Larimer County.

Future Land Use and Development Trends

As development expands into undeveloped areas, Larimer County may face higher risks of utility disruption. Sprawling development and the subsequent extension of utilities may increase the vulnerability of the county and its communities to utility disruption due to increased demand and increased exposure of utility lines. In developed areas, increased population densities and economic activity over time has potential to put additional stress on already overtaxed utility systems.





5.3.12 Winter Storm

| NATURAL HAZARDS | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING | |
|----------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--|
| Winter Storm (Blizzard | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 03 | 2 60 | |
| Accumulation) | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 2.00 | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 and higher) | | | | | | | |

Hazard Identification

Winter storms can cause hazardous driving conditions, communications and electrical power failure, community isolation, and can adversely affect business continuity. This type of snow-related weather may include one or more of the following winter factors:

Winter storms can include blizzards, heavy snow, ice storms, and extreme cold.

Blizzards as defined by the National Weather Service, are a combination of sustained winds or frequent gusts of 35 mph or greater and visibilities of less than a quarter mile from falling or blowing snow for 3 hours or more. A blizzard, by definition, does not indicate heavy amounts of snow, although they can happen together. The falling or blowing snow usually creates large drifts from the strong winds. The reduced visibilities make travel, even on foot, particularly treacherous. The strong winds may also support dangerous wind chills. Ground blizzards can develop when strong winds lift snow off the ground and severely reduce visibilities.

Heavy snow, in large quantities, may fall during winter storms. Six inches or more in 12 hours or eight inches or more in 24 hours constitutes conditions that may significantly hamper travel or create hazardous conditions. The National Weather Service issues warnings for such events. Smaller amounts can also make travel hazardous, but in most cases, only results in minor inconveniences. Heavy wet snow before the leaves fall from the trees in the fall or after the trees have leafed out in the spring may cause problems with broken tree branches and power outages.

Ice storms develop when a layer of warm (above freezing), moist air aloft coincides with a shallow cold (below freezing) pool of air at the surface. As snow falls into the warm layer of air, it melts to rain, and then freezes on contact when hitting the frozen ground or cold objects at the surface, creating a smooth layer of ice. This phenomenon is called freezing rain. Similarly, sleet occurs when the rain in the warm layer subsequently freezes into pellets while falling through a cold layer of air at or near the Earth's surface. Extended periods of freezing rain can lead to accumulations of ice on roadways, walkways, power lines, trees, and buildings. Almost any accumulation can make driving and walking hazardous. Thick accumulations can bring down trees and power lines.

Extreme Cold, in extended periods, although infrequent, could occur throughout the winter months in Larimer County. Heating systems compensate for the cold outside. Most people limit their time outside during extreme cold conditions, but common complaints usually include pipes freezing and cars refusing to start. When cold temperatures and wind combine, dangerous wind chills can develop. Addition information pertaining to extreme cold can be found in the Extreme Temperatures section of the Plan.





Previous Occurrences

The National Climate Data Center (NCDC) archives past "Significant" winter storm, winter weather, and blizzard events in the NCDC Storm Events Database if the event has more than one significant hazard (i.e., heavy snow and blowing snow; snow and ice; snow and sleet; sleet and ice; or snow, sleet, and ice) and meets or exceeds locally/regionally defined twelve or twenty-four hour warning criteria for at least one of the precipitation elements on a widespread or localized basis. According to the best available data there was no reported injuries, deaths, or crop damage in Larimer County due to winter storm events between 1996 and 2015. There have been 281 winter storms reported in Larimer County between 1996 and 2015. Of these storms approximately 25% occurred in the eastern portion of the county typically below 6,000 feet in elevation. Approximately 57% occurred in the central portion of the county typically between 6,000 feet and 9,000 feet. The majority of winter storms occur in the western portion of the state. The NCDC storm data base categorizes storm location by both elevation and regional location. Therefore winter storms can occur across in multiple locations and elevations at the same time.

On March 17, 2003 a slow moving storm system moved into Colorado from the Pacific Ocean. In addition to this storm, moist air moved north from the Gulf of Mexico as well as strong winds from the east resulted in an upslope flow across the Front Range. As a result of this storm 3 feet of saturated snow fell in Denver and up to 7 feet of snow fell in the foothills from March 17th through the 20th. In Larimer County approximately 30 inches of heavy snow fell causing damages to homes and businesses, and the closure of local schools including Colorado State University. Property damage as a result of this storm are estimated to be around \$31 million dollars. According to data there have been at least six significant winter storm events recorded in Larimer County each year.

| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|-----------|---|------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 1/1/1996 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/3/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/4/1996 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/18/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/24/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/25/1996 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, Between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/27/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 49. Historic Winter Storms- Larimer County⁵³

⁵³ NOAA storm data





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|---|------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 1/30/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/30/1996 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/17/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/19/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/20/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/22/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/13/1996 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, Between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/16/1996 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/23/1996 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/3/1996 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/18/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/25/1996 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, Above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/18/1996 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, Above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/24/1996 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/24/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/16/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/19/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/25/1996 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/14/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/15/1996 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/1/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |







| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|---|--------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 12/5/1996 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/6/1996 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/16/1996 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/10/1997 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/11/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/6/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/12/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/20/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/23/1997 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/26/1997 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/28/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/3/1997 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/24/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/1/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/4/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/9/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/10/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/21/1997 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/23/1997 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|--|--------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 4/25/1997 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/29/1997 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/24/1997 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Eastern Larimer County | Blizzard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/11/1997 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/28/1997 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/24/1997 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/5/1998 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Western Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/17/1998 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Western Larimer County | Blizzard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/24/1998 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/4/1998 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Western Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/6/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/18/1998 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Eastern Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/2/1998 | ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |




| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|--|--------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | | | | | |
| 4/7/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/15/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/18/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/20/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/26/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6/4/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/28/1998 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/7/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/8/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/9/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/18/1998 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Eastern Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/19/1998 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|--|--------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| | Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Western Larimer County | | | | | |
| 12/20/1998 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Western Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/4/1999 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Western Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/17/1999 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/21/1999 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Western Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/24/1999 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Western Larimer County, Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/10/1999 | Eastern Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/17/1999 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/21/1999 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/12/1999 | Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/1/1999 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/14/1999 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/21/1999 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/28/1999 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/29/1999 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/1/1999 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/28/1999 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|--|--------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| | Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Eastern Larimer County | | | | | |
| 10/16/1999 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/18/1999 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/21/1999 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Eastern Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/18/1999 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Western Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/9/2000 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Western Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/10/2000 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/15/2000 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/17/2000 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range, Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/15/2000 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/30/2000 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/2/2000 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|--|--------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 5/17/2000 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County, Western Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/23/2000 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/1/2000 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Western Larimer County, Central Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/28/2000 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Western Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/30/2000 | Rocky Mountain National Park, Medicine Bow Range | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/15/2001 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/15/2001 | Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/8/2001 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/10/2001 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/16/2001 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/25/2001 | Eastern Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/25/2001 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/10/2001 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Eastern Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/11/2001 | Eastern Larimer County | Blizzard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/21/2001 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/22/2001 | Eastern Larimer County | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |







| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|--|--------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 5/2/2001 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Western Larimer County, Central Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/20/2001 | Northern Front Range Foothills, Upper Larimer and Cache La Poudre River Basins, Central Larimer County | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/9/2002 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/23/2002 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/29/2002 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet and between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/1/2002 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet and between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/14/2002 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/23/2002 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/1/2002 | Larimer County Below 6,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/8/2002 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/5/2003 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/17/2003 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 15500000 | 0 |
| 3/17/2003 | Larimer County Below 6,000 feet | Blizzard | 0 | 0 | 15500000 | 0 |
| 4/23/2003 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/9/2003 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/21/2003 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/21/2003 | Larimer County Below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/8/2003 | Larimer County between 6.000 & 9.000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|---|-------------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 1/3/2004 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/28/2004 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/9/2004 | Larimer County Below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/21/2004 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/12/2004 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9/4/2004 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/28/2004 | Larimer County Below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/30/2005 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/15/2005 | Larimer County Below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/13/2005 | Larimer County Below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/10/2005 | Larimer County Below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/24/2005 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/28/2005 | Larimer County Below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/9/2005 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/14/2005 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/16/2006 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/17/2006 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/20/2006 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/25/2006 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/13/2006 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|---|-------------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 11/28/2006 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/20/2006 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Blizzard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/25/2006 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/28/2006 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/4/2007 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/5/2007 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/21/2007 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/16/2007 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/24/2007 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/4/2007 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/20/2007 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/20/2007 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/1/2007 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/6/2007 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/7/2007 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/25/2007 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/27/2007 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/5/2008 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/10/2008 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/7/2008 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/8/2008 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/8/2008 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|---|-------------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 4/9/2008 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/9/2008 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/1/2008 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/29/2008 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/4/2008 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/4/2008 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/24/2009 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/26/2009 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/3/2009 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/16/2009 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/9/2009 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/27/2009 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/14/2009 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/5/2009 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/13/2009 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/22/2009 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/18/2010 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/19/2010 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/23/2010 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/1/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 4/6/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/22/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/23/2010 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/11/2010 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/22/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/25/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/9/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/15/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/16/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/21/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/24/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/28/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/10/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/14/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/18/2010 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/30/2010 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/9/2011 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/16/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/1/2011 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet | Extreme Cold/Wind Chill | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/5/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/7/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/24/2011 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9 000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|---|-------------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 3/17/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/28/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/3/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/11/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/13/2011 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/23/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/29/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/10/2011 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/18/2011 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/20/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/25/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/25/2011 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/25/2011 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/1/2011 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/1/2011 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/1/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/2/2011 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/3/2011 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/21/2011 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/11/2012 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/15/2012 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/18/2012 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Blizzard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/20/2012 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|---|-------------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 2/2/2012 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/2/2012 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/2/2012 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/21/2012 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/28/2012 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/10/2012 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/19/2012 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/24/2012 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/29/2013 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/24/2013 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/26/2013 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/3/2013 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/8/2013 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/8/2013 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/13/2013 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/15/2013 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/22/2013 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/13/2013 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/16/2013 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/3/2013 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/3/2014 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|------------|---|-------------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 1/27/2014 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/29/2014 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/30/2014 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/7/2014 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/2/2014 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/12/2014 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/11/2014 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10/13/2014 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/11/2014 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11/22/2014 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/13/2014 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/21/2014 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12/25/2014 | Larimer County below 6,000 feet, between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, and above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/1/2015 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/15/2015 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2/25/2015 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Heavy Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/2/2015 | Larimer County above 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/3/2015 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/2/2015 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet | Winter Weather | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4/16/2015 | Larimer County between 6,000 & 9,000 feet, above 9,000 feet | Winter Storm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





| Date | Location | Event Type | Injuries | Deaths | Damage to Property | Damage to Crops |
|--------|----------|------------|----------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Total: | | 0 | 0 | \$31 million | 0 | |

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

As a result of global climate change, the United States is already experiencing more intense rain and snowstorms. The amount of snow falling in the heaviest one percent of storms has risen nearly 74%, averaged nationally, between 1958 and 2011.⁵⁴ As Larimer County prepares for regional changes in climate, it will be important to consider scenarios in which larger amounts of snow will fall over shorter periods of time. The impacts have the potential to affect infrastructure, public safety, and the local economy in a diversity of (potentially) negative ways.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in Larimer County can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes 324,122 people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the County's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of Larimer County and its jurisdictions including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for Larimer County.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Larimer County will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult

⁵⁴ Third U.S. National Climate Assessment, 2014. U.S. Global Change Research Program.





to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in Larimer County at least once every year.

Land Use and Development

All future structures built in Larimer County will likely be exposed to severe weather extremes and damage. Since the previous statement is assumed to be uniform countywide, the location of development does not increase or reduce the risk necessarily. Larimer County and its jurisdictions must adhere to building codes, and therefore, new development can be built to current standards to account for adverse weather. Additionally, as homes go up in more remote parts of the county, accessing those rural residents may become impossible should sheltering or emergency services be needed in an extreme event.





6 Mitigation Strategy

This section of the Plan provides the blueprint for Larimer County and its participating jurisdictions to become less vulnerable to natural hazards. The goals, objectives, and strategies are based on the general consensus of the Larimer County Planning Team and local stakeholder feedback, along with the findings of the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment. This section consists of the following subsections:

- INTRODUCTION
- GOALS AND OBJECTIVES SUMMARY
- 2009 HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN ACTION REPORT
- 2016 HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN ACTION REPORT

6.1 Introduction

The intent of the Mitigation Strategy is to provide the County and its participating jurisdictions with the goals that will guide future mitigation policy and project administration. The Mitigation Strategy includes a list of proposed actions deemed necessary to meet those goals and reduce the impact of natural hazards. The development of the strategy included a thorough review of natural hazards and identified policies and projects intended to not only reduce the future impacts of hazards, but also to help Larimer County and participating jurisdictions balance and achieve their economic, environmental, and social goals. The development of the Mitigation Strategy was strategic, in that all policies and projects have been linked to establish priorities. Moreover, projects have been assigned to specific departments or individuals responsible for their implementation. Potential funding sources are identified when possible and identified projects were assumed to be realistically achievable over the next five years.

- *Mitigation Goals* are general guidelines that explain what the county wants to achieve. Goals are usually expressed as broad policy statements representing desired long-term results.
- *Mitigation Objectives* describe strategies or implementation steps to attain the identified goals. Objectives are more specific statements than goals; the described steps are usually measurable and can have a defined completion date.
- *Mitigation Actions* provide more detailed descriptions of specific work tasks to help the county and its municipalities achieve prescribed goals and objectives.

Based on participation from the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team, the mitigation strategy from the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been modified and updated. Objectives were clarified to better document roles and responsibilities. Previously identified actions were updated and new actions have been added to address particular hazards facing Larimer County and its local jurisdictions.

In order to prioritize the mitigation actions in this plan, the County and each participating jurisdiction referred to FEMA's STAPLEE methodology as a guide. The STAPLEE approach allows for a careful review of the feasibility of mitigation actions by using seven criteria. The criteria are described below:

- S Social
- T Technical
- A Administrative





- P Political
- L Legal
- E Economic
- E Environmental

FEMA mitigation planning requirements indicate that any prioritization system used shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost-benefit review of the proposed projects. To do this in an efficient manner that is consistent with FEMA's guidance on using cost-benefit review in mitigation planning, the STAPLEE method was adapted to include a higher weighting (x1.5) for the economic feasibility factor – Cost Effective. This method incorporates concepts similar to those described in Method C of FEMA 386-5: Using Benefit Cost Review in Mitigation Planning (FEMA, 2007).

In order to ensure that a broad range of mitigation actions were considered for the Mitigation Strategy, the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team analyzed a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions for each hazard after the risk assessment was complete. This helped to ensure that there was sufficient span and creativity in the mitigation actions considered.

There are six categories of mitigation actions which Larimer County considered in developing its Mitigation Strategy. Those categories include:

- **Prevention**: Government administrative or regulatory actions or processes that influence the way land and buildings are developed and built. These actions also include public activities to reduce hazard losses. Examples include planning, zoning, building codes, subdivision regulations, hazard specific regulations (such as floodplain regulations), capital improvement programs, and open-space preservation and stormwater regulations.
- **Property Protection**: Actions that involve modifying or removing existing buildings or infrastructure to protect them from a hazard. Examples include the acquisition, elevation and relocation of structures, structural retrofits, flood-proofing, storm shutters, and shatter resistant glass. This category also includes insurance.
- Public Education and Awareness: Actions to inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about potential risks from hazards and potential ways to mitigate them. Such actions include hazard mapping, outreach projects, library materials dissemination, real estate disclosures, the creation of hazard information centers, and school age / adult education programs.
- **Natural Resource Protection**: Actions that in addition to minimizing hazard losses also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems. These actions include sediment and erosion control, stream corridor restoration, forest and vegetation management, wetlands restoration or preservation, slope stabilization, and historic property and archeological site preservation.
- **Structural Project Implementation**: Mitigation projects intended to lessen the impact of a hazard by using structures to modify the environment. Structures include stormwater controls (culverts); dams, dikes, and levees; and safe rooms.
- **Emergency Services**: Actions that typically are not considered mitigation techniques but reduce the impacts of a hazard event on people and property. These actions are often taken prior to,





during, or in response to an emergency or disaster. Examples include warning systems, evacuation planning and management, emergency response training and exercises, and emergency flood protection procedures.

6.2 Goals and Objectives Summary

The following table provides an update summary of the goals identified within the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan and of how they were incorporated into the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

| Goal | Goal | Continue | Change | Delete |
|------|--|----------|--------|--------|
| 1 | Protect Life and Property | | X | |
| 2 | Improve Public Awareness | | X | |
| 3 | Strengthen Partnerships and Promote Plan Implementation | | | X |
| 4 | Improve Emergency Services Response Plans | | Х | |

Table 50. Goals – 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan

Mitigation Goals are general guidelines that explain what a community wants to achieve with their local hazard mitigation plan. Goals are overarching targets and describe the ideal long-term outcomes envisioned by the community. For the 2016 Plan, Larimer County and the local jurisdictions participating in the hazard mitigation plan update identified the following five mitigation goals as the foundation of their local mitigation strategies:

- **GOAL 1:** Protect people, property, and natural resources
- **GOAL 2:** Improve capability to reduce disaster losses
- **GOAL 3:** Strengthen communication and coordination among public agencies, non-governmental organizations, businesses, and citizens
- GOAL 4: Increase public awareness of natural hazards and mitigation options
- **GOAL 5:** Integrate hazard mitigation into other planning mechanisms

More specific than Goals, Mitigation Objectives are the fundamental strategies prescribed by the Plan to achieve the identified Goals. In other words, Objectives describe the "how" of the mitigation strategy. In the 2016 Plan, Larimer County and the local jurisdictions participating in the hazard mitigation plan update identified the following five mitigation objectives:

- **OBJECTIVE 1:** Continue to develop and expand public awareness and information programs
- **OBJECTIVE 2:** Enhance training for hazard prevention and mitigation options





- **OBJECTIVE 3:** Incorporate risk reduction principles into policy documents and initiatives, as well as other institutional plans
- **OBJECTIVE 4:** Continue to collaborate with area partners through mutual aid agreements and long-term planning efforts
- **OBJECTIVE 5:** Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impacts of hazards.

In order to maintain continuity within the local mitigation strategy, each mitigation objective is associated with one or more mitigation goals (as is shown in the following table). This helps communities stay on track during the development of the mitigation strategy and focus their planning efforts around clear priorities. Together, the goals and objectives identified during the Larimer County mitigation strategy meeting, and refined over the course of the planning process, established the scope and focus of the proposed mitigation actions outlined in this Plan.

The following table provides a summary of the updated and/or revised mitigation goals for the 2016 Plan. It also outlines the planning objectives identified by the HM LPT for each goal and identifies whether the Goal is new to Larimer County or was previously identified in the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

| Goal | Objective | New |
|---------------------------------|--|-----|
| | Continue to develop and expand community preparedness education and resilience programs. | |
| COAL 1. Diretect needle | Enhance training for hazard prevention and mitigation options. | |
| property, and natural resources | Incorporate risk reduction principles into policy documents and initiatives, as well as other institutional plans. | |
| | Continue to collaborate with area partners through mutual aid agreements and long-term planning efforts. | |
| | Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impacts of hazards. | |
| | Continue to develop and expand community preparedness education and resilience programs. | |
| GOAL 2: Improve capability | Enhance training for hazard prevention and mitigation options. | |
| to reduce disaster losses | Incorporate risk reduction principles into policy documents and initiatives, as well as other institutional plans. | X |
| | Continue to collaborate with area partners through mutual aid agreements and long-term planning efforts. | |

Table 51. 2016 Larimer County Mitigation Strategy – Updated Goals and Objectives





| Goal | Objective | New |
|--|--|-----|
| | Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impacts of hazards. | |
| GOAL 3 : Strengthen communication and coordination among public | Continue to develop and expand community preparedness education and resilience programs. | Y |
| agencies, non-governmental organizations, businesses, and citizens | Enhance training for hazard prevention and mitigation options. | ~ |
| | Continue to develop and expand community preparedness education and resilience programs. | |
| GOAL 4: Increase public | Enhance training for hazard prevention and mitigation options. | |
| awareness of natural hazards and mitigation options | Incorporate risk reduction principles into policy documents and initiatives, as well as other institutional plans. | |
| | Continue to collaborate with area partners through mutual aid agreements and long-term planning efforts. | |
| | Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impacts of hazards. | |
| | Incorporate risk reduction principles into policy documents and initiatives, as well as other institutional plans. | |
| GOAL 5: Integrate hazard mitigation into other planning mechanisms | Continue to collaborate with area partners through mutual aid agreements and long-term planning efforts. | X |
| | Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impacts of hazards. | |

6.3 2010 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report

The Larimer County HM LPT reviewed the mitigation actions included in the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan that were specific to Larimer County and its participating jurisdictions. Based on a thorough action review and feedback process with the six 2010 participating communities – Larimer County, Loveland, Fort Collins, Estes Park, Wellington, and Berthoud – the project team developed a tracking matrix of action progress since the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan. Each of the six "legacy" communities reviewed the matrix before they began developing new and updated mitigation actions for the 2016 plan. The matrix is included in Appendix E.





6.4 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan Action Report

The final, and arguably the most important step in updating the Mitigation Strategy was the creation of new Mitigation Actions. In preparing their Mitigation Actions, the County and each participating jurisdiction considered the 2016 planning goals and their individual hazard risks, priorities, and capabilities to mitigate identified hazards. The mitigation actions below represent the key outcome of the mitigation planning process.

As detailed above, members of the HM LPT referred to STAPLEE to assist with the prioritization of their actions. All actions are tied to specific goals and objectives to ensure alignment with the Plan's overall mitigation strategy. The following Mitigation Action Guides describe the newly identified mitigation actions for Larimer County. The 2016 actions for each of the participating jurisdictions are included in the community profiles.

| Larimer County: Larimer Connects Project (Larimer – 1) | | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: 1 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land | |
| | Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe | |
| | Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: All of Larimer County | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1-5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives A, B, D and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2017 | | |
| ISSUE: Community Outreach regarding mitigation | tion measures is currently lacking. | |
| RECOMMENDATION: The purpose of this pro | ject is to build community connections – within | |
| communities, between communities and the | connections that reach past communities into formal | |
| structures (municipalities, special districts, co | ounties, region, and state). | |
| ACTION: Larimer Connects Community Outre | ach includes the development of community | |
| connections through coursework, education | and outreach throughout all of Larimer County to | |
| increase overall community knowledge, educ | ation, and readiness leading to a culture of community | |
| resilience at the lost local level. The project c | omponents involve three phases: 1) community | |
| assessment and identification of resources, 2 |) synthesis of available data, and 3) implementation of | |
| the program. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County, Office of | EXPECTED COST: \$400,000 | |
| Emergency Management | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: All municipal and other | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: The Board of | |
| emergency management partners in the | Commissioners has approved \$100,000 for the initial | |
| county, Fire Chiefs, EMS Chiefs, Law | study. | |
| Enforcement personnel, and community | | |
| members | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: The objectives of this project include: | | |
| Bringing greater awareness to community members about the hazards in their area | | |
| Building community from the ground up by strengthening connections and partnerships | | |
| Creating custom programs for each individual community to enhance knowledge, skills and skilities to each a gradulture and effectively means through the disector results. | | |
| abilities to solve problems and effectively move through the disaster environment | | |
| Changing the culture of Lammer County to ensure future generations are more equipped to respond and recover from disactors. | | |
| | | |

Efforts Underway



- Unmet Needs and Community Fragility Study to determine the current state of each individual community

Future Milestones

- Assessment and Identification of Resources Completion of the Unmet Needs and Community Fragility Study
- Analysis and Synthesis of Data accumulate all available date, along with available reports and studies, and analyze the information to determine the best outreach approach for individual communities
- Bullseye Approach Larimer seeks to first reach the individual, then the family, neighborhood, community and finally the networks of communities to build a culture of resilience in the county
- Implementation Consists of four parts
 - Identify of pilot communities to formalize the program
 - > Develop expanded educational modules multi-sector, resilience, fragility
 - Create online learning modules and tools
 - Conduct a community competition

| Larimer County: Emergency Preparedness Public Education/Outreach (Larimer – 2) | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| PRIORITY: 2 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Public Health | |
| LOCATION: County-wide | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/21/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | |

ISSUE: During the recent wildfire and flood events, many residents, especially in mountain areas, were not prepared to evacuate or to shelter-in-place. Many ran out of water, medicines, diapers, etc., in two or three days and expected government to provide resources for them. Some refused to leave their homes because they had no plans for dealing with pets or livestock.

RECOMMENDATION: Continue public education/outreach, especially in mountainous areas, encouraging residents to develop Family Disaster Plans and assemble an Emergency Kit.

ACTION: Continue to post information on Health Department website. Attend safety and health fairs. Develop displays/educational materials and create opportunities to present information to mountain locations.

Preparedness and Response grant

| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Department | EXPECTED COST: \$50,000 + 20 ETE |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| ful block in the second population | |
| of Health and Environment | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Office | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Emergency |

of Emergency Management, CDPHE, CDC PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Developing new emergency preparedness display
- Developing new educational materials and continuing to update website
- Engaging in outreach opportunities







| Larimer County: Wildfire Education and Outro | each (Larimer – 3) | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: 3 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Extreme Temperatures and Fire | |
| LOCATION: Larimer County WUI | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 3 and 4 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE:10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives A. B. D and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE:12/31/2018 | | |
| ISSUE: Climate change, increased population | and hazard complexity is all leading to increased risk to | |
| community members from wildfire | , , , | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Coordinate wildfire edu | ication and outreach programs amongst all partners in | |
| the county | | |
| ACTION: Development of a coordinated wildf | ire education and outreach program with multiple | |
| wildfire and natural lands partners | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Office of | EXPECTED COST: \$100,000 | |
| Emergency Management | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: county resources | |
| Sheriff's Office, Larimer County Building | | |
| Department, municipal emergency | | |
| management agencies, CSFS, USFS, Rocky | | |
| Mountain National Park, VOAD Agencies | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | le eutresch te Leviner County veridente verending | |
| Engage with key partners who provid wildfire risk and mitigation | le outreach to Larimer County residents regarding | |
| Determine common goals and coordi | inate actions | |
| Develop an education and outreach r | mate actions | |
| | | |
| Coalition for the Poudre River Watershed: Fo | rest Resilience and fuels reduction (Larimer – 4) | |
| PRIORITY: 4 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Fire | |
| LOCATION: High Park Fire Burn Area | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 3 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/27/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: D, E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 06/2017 | | |
| ISSUE: Reducing high fuel loads in critical fore | ested catchments in the Cache La Poudre by integrating | |
| volunteers with professional sawyers. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Collaborative planning | and implementation of forest resilience/fuels reductions | |
| projects to reduce the negative impacts of wildfires. | | |
| ACTION: This project involves training Youth Corps and volunteers to be certified sawyers to work | | |
| alongside professional sawyers to thin forests and reduce fuel loads in high priority areas of the | | |
| watershed. We began our project in the Nort | h Fork of the Poudre at the Boy Scout Ranch near Red | |
| Feather Lakes. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: CPRW | EXPECTED COST: ~\$100,000. | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: The Nature | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: | |
| Conservancy, Wildlands Restoration | City of Fort Collins, CSFS, Patagonia, New Belgium | |
| Volunteers, CSFS, NRCS, Larimer County | Brewing, and Dept Natural Resources. | |
| | | |





PROGRESS MILESTONES: In 2015, our partners treated ~30 acres of land at the Boy Scout Ranch and will continue to treat an additional 30 - 50acres by 2017. Thinned forest materials will be re-used at a different habitat restoration site or used by a local timber company.



| Larimer County: Flood Risk Velocity and Dept | h Criteria Project (Larimer – 5) | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: 5 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Land Subsidence, Flood, Severe | |
| | Storm and Fire | |
| LOCATION: Big Thompson, Little Thompson | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 | |
| and Cache la Poudre Watersheds | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE:10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives A, B, C, D, and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2017 | | |
| ISSUE: The topography of Larimer County lead | ds to varying degrees of risk depending upon the | |
| floodplain location | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Analyze waterflow dept | h and velocity to determine if floodplain regulations | |
| should be changed to account for varying con | ditions | |
| ACTION: Develop velocity and depth criteria f | or all floodplains in Larimer County and incorporate | |
| criteria into floodplain regulations | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering | EXPECTED COST: \$75,000 for initial pilot project, | |
| Department | \$250,000 for extensive study | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: county resources for | |
| Community Development Division and | pilot project. | |
| Office of Emergency Management | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Determine specific areas to conduct a pilot for the velocity and depth criteria and its | | |
| relevance to current floodplain regulations | | |
| Develop a Request for Proposal with a clear scope of work for the development of the criteria | | |
| Award a vendor | | |
| Analyze the results of the pilot project and make changes as needed for criteria accuracy | | |
| Implement the criteria countywide | | |
| Update floodplain regulations with new criteria | | |

| Larimer County: Flood and Fire Recovery Mitigation Activities (Larimer – 6) | | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: 6 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm, and Fire | |
| LOCATION: 2013 Flood Impacted Areas | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, and 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives B, C, and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2018 | | |





ISSUE: Larimer County continues to move through the recovery from the 2012 High Park Wildfire and the 2013 Flood. Many projects remain unfinished, allowing the county to look at mitigation opportunities for the future.

RECOMMENDATION: Assess all unfinished recovery projects for possible mitigation opportunities and implement alternatives when appropriate

ACTION: Include mitigation alternatives in flood and fire recovery efforts whenever possible

| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering | EXPECTED COST: Cost will depend upon each specific |
|---|--|
| Department and Community Development | recovery project |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Public | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: FEMA Public |
| Works Division, Community Development | Assistance funding, HMGP funding, county resources |
| Division and Office of Emergency | |
| Management | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Assess all unfinished flood and fire recovery projects for mitigation alternatives
- Incorporate mitigation actions into FEMA Public Assistance recovery projects when possible and allowable
- Continue county home acquisition program for homes destroyed in the floodway
- Work with CDOT and FHWA on joint projects where mitigation opportunities are warranted
- Incorporate mitigation actions into future county efforts and infrastructure upgrades

| Larimer County: Rainfall and Stream Gauge Monitoring System (Larimer – 7) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: 7 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Land Subsidence, Flood, Severe | |
| | Storm, Wildfire | |
| LOCATION: Larimer County Watersheds | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1-4 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/15/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objective E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2017 | | |

ISSUE: Rainfall and stream gauges exist on a small section of the county's watersheds and many of these gauges were damaged or destroyed during the 2013 Flood.

RECOMMENDATION: Install rainfall and stream gauges throughout Larimer County's major watersheds, including the Big Thompson River, Little Thompson River and the Cache la Poudre River and connect all with a monitoring system that can provide real-time data and early warning to citizens and emergency responders.

ACTION: Install rainfall and stream gauge monitoring hardware and software in major watersheds throughout Larimer County.

| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering | EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 |
|---|--|
| Department | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: 2015 HMGP grant |
| Community Development Division and | funding for partial implementation, county funding |
| Office of Emergency Management | |
| | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Determine the number and location of each rainfall / stream gauge necessary to provide full and accurate coverage of waterways
- Develop a Request for Proposal with a clear scope of work for the installation of the gauges and the implementation of the project
- Award a vendor
- Implement the system and test it to ensure functionality
- Train and educate county staff on the system at least annually





| Larimer County: High Water Mark Initiative P | roiect (Larimer – 8) | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: 8 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flooding | |
| LOCATION: 2013 Flood Locations | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, and 4 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives A, C, and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE:12/31/2016 | • | |
| ISSUE: The 2013 Flood brought to light the dangers of flash flooding from heavy rainfall events in the | | |
| county. Over time, the lessons learned will be | e forgotten leading to ongoing danger from future | |
| events. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Join FEMA's High Water | r Mark Initiative and Install high water placards along the | |
| Big and Little Thompson Rivers in flood-impace | cted areas to educate and inform community members | |
| about the risk from flooding. | | |
| ACTION: Purchase and install 2013 Flood High Water Mark placards | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County, Office of | EXPECTED COST: \$10,000 | |
| Emergency Management | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: City of Fort Collins, City | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Community | |
| of Loveland, Town of Berthoud, Town of | organizations, county funding | |
| Estes Park, Fire Districts, Water Districts | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Join the High Water Mark Initiative through FEMA | | |
| Coordinate the HWM Launch Event and HWM Sign Design, production and placement | | |
| Post HWM signs in high profile locations throughout flood impacted areas | | |
| | | |
| Coalition for the Poudre River Watershed: Post Fire Restoration (Larimer – 9) | | |
| PRIORITY: 9 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire and Flood | |
| LOCATION: High Park Fire Burn Area | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 and 3 | |

| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 06/2017 | |
|---|---|
| ISSUE: Post-fire erosion, debris flows, and flo | oding that affects water quality and increases risk to life |
| and safety | |

OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: D and E

RECOMMENDATION: Collaborative planning and implementation of post-fire restoration projects to control hillslope and channel erosion.

ACTION: Identifying which areas of the burn area are still at risk of degrading water quality and threatening life and property and then designing on the ground restoration treatments that help reduce erosion and stabilize channels, and reduce runoff volumes.

| • | |
|---|---|
| LEAD AGENCY: CPRW | EXPECTED COST: \$300-\$500k (difficult to estimate as we are mid-stream for both planning and implementation) |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: USFS, Wildlands Restoration Volunteers, CSFS, NRCS, local cities, Larimer County, Trout Unlimited and several other stakeholders | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Local water utilities, EPA, HUD, CWCB |





RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/27/2015

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Major project milestones and reporting of current project status

In addition to adding ~300 acres of post fire restoration from 2012 – 2013, we have begun implementation on a significant channel restoration project in Skin Gulch in 2015 and are planning other post-fire restoration efforts in Seaman Reservoir (Helwett Gulch Fire) and planning for other post fire restoration needs that are remaining in the burn area. We aim to finish that planning by January with an aim to begin implementation of any identified projects in mid-2016.



| Larimer County: Full Adoption of Updated FE | MA Floodplains (Larimer – 10) | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: 10 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: All of Larimer County | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives A, B, C, D and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2020 | | |
| ISSUE: Floodplain mapping is out of date and the 2013 Flood caused extensive changes to current | | |
| floodplains | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Work with FEMA on updating current floodplain mapping throughout Larimer | | |
| County | | |
| ACTION: By 2020, all Larimer County watersheds will be mapped and adopted by FEMA | | |
| ACTION: By 2020, all Larimer County waters | heds will be mapped and adopted by FEMA | |
| ACTION: By 2020, all Larimer County waters LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering | heds will be mapped and adopted by FEMA EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 | |
| ACTION: By 2020, all Larimer County waters LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering Department | heds will be mapped and adopted by FEMA EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 | |
| ACTION: By 2020, all Larimer County waters LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering Department SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | heds will be mapped and adopted by FEMA EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Colorado State Flood | |
| ACTION: By 2020, all Larimer County waters LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering Department SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Community Development and Office of | heds will be mapped and adopted by FEMA EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Colorado State Flood Hazard Mapping Project | |
| ACTION: By 2020, all Larimer County waters LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering Department SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Community Development and Office of Emergency Management | heds will be mapped and adopted by FEMA EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Colorado State Flood Hazard Mapping Project | |
| ACTION: By 2020, all Larimer County waters LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering Department SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Community Development and Office of Emergency Management PROGRESS MILESTONES: | heds will be mapped and adopted by FEMA EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Colorado State Flood Hazard Mapping Project | |

- Flood Review Board Review and Recommendation
- Community Outreach
- Formal adoption process through FEMA

| Larimer County: Bridge Improvement Project (Larimer – 11) | |
|---|--|
| PRIORITY: 11 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Earthquake, Flood, Severe |
| | Storm, and Fire |
| LOCATION: All of Larimer County | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2 and 5 |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives C and E |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2020 | |





ISSUE: The 2012 High Park Wildfire and the 2013 Flood caused the Public Works Division to delay necessary bridge improvements due to the wide scale destruction of roads and bridges throughout Larimer County, therefore structurally deficient bridges exist that must be replaced.

RECOMMENDATION: Assess and replace all structurally deficient bridges in Larimer County

ACTION: In accordance with the Larimer Strategic Plan, replace all structurally deficient bridges in Larimer County by 2020

| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering | EXPECTED COST: Dependent upon the project location |
|---|--|
| Department | and structure |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Public | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: county resources |
| Works Division | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | |

- Complete the assessment of all bridges in Larimer County to determine status
- Prioritize bridge projects based upon need and condition
- Implement bridge improvements as funding allows

| Larimer County: Hydrology Analysis and Infrastructure Upgrades (Larimer – 12) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: 12 | PRIORITY: 12 | |
| LOCATION: Project location | LOCATION: Project location | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2020 | TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2020 | |
| ISSUE: New hydrology is available since the 2013 Flood, illustrating undersized bridges and crossings | | |
| leading to inadequate flow capacity | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Analyze new hydrology and determine areas where improvements to structures | | |
| are needed | | |
| ACTION: Analyze need for bridge and crossing improvements and pursue funding for replacement | | |
| structures. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering | LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering | |
| Department | Department | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Public | SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Public Works | |
| Works Division | Division | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Collect all new hydrology from the 2013 Flood | | |

- Analyze data to determine undersized crossings and bridges leading to low capacity
- Develop long-term planning to replace or improve each site to improve capacity
- Seek funding opportunities for specific projects

| Larimer County: Long-Range Community Planning (Larimer – 13) | |
|--|---|
| PRIORITY: 13 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat |
| LOCATION: Western Larimer County (Unincorporated area from the eastern extent of the Front Range west to the Larimer County line) | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1,2,3 and 5 |





| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives C and E | |
|--|--|--|
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2017 | | |
| ISSUE: A multitude of planning and recovery | planning efforts are underway, and while each individual | |
| effort is needed, there is no unified plan for the area | | |
| BECOMMENDATION: The recommendation is to bring together all watershed coalition, governmental | | |
| and non-governmental plans into one unified planning effort | | |
| ACTION: The purpose of this mitigation action | is to develop a long range plan for the area affected by | |
| the 2012 High Park Wildfire and 2013 Flood, plus other areas suscentible to natural hazards | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County, Community | EXPECTED COST: \$350.000 | |
| Development Division | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Watershed Coalitions, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: CDBG-DR Funding | |
| Big Thompson Conservation District, Long- | through the Department of Local Affairs | |
| Term Recovery Group, Fire Districts, USFS, | | |
| CSFS, Rocky Mountain National Park | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Coordinate with all stakeholders to incorporate the coalition master plans into the future | | |
| planning process | | |
| Coordinate with incorporated cities and towns | | |
| Coordinate with all districts, state landholders, and federal landholders | | |
| - Identify all other plans (transportation, open lands, trails, hazards, river coalitions, etc.) for | | |
| inclusion in the final long-range plan | | |
| Develop needed planning | | |
| Utilize community outreach for citizen input to the plan | | |
| | | |
| Larimer County: Mitigation Code Changes (Larimer – 14) | | |

| PRIORITY: 14 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | |
|--|---|--|
| LOCATION: All of Larimer County | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 4, and 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 6/1/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives B, C, and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE:12/31/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: Recent large-scale disasters have caused Larimer County to re-evaluate all Land Use, Wildfire and Building codes for possible mitigation actions | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Provide recommendations for code changes to the Land Use, Wildfire and Building Codes for reducing losses and mitigating risk | | |
| ACTION: Update Larimer County Land Use, Wildfire and Building Codes with recommendations approved by the Board of Commissioners, Planning Commission and Flood Review Board to decrease future risk and disaster losses. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County, Building Department | EXPECTED COST: \$0 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Office of Emergency Management, Community Development Division | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: County staff time | |





PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Develop a review team to go over all codes and provide suggested changes
- Participate in the Colorado State DOLA Mitigation Advisory Group
- Compile all recommended changes and present to the Board of Commissioners for consideration
- Make changes as appropriate and finalize recommended actions
- Participate in the code revision process, including public meetings and review by the Planning Commission and Flood Review Board

Larimer County: Maintain adequate public health monitoring, surveillance, response capabilities (Larimer – 15)

| PRIORITY: 15 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Public Health |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| LOCATION: County-wide | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/21/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing

ISSUE: Larimer County is vulnerable to a wide variety of public health threats, including disease epidemics and exposure to chemical, biological or radiological agents.

RECOMMENDATION: Continue to ensure that adequate resources are in place to monitor public health threats and take the necessary steps to prevent or limit the scope and magnitude of threats that could escalate into public health emergencies.

ACTION: Continue to monitor disease outbreaks and remain prepared to provide safe and rapid prophylaxis of residents during large-scale events through the SNS program. Maintain capability to identify and respond to chemical, biological or radiological incidents. Maintain systems for education, notification, and communication with partners.

| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Department | EXPECTED COST: Unknown |
|--|--|
| of Health and Environment | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Emergency |
| Department of Emergency Management, | Preparedness and Response grant, other grant and |
| CDPHE, CDC, local hospitals and other | general fund monies. |
| healthcare providers, Larimer County | |

Emergency Healthcare Coalition.

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Identifying and responding to community disease outbreaks, as needed.
- Continuing to provide routine vaccinations and immunizations.
- Issuing Health Alerts and other notifications, as needed



Larimer County: Box Elder Stormwater and Drainage Master Plan Implementation (Larimer – 16)PRIORITY: 16HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Land Subsidence, Flood and
Severe Storm





| LOCATION: Larimer County | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, and 3 | |
|---|--|--|
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives C, D and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2020 | | |
| ISSUE: The Box Elder Stormwater and Drainag | ge Master Plan has been established and needs to be | |
| implemented. The Box Elder Basin Regional Stormwater Authority has begun the regional portions of | | |
| the project. The Larimer County portion of the master plan will follow. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Implement the Larimer County portions of the master plan | | |
| ACTION: Larimer County will need to upgrade infrastructure to fully implement the master plan, | | |
| including increasing flow capacity at county crossings. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering | EXPECTED COST: \$5.3 million in county resources and | |
| Department | another \$14 million from the authority | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Larimer County and | |
| Community Development Division | authority resources | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Complete the Regional part of the master plan | | |

- Establish funding for county projects
- Determine the engineering and design for each phase
- Construction of new infrastructure to support the master plan

| Larimer County: Transportation Master Plan Update (Larimer – 17) | | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: 17 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Earthquake, Land Subsidence, | |
| | Flood, Severe Storm, Fire | |
| LOCATION: All of Larimer County | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives C, D and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 9/1/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: The current Transportation Master Plan is out of date | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Update the master plan to ensure existing conditions are addressed | | |
| ACTION: Review and update the Transportation Master Plan | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Public Works | EXPECTED COST: \$85,000 for capital expansion fee | |
| Division | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: county resources | |
| Engineering Department | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Update the Capital Expansion Fee Program | | |
| Update the Transportation Master Plan (County staff) | | |

- Follow the county public input process for plan approval
- Adoption of the plan
- Implementation projects

| Larimer County: Risk Assessment Program (Larimer – 18) | |
|--|---|
| PRIORITY: 18 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Civil Disturbance and Hazmat |
| LOCATION: All of Larimer County | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 3 and 5 |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives B, C, D and E |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2017 | |

ISSUE: Increasing population throughout Larimer County has led to more industry and larger employers, increasing the potential for a large-scale human-caused incident in the county.





RECOMMENDATION: Develop a risk assessment program for large businesses, hazardous materials fixed facilities, schools, and industry to develop awareness, decrease risk and improve response protocols

ACTION: Develop a risk assessment program for large businesses, hazardous materials fixed facilities, schools, and industry to develop awareness, decrease risk and improve response protocols

| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Office of | EXPECTED COST: \$0 |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Emergency Management | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: All Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: staff time only |
| Emergency Management partners | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | |

- Seek support from emergency management partners for the development of a risk assessment program
- Determine team members for risk assessment team
- Train personnel on the Statewide IP Gateway risk assessment software program
- Determine roles and responsibilities of risk assessment team members
- Create risk assessment forms and reports
- Seek out pilot locations to test the program
- Conduct pilot assessments and refine and finalize process

| Big Thompson Watershed Coalition: River Restoration Projects (Larimer – 19) | |
|---|--|
| PRIORITY: 19 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood |
| LOCATION: Big Thompson River Corridor | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1) Protect people, property and natural resources; 2) Improve capability to reduce disaster losses; 3) Strengthen Communication & coordination among public agencies, non-governmental organizations, etc. |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: 1) Incorporate risk reduction principles into policy documents & initiatives & plans; 2) Continue to collaborate with area partners through long-term planning efforts; 3) Reduce vulnerability of local assets to impact of hazards |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: | 6/1/2020 |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE:

ISSUE: The floods of 2013 caused significant loss of property within the Big Thompson River Corridor. The Big Thompson Watershed Coalition seeks to implement resilient river restoration throughout the watershed to mitigate the extent of severe damage in the next high water event. Using the Master Plan developed in 2015 as a guiding document, the Coalition seeks to plan and implement restoration projects in strong collaboration with other corridor projects planned by other agencies and organizations in an effort to minimize duplication of efforts and leverage funding; updating the master plan throughout the process; Approximately 50% of the guidelines described in the Master Plan, and to keep the plan updated as projects are put in place.

RECOMMENDATION: Build on the high level resilient restoration guidelines outlined in the Master Plan to design and implement river restoration projects.

ACTION: Resilient restoration techniques which focus on holistic watershed health, including stabilizing river channel and banks, considering how infrastructure is located in the floodplain; creating and improving aquatic and riparian habitat.

| LEAD AGENCY: Big Thompson Watershed | EXPECTED COST: approximately \$10 – 50 million |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Coalition | |





SUPPORT AGENCIES: CDOT, NRCS, Colorado Water Conservation Board, CDBG, Larimer County, Colorado Parks and Wildlife; Trout Unlimited, Wildland Restoration Volunteers;

PROGRESS MILESTONES: 1) Annual Master Plan Updates ; 2)Detailed resilient restoration design for approximately 20 river reaches in collaboration with supporting agencies; 3) Complete design and implement on the ground projects for approximately 20 river reaches in collaboration with supporting agencies; 4) Provide Larimer County and supporting agencies quarterly and annual updates on project progress. POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: CWCB, CDBG, NRCS, matching funds through non-profit and other foundation grant programs



| Larimer County: River Restoration and Mitigation Projects (Larimer – 20) | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| PRIORITY: 20 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood |
| LOCATION: Big Thompson River Corridor | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2 and 3 |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/30/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: 1, 2 and 3 |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 6/1/2020 | |
| | |

ISSUE: After the High Park Wildfire in 2012 and the floods of 2013, there was significant loss of property within all three of our major watersheds in Larimer County. Several citizen-led coalitions were established after these events for planning and implementation of projects to restore these watersheds.

RECOMMENDATION: The county seeks to partner with all of the coalitions in Larimer County to restore the watersheds and mitigate against future risk.

ACTION: Resilient restoration techniques which focus on holistic watershed health, including stabilizing river channel and banks, considering how infrastructure is located in the floodplain; creating and improving aquatic and riparian habitat.

| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County | EXPECTED COST: Project specific. Total restoration and mitigation would be over \$20 million |
|---|--|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Big Thompson | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: CWCB, CDBG, NRCS, |
| Watershed Coalition, Coalition for the | Larimer County, and matching funds through non- |
| Poudre River Watershed, Estes Valley | profit and other foundation grant programs |
| Watershed Coalition, Little Thompson | |
| Watershed Coalition, CDOT, NRCS, Colorado | |
| Water Conservation Board, CDBG, Colorado | |
| Parks and Wildlife; Trout Unlimited, | |
| Wildland Restoration Volunteers; USFS, CSFS | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: 1) Annual Master Plan Updates ; 2)Detailed resilient restoration design for approximately 20 river reaches in collaboration with supporting agencies; 3) Complete design and implement on the ground projects for approximately 20 river reaches in collaboration with supporting agencies; 4) Provide Larimer County and supporting agencies quarterly and annual updates on project progress





| Larimer County: Cotton Willows Subdivision Engineering Study (Larimer – 21) | |
|---|---|
| PRIORITY: 21 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood |
| LOCATION: Cotton Willows Subdivision, | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2 and 5 |
| LaPorte, Larimer County | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives C, D and E |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2018 | |

ISSUE: The Cotton Willows Subdivision is a residential subdivision located in the vicinity of LaPorte, Colorado, along the Cache la Poudre River. The subdivision has experienced both drainage and flood issues for many years. Shallow ground water conditions exist and frequently result in either pumping of water from the subdivision or water damage to existing structures. The area is also susceptible to flooding and drainage issues due to spring runoff from the Cache la Poudre each spring. Following the High Park Wildfire, the area's flood issues increased dramatically, leading to extensive sandbag efforts and pumping of water throughout the spring and during the rainy season.

RECOMMENDATION: Conduct an extensive engineering study in the area in an attempt to identify viable solutions for the subdivision.

ACTION: Conduct 1) a Groundwater and Drainage Study and 2) a Floodplain Mitigation Study

| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County Engineering | EXPECTED COST: \$90,000 |
|---|--|
| Department | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Public | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: county resources, |
| Works Division, Engineering Department | grant funding for infrastructure and community |
| | development projects |

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Obtain funding for the project
- Create a Request for Proposals and Send out to vendors
- Choose a consultant to conduct the studies
- Finalize the study and analyze the results
- Provide recommendations to the Cotton Willows Subdivision on future action

| Larimer County: Vehicle for Severe Storm and Fire Events (Larimer – 22) | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| PRIORITY: 22 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Storm, Fire | |
| LOCATION: Project location | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3. | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E, D | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2019 | | |

ISSUE: In severe weather, particularly snowstorms, there are many miles of public and private roads which will not be cleared. Any emergency response (Law, Fire, EMS) may be delayed for hours or days until roads can be cleared. Many residential roads are not maintained and can be impassable until a contractor can remove snow. Some of these roads are miles long.

RECOMMENDATION: Obtain a vehicle which is capable of transporting responders and supplies/equipment into a scene, and be capable of removing citizens trapped or in distress when over the road vehicles are not able to make access.

ACTION: Determine vehicle configurations are adaptable to fire and EMS situations that can travel off-road or over snow-closed road. Obtain trailer for such vehicle, if needed, obtain storage location which will be accessible to Red Feather Lakes Fire Protection Members when roads are impassable. Train members on the use operation, use, and driving. Red Feather Lakes Fire would maintain and repair this vehicle. They would also make other agencies aware of this capability and of its availability for situations in their district. We would also make this available for organizations providing essential services for our area. (REA, Verizon, etc.)





LEAD AGENCY: Red Feather Lakes Volunteer Fire Department SUPPORT AGENCIES: Crystal Lakes Fire

Protection District, Larimer County SO

EXPECTED COST: Enclosed, heated for multiple personnel and supine patients: \$110,000. POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Red Feather Lakes Volunteer Fire Department, fund raising, grants.

PROGRESS MILESTONES: 1. Determine design/capacity parameters to include dimensions, weight, ability to be used over a variety or terrain and narrow roads. Ability to respond to multiple types of missions; i.e. EMS, Fire, Rescue. 2. Obtain storage facility meeting objectives above. 3. Select vendor of vehicle and determine cost. 4. Match cost with available funding and apply for grants. 5. Obtain grant and purchase equipment. Install equipment. 6. Extensive training on maintenance and operation of the vehicle for members.





7 Plan Implementation and Maintenance

Having a solid plan for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the County's mitigation strategy is critical to maintaining its value and success. Ensuring effective implementation of mitigation activities paves the way for continued momentum in the planning process and gives direction for the future. This section explains who will be responsible for maintenance activities and what those responsibilities entail. It also provides a methodology and schedule of maintenance activities including a description of how the public will be involved on a continual basis.

This Chapter discusses how the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Strategy will be implemented and how the overall Hazard Mitigation Plan will be evaluated and enhanced over time. This section also discusses how the public and participating stakeholders will continue to be involved in the hazard mitigation planning process. This chapter consists of the following subsections:

- IMPLEMENTATION ACTION PLAN
- PLAN INTEGRATION, EXISTING CAPABILITIES AND RESOURCES
- FUTURE PLAN EVALUATION, MONITORING, UPDATING

7.1 Implementation Action Plan

The 2016 planning process was overseen by the Larimer County Office of Emergency Management, in coordination with other County departments.

The Larimer County Board of Commissioners has authorized the submission of this Plan to both the Colorado Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (DHSEM) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for their respective reviews and subsequent approvals. Upon state and federal approval, the Larimer County Board of Commissioners will act to formally adopt this Plan.

7.1.1 Plan Integration, Existing Capabilities and Resources

The capability assessment examines the ability of Larimer County to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the County are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the town's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The table below outlines Larimer County's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | Х | | |
| Floodplain Administrator | Х | | |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |
| Grant Writer | Х | | |





Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The table below outlines the County's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A Zoning Ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Y |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Ν |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Y |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Y |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

7.1.2 Plan Maintenance and Implementation

Larimer County has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping this plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the County will continue to encourage meaningful public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|----------------|--|
| Larimer County | "The Larimer County Office of Emergency Management will be the lead agency for the plan and the follow up. Meetings will occur at least once every six months to check in on mitigation actions and determine next steps." |
| | <i>"The Larimer County Office of Emergency Management has standing public meetings with the Board of Commissioners on key projects and will ensure the HMP is reviewed and updated during these meetings."</i> |

Larimer County will actively maintain the hazard mitigation plan by coordinating a bi-annual review with participating jurisdictions of all mitigation actions included in the 2016 Mitigation Strategy. The County will facilitate the mitigation action check-in process with each participating community and staff will meet with participating jurisdictions that are not able to attend the meeting either in person or by phone to facilitate an effective maintenance and implementation process.

Each participating jurisdiction has identified a process through which it will evaluate, maintain, and update their local mitigation action. Details about their processes are included in the Community Profiles section of the plan.




The 2016 Plan will be updated by the FEMA approved five year anniversary date, as required by the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, or following a disaster event. Future plan updates will account for any new hazard vulnerabilities, special circumstances, or new information that becomes available. During the five-year review process, the following questions will be considered as criteria for assessing the effectiveness of the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

- Has the nature or magnitude of hazards affecting the County changed?
- Are there new hazards that have the potential to impact the County?
- Do the identified goals and actions address current and expected conditions
- Have mitigation actions been implemented or completed?
- Has the implementation of identified mitigation actions resulted in expected outcomes?
- Are current resources adequate to implement the plan?
- Should additional local resources be committed to address identified hazards?

Issues that arise during monitoring and evaluation which require changes to the local hazard, risk and vulnerability summary, mitigation strategy, and other components of the plan will be incorporated during future updates.

7.1.3 Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The table below lists the specific integration strategies identified by Larimer County based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Table E2 Drocossos | for Integrating Hazard | Mitigation into | Othor Planning | Machanisms |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Table JZ. FIUCESSES | ior integrating hazaru | willigation into | other Flamming | IVIECHAIIISIIIS |

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|----------------|---|
| Larimer County | <i>"We will update our hazard mitigation codes in the Land Use, Wildfire and Building Code documents"</i> |





Appendix A – Meeting Minutes & Sign-In Sheets



We Make a Difference



Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Large Team Kickoff Meeting

When and Where

Larimer County Courthouse on June 29th, 2015, 1:00 - 3:00 PM

Attendees

See Sign-In Sheets Attached

Agenda and Minutes:

1. Welcome and Introductions

Lori Hodges, Larimer County Director of Emergency Management, welcomed the large planning team attendees and then introduced Mike Garner, Michael Baker International (Baker), who is serving as the contracted project manager for the countywide hazard mitigation plan update. Due to the large number of attendees and time constraints, individual introductions of the large team were bypassed. Mike then stepped through the meeting's agenda.

2. Hazard Mitigation Planning Overview

Mike then briefly discussed hazard mitigation and an overview of the hazard mitigation planning process. He explained that the current Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan was set to expire in July 2015, but that due to recent disasters FEMA has extended the expiration date until early 2016.

3. Jurisdictional Participation Requirements

Mike then walked through the following participation requirements for any jurisdictions planning to formally adopt the plan: submit a participation letter; help to identify hazards unique to that jurisdiction; identify how vulnerabilities and risks may differ from the county as a whole; formulate mitigation actions specific that that jurisdiction; offer community stakeholders an opportunity to be involved in the planning process; document a process for plan integration and maintenance; and formally adopt the plan by the jurisdiction's governing body. Lori confirmed receipt thus far of roughly 20 letters of intent to participate.

4. Planning Process / Project Schedule

Mike then presented the following project schedule.

- 6/29 Large Team Kick-Off Meeting
- August: Risk Assessment / Mitigation Strategy Meeting
- September: Mitigation Actions / Plan Maintenance Meetings
- Late Summer / Fall: Public Outreach
- October: Final Draft Posted for Comment

MBAKERINTL.COM

165 South Union Blvd., Suite 200 | Lakewood, CO 80228 Office: 720.514.1100 | Fax: 720.479.3157





- November 26: Submit to State/FEMA
- TBD: FEMA Approval Pending Adoption
- TBD: Presentation to County Commissioners

5. 5-Year Plan Review

Mike then gave an overview of the first of the large planning team surveys that will be disseminated to the large planning team shortly after this kick-off meeting. The intent is to solicit comments of the existing plan: strengths and weaknesses, has it been implemented and what were implementation challenges, have hazard risks changed, etc. He asked the audience to raise hands if they were involved in the current plan's development. Less than 10 people did so in the group. Mike mentioned that the current plan is posted to the project website (www.LarimerHMP2016.com) for those interested in reviewing.

6. Hazards to Profile.

Mike then presented the list of hazards that the small team agreed to profile fully. This 'top 10' list ended up including the following 12 hazards:

- Biological Hazards / Contagion
- Civil Disturbance
- Earthquake
- Erosion / Deposition
- Fire Wildland
- Flood Flash and Riverine
- Hazmat Fixed and Transport
- Landslide / Rockslide
- Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)
- Tornado
- Utility Disruption
- Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Mike explained that other hazards not on this list will still be mentioned in the plan, but that a full hazard profile & risk/vulnerability assessment would not be conducted at the county level for those. It was pointed out that this plan update should focus on those hazards that can be mitigated against.

One large planning team participant, Katie Bigner (Fort Collins Utilities and Sustainability Services) spoke up about possibly including extreme temperatures or extreme heat as an additional hazard to profile fully. Katie mentioned that the city had recently commissioned an extreme heat report and felt that information would be applicable to this planning effort. She agreed to share that report to Lori and Mike for small team review and discussions. Katie mentioned that she did believe the hazard of extreme heat did present opportunities for mitigation projects to consider incorporating into this plan. Lori asked for time to review the report and that Katie's suggestion would be considered.

7. Current Mitigation Strategy Goals





Mike then reviewed the following current plan's goals and mentioned that these would be revisited in the next meeting for changes/edits. He then explained how a mitigation strategy can include goals, objectives for achieving those goals, and then mitigation actions/projects to accomplish those goals.

- 1. Protect life and property
- 2. Improve public awareness
- 3. Strengthen partnerships and promote plan implementation
- 4. Improve emergency services response plans

8. Mitigation Action Overview

Mike then spent some time talking to the group about mitigation actions. He walked through the 4 main categories of actions, which include: Local Plans and Regulations, Structure and Infrastructure Projects, Natural Systems Protection, and Education and Awareness Programs. The next few slides provided some examples of these types of projects.

9. Planning Exercise

The next portion of the meeting involved a planning exercise. Attendees were divided into small groups (3-6 people) and each were provided a hazard scenario. Four different scenarios existing included hazard situations specific to: flooding, wildfire, tornado, and winter storm. Each group was then asked to spend some time brainstorming potential mitigation actions to help reduce or eliminate the hazard, preferably one from each of the four mitigation action categories. Throughout the meeting, Baker circulated copies of FEMA's Mitigation Ideas booklet, which contains ideas for specific mitigation ideas focused on individual hazards.

After ~10 minutes, Mike then asked the groups to present their ideas. Each scenario was read and then groups took turns explaining their mitigation ideas. This lead to some beneficial dialog. Ideas presented by the groups were solid and well thought out.

10. Wrap-Up

Lori then asked a few of the jurisdictions on the small planning team to individually address their jurisdictional participants.

Mike Gavin (Fort Collins) gave some good background on past iterations of the hazard mitigation plan. He mentioned that the large number of city departments were invited to participate in this process to ensure that the mitigation strategy that results from this planning process is as robust and allencompassing as possible. He also mentioned that this planning process would benefit the city's participation in FEMA's Community Rating System (CRS) program, which provides for reduced flood insurance rates for citizens and businesses.

Pat Mialy (Loveland) then spoke about how this process will align with another hazard mitigation master planning project that the city is kicking off in the coming months. She wants this project to help serve as a springboard for the other and is also looking to involve as large of a cross section of city personnel as possible. Her hope is to ultimately develop a mitigation strategy and plan for the city that covers all current and future project and which aligns with both the city's short and long term (50+ years) visions.





Karen Thompson (Estes Park) then spoke of how they are in the beginning stages of entering into the CRS program. She said that the town works closely with many federal agencies and looks for this project to help the town develop a list of mitigation actions that can assist with grants and project implementation.

Lori then wrapped up discussions by stating that we want to include as many interested agencies and organizations in this hazard mitigation planning process. She spoke to how the results of this plan can then be implemented into other planning mechanisms to continue to work towards a more resilient county.

Questions were then fielded relating to plan participation for Title 32 Special Districts. Lori mentioned that those entities are allowed to formally adopt this plan if they would like, but that would mean that those districts would fully participate in this planning process. A question was raised about private utility participation. Lori stated that they were welcome to participate in this planning process and offer up mitigation actions.

Mike Garner then concluded the meeting by showing the project website (<u>www.LarimerHMP2016.com</u>) and welcoming any questions throughout the process. He stated that all presentations, minutes, etc will be accessible via the project website.

A post-meeting CRS discussion was then held with those interested participants.

Post-Meeting Action Items:

- 1. Large team members were asked to begin compiling and sending existing data and plans to Mike Garner or Lori that may be applicable to this hazard mitigation plan. A hard deadline will be communicated in the near future.
- 2. Large team members were asked to begin sharing news of this project with their communities.
- 3. Large team members were asked to begin thinking about mitigation actions that they want to document in this plan.





| Last Name | First Nam | e Email | Jurisdiction / Or | gani Representing | Signature |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Adams | Steve | Steve.Adams@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Power | felle form |
| Adamson | Shane | Shane.Adamson@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | IT | New Jermin |
| Applegate | Braden | braden.applegate@uchealth.org | Non Profit | Poudre Valley EMS | A |
| Bielmaier | Mike | MBielmaier@epmedcenter.com | Estes Park | Chief Medical | MBelmarer |
| Blackwill | Mike | mblackwill@wsfr.us | Non Profit | Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | Mal & Blin |
| Bloom | Carmen | Carmen.Bloom@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | 911 | |
| Brinkhoff | Jack | brinkhjd@co.larimer.co.us | Wellington | Town of Wellington | |
| Burns | John | John.Burns@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | п | |
| Collins | Hugh | H.Collins@poudrecanyonfiredistrict.org | FPD | Poudre Canyon FPD | Alse |
| Dahlgren | Gary | Gary.Dahlgren@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Streets | |
| Dorman | Scott | sdorman@estesvalleyfire.org | Estes Park | Fire Chief | |
| Ellerby | Mike | Michael.Ellerby@frontrange.edu | Educational | Front Range College - Safety | |
| Engen | Corey | corey@flywater.com | Non Profit | Colorado Riparian Association | |
| George | Greg | Greg.George@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Building & Planning | |
| Gingery | Kevin | Kevin.Gingery@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Stormwater | |
| Green | Gary | ggreen@wfpd.org | Wellington | Wellington FPD | A |
| Hale | Betsey | Betsey.Hale@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Economic Development | |
| Hilgenberg | Marilyn | Marilyn.Hilgenberg@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Parks & Rec | 4 |
| Hilmes-Robinson | Marsha | mhilmesrobinson@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | CRS Coordinator | Mayoungton- Reme |
| Hodges | Lori | hodgeslr@co.larimer.co.us | County | OEM | Burgige |
| Isaacson | Robert | gvfdchief1@gmail.com | FPD | Glacier View FPD | Toped Daar |

LARIMER HMP KICK-OFF MEETING June 29, 2015

Fraundort Alan 97 noundarle estes utrilles/DT '97 multilles/DT '97 multill





LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

| 51 1 | 1 | LARIME | R HMP KICK-OFF MEE | TING | 0 11 |
|------------|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Last Name | First Name | USON Sle@ norther Wateroz | June 29, 2015 | Representing | Signature |
| MOWTAGE | Jim | JMDWIAGUE PROVIDE F. DE. OR S | Pausac Fac D = 11 | | Former 2 mater |
| Callies | Deb | Job Callier CCity offoreland | 03 (its of | loveland | 10m CDe 1 |
| MATKINS | CHAIS | chois matkinse cit of low lad up | COL-Water | + Power | AL |
| FRICK | Kim | Kimfridrocitaefluidend.org | latland | | |
| testi | Where | Musser . Chentrin @ Con Station of | R. IFRA | | A take : |
| Schneider | Larry | Ischneider PAnnu sen | CAFC | Streets | And the b |
| Sporer | Nicholas | NSporence FCGnu com | COFC - Streets | | |
| GADIE3 | Dove | degroves efegov, con | () | ι, | ul |
| Kamoske | Becky | Becky, Kamoske Ocifycf Lexand | RE LECC | | Hebecca Ranske |
| GAISFORD | MARE | Mark Gaisforde city flovelan | lorg LECC | LOVELAND 9-1-1 CENTER | Mak Starly |
| Peters- | Junh | 0.1 | LE Engreen | 7 | Jule R MC |
| BORDT | JIM | borzoti & praz. ora | PRPA | | AR |
| MODRE | BRIAN | monoch & prom. Arc | V | | 19 |
| HAUKAAS | uol. | havkoas afagor, com | FCU | | Star |
| Fried | Enz | efried@larimer.org | L.C. Bldg | | Ely Fried |
| Kengton | Nort | mkendard fasor-com | COFC | | Mant has |
| Sampley | Ken | Kranily & Frank. um | COFE | | Kansd |
| Dieg | Riegan | nuncol lannar are | Loraner EM | | Un |
| LESSAND | thic | Eric lesserde city of love lend.or | COL | LOVELAND STOR MWATTER | hal |
| LANDKAMEN | Jon |) LANDER MER CLOTES VALLEY FIRE OR | EVFPD | | her |
| Machalek | Toquir | ; invehalek@estes.old | TOFP | TOFN = | Tinda |
| Kelly N | larian | mkelly e alvfallory | CLVFD | | Marie Kelly |
| efibansh . | Dan. | CLFPD BOAM OS | enbaush@ hotr | nail.com | K- |

LARIMER HMP KICK-OFF MEETING









Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Large Planning Team Meeting #2

Where and When

The Ranch Complex, McKee Building, Loveland on August 24th, 2015, 1:00 - 4:00 PM

Attendees

See separate sign-in sheets

Agenda and Minutes:

1. Welcome and Introductions

Lori Hodges welcomed the large planning team attendees and then introduced the county's consultants for this project, Mike Garner and Enessa Janes, from Michael Baker International (Baker). Attendees then individually introduced themselves and identified the jurisdiction/district/organization that they represent.

2. Project Overview Update: Schedule, Status, Small Team Role

Baker then reviewed the project schedule (detailed in presentation). The current status is that the risk and vulnerability assessment is roughly 75% complete. Data sets requested during past meetings have for the most part now been delivered and Baker is working through these. The Baker Team then reviewed the role of the hazard mitigation small planning team, which to date has involved: 2010 mitigation action reporting, data collection, outreach strategizing, meeting and plan document content, and identification of hazards to profile and critical facilities across the county.

3. Jurisdictional Participation Requirements / Expectations

Baker then walked through the following participation requirements for any jurisdictions planning to formally adopt the plan: submit a participation letter; help to identify hazards unique to that jurisdiction; identify how vulnerabilities and risks may differ from the county as a whole; formulate mitigation actions specific that that jurisdiction; offer community stakeholders an opportunity to be involved in the planning process; document a process for plan integration and maintenance; and formally adopt the plan by the jurisdiction's governing body.

4. Review of 5-Year Plan Review & Risk Factor survey results

Baker then presented some of the high-level results of the 5-Year Plan Review & Risk Factor survey. This survey was conducted through the large planning team and will be used for the jurisdictional and district appendixes to the plan document. The Baker Team then also presented some results from the 1st public survey, which will be shared with the large planning team for their use in compiling mitigation actions.

5. Overview of Risk Assessment Results

MBAKERINTL.COM

165 South Union Blvd., Suite 200 | Lakewood, CO 80228 Office: 720.514.1100 | Fax: 720.479.3157





Baker then presented the risk assessment results webmap that is linked from the project website. Additional risk and vulnerability data layers will be added as they are available. The large planning team was urged to utilize this information when compiling mitigation actions.

6. Review the updated Mitigation Strategy Goals & Objectives

The updated mitigation strategy goals and objectives, updated and reviewed by the small planning team were then presented by Baker. Baker explained how the goals and objectives define the high-level mitigation strategy for this plan update and how proposed actions will align with these.

7. Reporting of status updates for 2009 Mitigation Actions

Baker then informed the large planning team that the small planning team had recently completed the status reporting for over 200 mitigation actions that were documented in the 2010 plan. This information will be included in the 2016 updated plan document.

8. 2016 Mitigation Actions (Mitigation Action Guide)

Baker then presented the Mitigation Action Guide template that will be used to collect and document 2016 mitigation actions. The template is posted on the project website and should be used by all plan participants to document those actions to be incorporated into the updated plan.

9. Jurisdictional/Special District Break-out Session

Large planning team participants were then broken out into jurisdictional groups for an opportunity for each jurisdiction to discuss strategy, questions, and next steps forward. Both Ms. Hodges and the Baker staff floated amongst the groups helping to answer questions and provide guidance. These jurisdictional groups then reported back to the larger group what they discussed. Some jurisdictions agreed that they would be holding internal planning meetings in preparation for the 3rd and final large planning team meeting to be held on September 30th.

10. Q&A Session

Baker and Ms. Hodges concluded the meeting with a Q&A session. Final meeting points were to ensure that all large planning team members understood what is expected from their jurisdictions/districts and what the post-meeting actions items were for all.

Post-Meeting Action Items:

- 1. Adopting jurisdictions to submit Participation Letter (if not already done)
- 2. Adopting jurisdictions to complete pending surveys
- 3. Adopting jurisdictions (and other interested Large Team organizations) to begin brainstorming / compiling mitigation actions/projects for review during the final large planning team meeting

www.LarimerHMP2016.com





| | N | Λi | С | h | a | el | | B | a | k | er | • |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|
| I | N | т | Е | R | N | A | т | I | 0 | N | A | L |

| August 24, 2015 | HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING MEETING |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|
|-----------------|------------------------------------|

| Last Name | First Name | Email | Signature |
|----------------|------------|--|--|
| Applegate | Braden | braden.applegate@uchealth.org | |
| Bernish | Kelly | kbernish@fcgov.com | |
| Bieker | Chris | chris@utsd.org | |
| Bielmaier | Mike | MBielmaier@epmedcenter.com | 1 |
| Bigner | Katy | KBigner@fcgov.com | AA |
| Birchfield | Will | wbirchfield@estes.org | |
| Blackwill | Mike | mblackwill@wsfr.us | |
| Boizot | Jim | BoizotJ@prpa.org | (). W |
| Boschman | Nate | nate@wlrv.org | - The Bar |
| Brady | Herb | hbrady@wsfr.us | |
| Brinkhoff | Jack | brinkhjd@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Charles | Steve | scharles@berthoudfire.org | |
| Chilcott | Alison | achilcot@estes.org | |
| Christensen | Cory | cchristensen@fcgov.com | |
| Collins | Hugh | H.Collins@poudrecanyonfiredistrict.org | and con bails out |
| Cordery-Cotter | Susanne | susanne.cordery-cotter@colostate.edu | in the second se |
| Culp | Kimberly | Kculp@leta911.org | |
| Davis | Mary | mary@evrpd.com | |
| Defibaugh | Dan | osenbaugh@hotmail.com | > |
| Dorman | Scott | sdorman@estesvalleyfire.org | Le Co z |
| Dougherty | Sean | sean@hawaiianshirtguy.com | |
| Dowker | Jan | idowker@berthoud.org | |
| Duell | Jim | iduell@estesparksanitation.com | |
| Ellerby | Mike | Michael.Ellerby@frontrange.edu | |
| Engen | Corey | <u>corey@flywater.com</u> | |
| Ex | Lindsay | lex@fcgov.com | |
| Fraundorf | Alan | afraundorf@estes.org | |
| Frei | Rick | rick.frei@thompsonschools.org | |
| Fried | Eric | friedeb@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Gavin | Mike | migavin@poudre-fire.org | Wek. |
| Gertig | Kevin | kgertig@fcgov.com | |
| Getchius | April | agetchius@timnathgov.com | |
| Gilbert | Terry | gilberrt@co.larimer.co.us | |

LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN



| | N | Λi | С | h | a | el | | B | a | k | er | - |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|
| I | N | т | Е | R | N | A | т | I | 0 | N | A | L |

| Godinez | Jason | Jason.Godinez@redcross.org | Signature |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------------|
| Gonzales | Ron | rgonzales@poudre-fire.org | |
| Green | Gary | ggreen@wfpd.org | |
| Groves | Dave | degroves@fcgov.com | |
| Haberecht | Fred | fred.haberecht@colostate.edu | |
| Hall | Pete | phall@psdschools.org | |
| Harris | Chris | charris@soldiercanyon.com | |
| Haukaas | Jon | jhaukaas@fcgov.com | |
| Hellen | Tom | thellen@townofjohnstown.com | |
| Henderson | Janelle | henderjl@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Henggeller | Errin | ehenggeler@fcgov.com | |
| Hilmes-Robinson | Marsha | mhilmesrobinson@fcgov.com | 1 xthat will a |
| Hodges | Lori | hodgeslr@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Hummer | Scott | npicscott@qwestoffice.net | |
| Isaacson | Robert | gvfdchief1@gmail.com | |
| Jackson | Mark | mjackson@fcgov.com | |
| Janett | Gina | ginaciao@frii.com | |
| Jones | Shayna | shayna.brause@gmail.com shauna in nor () h | that all a D O and |
| Kadrich | Lauri | Ikadrich@fcgov.com | - and with a straight |
| Kelly | Marian | mkelly@clvfd.org | |
| Kempton | Mark | mkempton@fcgov.com | |
| Klippert | Tim | tbk@pvhs.org | |
| Kozak Thiel | Jaqueline | ikozak-thiel@fcgov.com | |
| Kubichek | Jim | greenbackcut@yahoo.com | |
| Kufeld | Wes | wkufeld@estes.org | |
| Kurtz | Tina | tkurtz@estes.org | |
| Lancaster | Frank | flancaster@estes.org | |
| Landkamer | Jon | jlandkamer@estes.org | |
| Larson | Mike | mlarson@tvems.com | |
| Lesher | Randy | <u>rlesher@tvems.com</u> | |
| Lochra | Chris | <u>clochra@fcgov.com</u> | |
| Lotter | Jenne | <u>iloffer@uwaylc.org</u> | |
| rorentzen | Larry | lorentll@co.larimer.co.us | |



| | N | Λi | С | h | a | el | | B | a | k | er | • |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|
| I | N | т | Е | R | N | A | т | I | 0 | N | A | L |



| Last Name | First Name | Email | Cimature |
|------------|------------|--|----------------|
| Machalek | Travis | tmachalek@estes.org | Signature |
| Kelly | Marian | mkelly@clvfd.org | |
| Kovecses | Jennifer | jenk@poudrewatershed.org | |
| Maynard | Donn | livermorechief@gmail.com | |
| McFarland | Steve | smcfarland@estes.org | |
| McGaffin | Shawn | smgaffin@poudre-fire.org | |
| Mialy | Pat | pat.mialy@cityofloveland.org | |
| Montague | Jim | imontague@poudre-fire.org | |
| Moore | Brian | mooreb@prpa.org | R Mart |
| Nies | Megan | niesml@co.larimer.co.us | and the second |
| Pass | Corey | cpass@estes.org | |
| Peterson | Mark | petersmr@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Poncelow | Bob | bponcelow@poudre-fire.org | |
| Quintana | Ken | ken.quintana@colostate.edu | |
| Rellergert | Louis | LRELLERGERT@fcgov.com | |
| Reynolds | Karen | bsdacctg@boxeldersanitation.org | |
| Davis | Mary | mary@evrpd.com | |
| Rose | Eric | erose@estes.org | |
| Rosintoski | Lisa | lrosintoski@fcgov.com | |
| Rusch | Kate | krusch@estes.org | |
| Sampley | Ken | ksampley@fcgov.com | |
| Schneider | Larry | lschneider@fcgov.com | |
| Skutchan | Clint | clint@fcbr.org | |
| Sporer | Nicholas | nsporer@fcgov.com | |
| Storgaard | Melody | melody.storgaard2@redcross.org | |
| Strong | Susan | sstrong@fcgov.com | |
| Struble | Jim | jstruble@northernwater.org | |
| Thompson | Karen | kthompson@estes.org | |
| Tierney | Shawn | Shawn@SustainableLivingAssociation.org | |
| Tower | Joel | itower@fcgov.com | |
| Turner | Mark | Mturner@tvems.com | |
| Vazquez | John | jvazquez@windsorgov.com | |
| Wagner | Gerry | rflvfdchief@centurylink.net | |
| | | | |

| | N | Λi | С | h | a | el | | B | а | k | er | - |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|
| I | N | Т | Е | R | N | A | т | I | 0 | N | A | L |

| August 24, 2015 | HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING MEETING |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|
|-----------------|------------------------------------|

| Last Name | First Name | Email | |
|----------------|------------|--|------------------------|
| Applegate | Braden | braden.applegate@uchealth.org | |
| Bernish | Kelly | kbernish@fcgov.com | |
| Bieker | Chris | chris@utsd.org | |
| Bielmaier | Mike | MBielmaier@epmedcenter.com | HILLIN Morteuctsa. org |
| Bigner | Katy | KBigner@fcgov.com | |
| Birchfield | Will | wbirchfield@estes.org | |
| Blackwill | Mike | mblackwill@wsfr.us | |
| Boizot | Jim | Boizotl@prpa.org | |
| Boschman | Nate | nate@wlrv.org | |
| Brady | Herb | hbrady@wsfr.us | |
| Brinkhoff | Jack | brinkhjd@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Charles | Steve | <u>scharles@berthoudfire.org</u> | |
| Chilcott | Alison | achilcot@estes.org | |
| Christensen | Cory | <u>cchristensen@fcgov.com</u> | |
| Collins | Hugh | H.Collins@poudrecanyonfiredistrict.org | |
| Cordery-Cotter | Susanne | susanne.cordery-cotter@colostate.edu | |
| Culp | Kimberly | Kculp@leta911.org | |
| Davis | Mary | mary@evrpd.com | |
| Defibaugh | Dan | osenbaugh@hotmail.com | |
| Dorman | Scott | <u>sdorman@estesvalleyfire.org</u> | |
| Dougherty | Sean | sean@hawaiianshirtguy.com | |
| Dowker | Jan | idowker@berthoud.org | |
| Duell | Jim | iduell@estesparksanitation.com | |
| Ellerby | Mike | Michael.Ellerby@frontrange.edu | |
| Engen | Corey | corey@flywater.com | |
| Ex | Lindsay | lex@fcgov.com | |
| Fraundorf | Alan | afraundorf@estes.org | |
| Frei | Rick | rick.frei@thompsonschools.org | |
| Fried | Eric | friedeb@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Gavin | Mike | migavin@poudre-fire.org | |
| Gertig | Kevin | kgertig@fcgov.com | |
| Getchius | April | agetchius@timnathgov.com | |
| Gilbert | Terry | gilberrt@co.larimer.co.us | |

| Last Name | First Name | Email | Cianation |
|-----------------|------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Godinez | Jason | Jason.Godinez@redcross.org | oignature |
| Gonzales | Ron | rgonzales@poudre-fire.org | |
| Green | Gary | ggreen@wfpd.org | |
| Groves | Dave | degroves@fcgov.com | |
| Haberecht | Fred | fred.haberecht@colostate.edu | |
| Hall | Pete | phall@psdschools.org | |
| Harris | Chris | charris@soldiercanyon.com | |
| Haukaas | Jon | ihaukaas@fcgov.com | |
| Hellen | Tom | thellen@townofjohnstown.com | |
| Henderson | Janelle | henderil@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Henggeller | Errin | ehenggeler@fcgov.com | |
| Hilmes-Robinson | Marsha | mhilmesrobinson@fcgov.com | Maria atra P |
| Hodges | Lori | hodgeslr@co.larimer.co.us | 10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-1 |
| Hummer | Scott | npicscott@qwestoffice.net | 2 2 |
| Isaacson | Robert | gvfdchief1@gmail.com | Bhut Maire |
| Jackson | Mark | mjackson@fcgov.com | 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1 |
| Janett | Gina | ginaciao@frii.com | |
| Jones | Shayna | shayna.brause@gmail.com | |
| Kadrich | Lauri | lkadrich@fcgov.com | |
| Kelly | Marian | mkelly@clvfd.org | |
| Kempton | Mark | mkempton@fcgov.com | |
| Klippert | Tim | tbk@pvhs.org | |
| Kozak Thiel | Jaqueline | ikozak-thiel@fcgov.com | |
| Kubichek | Jim | greenbackcut@yahoo.com | |
| Kufeld | Wes | wkufeld@estes.org | |
| Kurtz | Tina | tkurtz@estes.org | |
| Lancaster | Frank | flancaster@estes.org | |
| Landkamer | Jon | jlandkamer@estes.org | |
| Larson | Mike | mlarson@tvems.com | |
| Lesher | Randy | rlesher@tvems.com | |
| Lochra | Chris | clochra@fcgov.com | |
| Loffer | Jenne | iloffer@uwaylc.org | |
| Lorentzen | Larry | lorentll@co.larimer.co.us | |
| LESSARD | Ear | Eric Lessard @ Lity of lovera | l'on Crief |
| | | < | |





| | | Signature |
|----------|--|--|
| Travis | tmachalek@estes.org | |
| Marian | mkellv@clvfd.org | |
| Jennifer | ienk@poudrewatershed.org | |
| Donn | livermorechief@gmail.com | |
| Steve | smcfarland@estes.org | |
| Shawn | smgaffin@poudre-fire.org | |
| Pat | pat.mialy@cityofloveland.org | |
| Jim | imontague@poudre-fire.org | |
| Brian | mooreb@prpa.org | |
| Megan | niesml@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Corey | cpass@estes.org | |
| Mark | petersmr@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Bob | bponcelow@poudre-fire.org | |
| Ken | ken.quintana@colostate.edu | |
| Louis | LRELLERGERT@fcgov.com | |
| Karen | bsdacctg@boxeldersanitation.org | |
| Mary | mary@evrpd.com | |
| Eric | erose@estes.org | |
| Lisa | Irosintoski@fcgov.com | |
| Kate | krusch@estes.org | |
| Ken | ksampley@fcgov.com | |
| Larry | lschneider@fcgov.com | |
| Clint | clint@fcbr.org | |
| Nicholas | nsporer@fcgov.com | |
| Melody | melody.storgaard2@redcross.org | |
| Susan | sstrong@fcgov.com | |
| Jim | istruble@northernwater.org | |
| Karen | kthompson@estes.org | |
| Shawn | Shawn@SustainableLivingAssociation.org | |
| Joel | itower@fcgov.com | |
| Mark | Mturner@tvems.com | |
| John | jvazquez@windsorgov.com | |
| Gerry | rflvfdchief@centurylink.net | |
| Michelle | michelle. stalker @ cityof Loveland.org | Maull p. Study |
| | TravisMarianJenniferDonnSteveShawnPatJimBrianMeganCoreyMarkBobKenLouisKarenLouisKarenMaryEricLisaKarenLouisKarenJimMaryCoreySusanJimSusanJoelMarkJohnGerryKarenKaren | IravisImachalek@estes.orgMarianmkelly@clvfd.orgJenniferlenk@poudrewatershed.orgDonnlivermorechlef@gmail.comStevesmcfarland@estes.orgPatpat.mialy@cityofloveland.orgImnimontague@poudre-fire.orgPatpat.mialy@cityofloveland.orgBrianmooreb@prpa.orgMeganniesml@co.larimer.co.usBobbponcelow@poudre-fire.orgMarkpetersmr@co.larimer.co.usBobbponcelow@poudre-fire.orgKenken.quintana@colostate.eduLouisLRELERGERT@fcgov.comKarenbsdacctg@boxeldersanitation.orgMarymary@evrpd.comFricerose@estes.orgUisaIrosintoski@fcgov.comKarenksamplev@fcgov.comLarrylscharler@fcgov.comLarrystrong@fcgov.comJimistrub@enorthernwater.orgNicholasnsporer@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJoelitower@fcgov.comJo |





| | N | Λi | С | h | a | el | | B | a | k | er | • |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|
| I | N | т | Е | R | N | A | т | I | 0 | N | A | L |

| | | LIDITO LEADER | 6 |
|----------------|------------|--|-------------|
| Last Name | First Name | Email | Signature |
| Applegate | Braden | braden.applegate@uchealth.org | ff free for |
| Bernish | Kelly | kbernish@fcgov.com | 1 19 19 |
| Bieker | Chris | chris@utsd.org | |
| Bielmaier | Mike | MBielmaier@epmedcenter.com | |
| Bigner | Katy | KBigner@fcgov.com | |
| Birchfield | Will | wbirchfield@estes.org | |
| Blackwill | Mike | mblackwill@wsfr.us | |
| Boizot | Jim | BoizotJ@prpa.org | |
| Boschman | Nate | nate@wlrv.org | |
| Brady | Herb | hbrady@wsfr.us | |
| Brinkhoff | Jack | brinkhjd@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Charles | Steve | scharles@berthoudfire.org | |
| Chilcott | Alison | achilcot@estes.org | |
| Christensen | Cory | cchristensen@fcgov.com | |
| Collins | Hugh | H.Collins@poudrecanyonfiredistrict.org | |
| Cordery-Cotter | Susanne | susanne.cordery-cotter@colostate.edu | |
| Culp | Kimberly | Kculp@leta911.org | |
| Davis | Mary | mary@evrpd.com | |
| Defibaugh | Dan | osenbaugh@hotmail.com | |
| Dorman | Scott | sdorman@estesvalleyfire.org | |
| Dougnerty | Sean | sean@hawaiianshirtguy.com | |
| Dowker | Jan | jdowker@berthoud.org | |
| Duell | Jim | iduell@estesparksanitation.com | |
| Ellerby | Mike | Michael.Ellerby@frontrange.edu | |
| Engen | Corey | corey@flywater.com | |
| Ex | Lindsay | lex@fcgov.com | |
| Fraundorf | Alan | afraundorf@estes.org | |
| Frei | Rick | rick.frei@thompsonschools.org | |
| Fried | Eric | friedeb@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Gavin | Mike | migavin@poudre-fire.org | |
| Gertig | Kevin | kgertig@fcgov.com | |
| Getchius | April | agetchius@timnathgov.com | |
| Gilbert | Terry | gilberrt@co.larimer.co.us | |



| | N | 1i | С | h | a | el | | B | a | k | er | - |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|
| I | N | т | Е | R | N | A | т | I | 0 | N | A | L |



Page 269

| | | HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING MEETI August 24, 2015 | ING |
|-----------------|------------|---|--------------------|
| Last Name | First Name | Email | Cianativo |
| Godinez | Jason | Jason.Godinez@redcross.org | op.mm.c |
| Gonzales | Ron | rgonzales@poudre-fire.org | |
| Green | Gary | ggreen@wfpd.org | |
| Groves | Dave | degroves@fcgov.com | |
| Haberecht | Fred | fred.haberecht@colostate.edu | |
| Hall | Pete | phall@psdschools.org | |
| Harris | Chris | charris@soldiercanvon.com | |
| Haukaas | Jon | jhaukaas@fcgov.com | |
| Hellen | Tom | thellen@townofjohnstown.com | |
| Henderson | Janelle | henderjl@co.larimer.co.us | Kan II (A) |
| Henggeller | Errin | ehenggeler@fcgov.com | Marrie Temperation |
| Hilmes-Robinson | Marsha | mhilmesrobinson@fcgov.com | |
| Hodges | Lori | hodgeslr@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Hummer | Scott | npicscott@qwestoffice.net | |
| Isaacson | Robert | gvfdchief1@gmail.com | |
| Jackson | Mark | mjackson@fcgov.com | |
| Janett | Gina | ginaciao@frii.com | |
| Jones | Shayna | shayna.brause@gmail.com | |
| Nadrich | Lauri | lkadrich@fcgov.com | |
| Kelly | Marian | mkelly@clvfd.org | |
| Kempton | Mark | mkempton@fcgov.com | |
| Klippert | Tim | tbk@pvhs.org | |
| Kozak Thiel | Jaqueline | ikozak-thiel@fcgov.com | |
| Kubichek | Jim | greenbackcut@yahoo.com | |
| Kufeld | Wes | wkufeld@estes.org | |
| Kurtz | Tina | tkurtz@estes.org | |
| Lancaster | Frank | flancaster@estes.org | |
| Landkamer | Jon | ilandkamer@estes.org | |
| Larson | Mike | mlarson@tvems.com | |
| Lesher | Randy | rlesher@tvems.com | |
| Lochra | Chris | clochra@fcgov.com | |
| Loffer | Jenne | jloffer@uwaylc.org | |
| Lorentzen | Larry | lorentll@co.larimer.co.us | |
| | | | |

| | N | /li | С | h | a | el | | B | a | k | er | • |
|---|---|-----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|
| I | N | т | E | R | N | A | т | I | 0 | N | A | L |

| August 24, 20 | HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN |
|---------------|------------------------|
| , 2015 | LANNING MEETING |

| Last Name | First Name | Email | Cianatura |
|------------|------------|--|-------------------|
| Machalek | Travis | tmachalek@estes.org | |
| Kelly | Marian | mkelly@clvfd.org | 111 |
| Kovecses | Jennifer | ienk@poudrewatershed.org | 10 mm (Alety |
| Maynard | Donn | livermorechief@gmail.com | |
| McFarland | Steve | smcfarland@estes.org | |
| McGaffin | Shawn | smgaffin@poudre-fire.org | |
| Mialy | Pat | pat.mialy@cityofloveland.org | |
| Montague | Jim | imontague@poudre-fire.org | |
| Moore | Brian | mooreb@prpa.org | |
| Nies | Megan | niesml@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Pass | Corey | cpass@estes.org | |
| Peterson | Mark | petersmr@co.larimer.co.us | |
| Poncelow | Bob | bponcelow@poudre-fire.org | 2 |
| Quintana | Ken | ken.quintana@colostate.edu | Vand Rate |
| Rellergert | Louis | LRELLERGERT@fcgov.com | 1 - the constant |
| Reynolds | Karen | bsdacctg@boxeldersanitation.org | |
| Davis | Mary | mary@evrpd.com | |
| Rose | Eric | erose@estes.org | |
| Rosintoski | Lisa | Irosintoski@fcgov.com | |
| Rusch | Kate | krusch@estes.org | |
| Sampley | Ken | ksampley@fcgov.com | |
| Schneider | Larry | lschneider@fcgov.com | |
| Skutchan | Clint | clint@fcbr.org | |
| Sporer | Nicholas | nsporer@fcgov.com | |
| Storgaard | Melody | melody.storgaard2@redcross.org | |
| Strong | Susan | sstrong@fcgov.com | |
| Struble | Jim | jstruble@northernwater.org | TERRY VERENCE MAN |
| Thompson | Karen | kthompson@estes.org | |
| Tierney | Shawn | Shawn@SustainableLivingAssociation.org | |
| Tower | Joel | itower@fcgov.com | |
| Turner | Mark | Mturner@tvems.com | |
| Vazquez | John | jvazquez@windsorgov.com | |
| Wagner | Gerry | rflvfdchief@centurylink.net | |
| | | | |



| | N | Λi | С | h | a | el | | B | a | k | er | • |
|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|---|
| I | N | т | Е | R | N | A | т | I | 0 | N | A | L |

| ILast Name | First Name | Email | 2 | |
|------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| Wagner | Sherry | Swagner@timnathgov.com | oignature | |
| Webb | Carol | cwebb@fcgoy.com | | |
| Whitesell | Justin | whitesil@co.larimer.co.us | Kin Takart ala (1) | A |
| Wilcox | Richard | chief@pinewoodspringsfire.org | and all with when | 1 |
| Wockner | Gary | media@savethepoudre.org | U | |
| Wolf | Chris | cwolf@poudre-fire.org | | |
| Wray | Pete | pwray@fcgov.com | | |
| Peters | Milissa | moeters @ Finingthrand. non | M UNDO | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

LARIMER COUNTY

COMMITTED TO EXCELLENCE

| Michael Baker |
|----------------------|
| |

| August 24, 2015 | HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING MEETIN |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| | G |

| Last Name | First Name | Email | Cianatiun |
|-------------------|------------|--|--------------|
| Adams | Steve | Steve.Adams@cityofloveland.org | a.B.m.m.c |
| Adamson | Shane | Shane.Adamson@cityofloveland.org | |
| Bloom | Carmen | Carmen.Bloom@cityofloveland.org | |
| Browder | Leah | Leah.Browder@cityofloveland.org | A LANNINIK |
| Burns | John | John.Burns@cityofloveland.org | |
| Callies | Deb | deb.callies@cityofloveland.org | |
| Ceronski | Michael | michael.ceronski@cityofloveland.org | |
| Cooper | Ken | Ken.Cooper@cityofloveland.org | (JA |
| Cornelison-Spight | Christina | christina.cornelison-spight@citvofloveland.org | |
| Dahlgren | Gary | Gary.Dahlgren@cityofloveland.org | |
| Dann | Carie | Carie.Dann@cityofLoveland.org | |
| Frick | Kimberly | kim.frick@cityofloveland.org | |
| Gaisford | Mark | Mark.Gaisford@cityofloveland.org | |
| George | Greg | Greg.George@cityofloveland.org | |
| Gingery | Kevin | Kevin.Gingery@cityofloveland.org | |
| Greenberg | Bettie | Bettie.Greenberg@cityofloveland.org | |
| Gross | Kathy | kathy.gross@cityofloveland.org | Kallar Arass |
| Hade | Alison | Alison.Hade@cityofloveland.org | |
| Hale | Betsey | Betsey.Hale@cityofloveland.org | |
| Hilgenberg | Marilyn | Marilyn.Hilgenberg@cityofloveland.org | |
| Holland | Julia | Julia.Holland@cityofloveland.org | |
| Howard | Larry | Larry.Howard@cityofloveland.org | |
| Kamoske | Becky | Becky.Kamoske@cityofloveland.org | |
| Klinger | Bob | bob.klinger@cityofloveland.org | |
| Lessard | Eric | eric.lessard@cityofloveland.org | |
| Licon | Jason | Jason.Licon@cityofloveland.org | |
| Lundquist | Bill | welundquist@gmail.com | |
| Matkins | Chris | chris.matkins@cityofloveland.org | |
| McCrary | Mike | Michael.McCrary@cityofloveland.org | |
| McMillan-Ernst | Ingrid | Ingrid.McMillan-Ernst@cityofloveland.org | |
| Meisel-Burns | Janet | janet.Meisel-Burns@cityofloveland.org | |
| Wercer | Mick | Mick.Mercer@cityofloveland.org | |
| | | | |

LARIMER COUNTY

COMMITTED TO EXCELLENCE

Michael Baker

| | 1 | LARIMER |
|-----------|----|------------|
| COMMITTED | TO | EXCELLENCE |

| | | CTO3 (LT JCn9nu | |
|-------------|------------|--|----------------|
| Last Name | First Name | Email | Signature |
| Miller | Bob | Bob.Miller@cityofloveland.org | |
| Newbanks | Brent | Brent.Newbanks@cityofloveland.org | |
| Reed-Harmel | Brieana | brieana.reed-harmel@citvofloveland.org | |
| Ryan | Heidi | heidi.ryan@cityofloveland.org | |
| Ward | Greg | Greg.Ward@cityofloveland.org | |
| Wensing | Rod | Rod.Wensing@citvofloveland.org | |
| Worthington | Brent | Brent.Worthington@cityofloveland.org | |
| Le SMUUN | Jodi: | Vodi, lessman @ city of laxband. | org (od heren |
| | | C | C |

Michael Baker

| | LARIMER |
|--------------|------------|
| COMMITTED TO | EXCELLENCE |

| Last Name | First Name | Email | Signature |
|-------------------|------------|--|-----------|
| Miller | Bob | Bob.Miller@cityofloveland.org | 9 |
| Newbanks | Brent | Brent.Newbanks@citvofloveland.org | AL & The |
| Reed-Harmel | Drippen | | C WIN |
| Need-Halliel | Brieana | brieana.reed-harmel@cityofloveland.org | |
| Ryan | Heidi | heidi.ryan@cityofloveland.org | |
| Ward | Greg | Greg.Ward@citvofloveland.org | |
| Wensing | Rod | Rod.Wensing@citvofloveland.org | |
| Worthington | Bront | | |
| AA OI CIIIIIBLOII | brent | Brent.Worthington@cityofloveland.org | |
| | | | |





Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Large Team Meeting #3

Where and When

East Training Room at the Larimer County Sheriff's Office, 2501 Midpoint, Fort Collins on October 20th, 2015, 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Attendees

See separate sign-in sheets

Agenda:

1. Welcome and Introductions

Lori Hodges and her consultants from Michael Baker International (Baker) welcomed attendees to this final large planning team meeting and workshop. Attendees were asked to introduce themselves.

2. Project Overview Update: Schedule, Status

As part of their brief slideshow presentation, Baker updated participants on the current status of the planning project, past milestones, and that a draft document was anticipated to be ready by the end of November. Baker then discussed next steps after that: jurisdictional/district/public review & comment, DHSEM/FEMA review, and adoption.

3. Jurisdictional Participation Requirements / Expectations

Baker then reviewed with attendees what the participation requirements were for those jurisdictions and districts that planned to formally adopt the hazard mitigation plan. These have been detailed in all presentations delivered throughout the planning process and include: providing required data, completing project surveys, internal education and outreach, meeting attendance, formulation of new mitigation actions, review and comment on the draft plan, and formal adoption.

4. 2016 Mitigation Actions (Mitigation Action Guide [MAG]) Working Session

Baker then concluded their presentation by walking through the Mitigation Action Guide templates that are being used to document and track new mitigation actions. They then talked through the various types of mitigation actions and provided some examples of each. Following the presentation, attendees were divided up into jurisdictional/district groups to work through finalizing their new 2016 actions. During this working session, the Baker team completed and final necessary project data collection from participants. Baker and Lori then spent the rest of the meeting time bouncing between attendees and providing assistance as needed. Final digital versions of the new MAGs were requested by 10/23.

5. Q&A Session

Post-Meeting Action Items:

- 1. Adopting jurisdictions to complete any remaining surveys
- 2. Adopting jurisdictions to provide digital versions of final MAGs

MBAKERINTL.COM

165 South Union Blvd., Suite 200 | Lakewood, CO 80228 Office: 720.514.1100 | Fax: 720.479.3157





| 015 | Signature | | 1 4 2 1.1 1 a. I | Con all all | April average | and the second of the second s | 14.1.00 | all the second | - 1 und ansance | 11. Still | MAL NON COM | anter > man | Carte | Contraction of the second seco | Control and | Anton that | 2° | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Planning Team Meeting Sign In Sheet - 10/20/20 | Representing | TOWN OF BEETHOUD | Pinesoud Sound's Line | timmath and a truth | TOWN OF LOW MAN | Pouller Carl of Far Pall | Benthic of Fine & O | City at PC Licht Elines | Chy of Fort Colline FRA | NO2THERN LIJATER | P. Hinf Levelouil | | Upper I hempson Sunitation District | (WALENON TO TTI) | LARWER CONT SHERE'S DECKE | 1 as 1 0 1225 02 - 1 | LOWN OF WILL TACK | | | | | | |
| | Last Name | ANDENSON | Wilcos | (Jesteh! us | MICHAELS | COAVIN | CHARIES | Hersem ciler | Green | Ciggens | Shalker | A11. | VIIIV | LESSALL | NHITESEUL | 12nsis | 9 | | | | | | |
| | First Name | Tim | Dick | Anci) | NON | MIRO | Steve | Wills | Diame | JERZY | Michelle | H.W. | 1 and | TAC | < USTIN | 17PW | | | | | | | |





LOVELAND

| tigation Plan | 100/00/01 - took |
|---------------|------------------|
| Σ | 2 |
| Hazard | no Sign |
| County | Meetir |
| mer | Leam |
| Lari | ne |

| | | Planning Team Meeting Sign In Sheet - 10/20/201 | |
|------------|-------------------|---|---------------------------|
| First Name | Last Name | Representing | Signature |
| Steve | Adams | Power | olbright c |
| Shane | Adamson | Ш | |
| Carmen | Bloom | 911 | |
| Leah | Browder | Public Works | |
| John | Burns | 11 | |
| Deb | Callies | City of Loveland | |
| Michael | Ceronski | City of Loveland | |
| Ken | Cooper | Facilities | |
| Christina | Cornelison-Spight | Loveland Risk Management | Planton loud . A 11 |
| Gary | Dahlgren | Streets | Ana ever 1 concersor my W |
| Carie | Dann | Fire | |
| Kimberly | Frick | City of Loveland | |
| Mark | Gaisford | 911 | |
| Greg | George | Building & Planning | |
| Kevin | Gingery | Stormwater | |
| Bettie | Greenberg | HR | |
| Kathy | Gross | City of Loveland | |
| Alison | Hade | Building & Planning | |
| Betsey | Hale | Economic Development | |
| Marilyn | Hilgenberg | Parks & Rec | |
| Julia | Holland | HR | |
| Larry | Howard | Water | |
| Becky | Kamoske | 911 | |
| Bob | Klinger | Police | |











| First Name | Last Name | Representing | |
|------------|----------------|--|--------------|
| - | | Nepresenting Signatu | ture |
| Braden | Applegate | Poudre Valley EMS | |
| Matt | Allen | Upper Thompson Sanitation District | 1. and |
| Kelly | Bernish | Fort Collins | appen |
| Chris | Bieker | Sanitation | |
| Mike | Bielmaier | Chief Medical | |
| Katy | Bigner | City of Fort Collins | |
| Will | Birchfield | Chief Building Official and Floodplain Manager | |
| Mike | Blackwill | Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | |
| Jim | Boizot | Platte River Power Authority | |
| Nate | Boschman | Wildland Restoration Volunteers | |
| Herb | Brady | Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | |
| Jack | Brinkhoff | Town of Wellington | |
| Steve | Charles | Berthoud Fire Protection District | |
| Alison | Chilcott | Community Development | |
| Cory | Christensen | PD Division Chief | |
| Hugh | Collins | Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District | 11001 |
| Susanne | Cordery-Cotter | Colorado State University Facilities Dept. | the well and |
| Kimberly | Culp | 911 Director | |
| Alisa | Darrow | Town Clerk / Asst Town Administrator | 1100 C) |
| Mary | Davis | Estes Valley Recreation and Parks District | wind com |
| Dan | Defibaugh | Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | |
| Scott | Dorman | Fire Chief | |
| Sean | Dougherty | Relator (Public) | |
| | | | |







| | | Planning Team Meeting Sign In Sheet - 10/20/201 | 5 |
|------------|------------|---|------------------------------|
| First Name | Last Name | Representing | Signature |
| Jan | Dowker | Town of Berthoud | Jerature |
| Jim | Duell | Sanitation | |
| Mike | Ellerby | Front Range College - Safety | |
| Corey | Engen | Colorado Riparian Association | |
| Lindsay | Ex | Environmental Planner | |
| Alan | Fraundorf | IT Manager | |
| Rick | Frei | Schools | |
| Eric | Fried | Larimer Building Dept | |
| Mike | Gavin | EM | |
| Kevin | Gertig | Utility Director | |
| April | Getchius | Town of Timnath | |
| Terry | Gilbert | Larimer CountyCommunity Development Director | |
| Jason | Godinez | ARC | |
| Ron | Gonzales | Poudre Fire Prevention | |
| Gary | Green | Wellington FPD | |
| Dave | Groves | City of Fort Collins | |
| Fred | Haberecht | Colorado State University Facilities Dept. | |
| Pete | Hall | Poudre School District Operations Director | |
| Chris | Harris | Water Treatment Facility | |
| Mike | Hart | Berthoud Town Administrator | |
| lon | Haukaas | Stormwater | |
| Tom | Hellen | Johnstown Public Works | and Sull |
| Janelle | Henderson | Larimer Health and Environ. | m win |
| Errin | Henggeller | Cityan Fort Collins | Contract long |
| | | | and the second of the second |





| | | Planning Team Meeting Sign In Sheet - 10/20/201 | 15 |
|------------|-----------------|---|-----------------|
| First Name | Last Name | Representing | Signature |
| Marsha | Hilmes-Robinson | CRS Coordinator | Manual Der Chan |
| Matt | Hines | Estes Valley Recreation and Parks District | the man hours |
| Lori | Hodges | OEM | Min BON |
| Scott | Hummer | North Poudre Irrigation | area o produce |
| Robert | Isaacson | Glacier View Fire Protection District | > |
| Mark | Jackson | Transportation | |
| Gina | Janett | Save the Poudre | |
| Shayna | Jones | Big Thompson R. Restoration Coalition | An autor a Do |
| Lauri | Kadrich | Planning, Development, Transportation Director | A current of |
| Marian | Kelly | Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | il Rose |
| Mark | Kempton | City of Fort Collins | p. 1 mec |
| Tim | Klippert | UC Health Emergency Manager | |
| Jaqueline | Kozak Thiel | Chief Sustainability Officer | |
| Jim | Kubichek | Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | I V. A. A. |
| Wes | Kufeld | Police Chief | fin the call |
| Tina | Kurtz | Estes Park | |
| Frank | Lancaster | Town Administrator | |
| lon | Landkamer | Estes Park Police | |
| Mike | Larson | Thompson Valley EMS | |
| Randy | Lesher | Thompson Valley EMS | |
| Chris | Lochra | Stormwater | |
| Jenne | Loffer | United Way 211 Larimer County | |
| Larry | Lorentzen | Town of Wellington | 1 J |
| Travis | Machalek | Assistant TA | A way |
| | | | |





| | - | Planning Team Meeting Sign In Sheet - 10/20/20 | 15 |
|------------|------------|--|-------------------|
| First Name | Last Name | Representing | Signature |
| Marian | Kelly | Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | |
| Jennifer | Kovecses | Coalition for the Poudre River Watershed | |
| Donn | Maynard | Livermore Fire Protection Dist. | |
| Steve | McFarland | Finance Officer | |
| Shawn | McGaffin | Poudre Fire Prevention | |
| Pat | Mialy | Loveland OEM | L'M Q |
| John | Michaels | Town of Windsor | Le marte |
| Jim | Montague | Poudre Fire GIS | (a man |
| Brian | Moore | Platte River Power Authority | |
| Megan | Nies | Larimer County OEM | |
| Corey | Pass | Commander | |
| Milissa | Peters | Timnath | |
| Mark | Peterson | Engineering | |
| Bob | Poncelow | Poudre Fire Marshall | |
| Ken | Quintana | Colorado State University | V AROH |
| Louis | Rellergert | Environmental Quality | |
| Karen | Reynolds | Boxelder Sanitation District | |
| Mary | Davis | Parks and Recreation District | |
| Eric | Rose | PD | Elle Incon |
| Lisa | Rosintoski | PIO | On my and and and |
| Kate | Rusch | Town of Estes Park | have a al al los |
| Ken | Sampley | Stormwater | |
| Larry | Schneider | Streets Superintendent | |
| Clint | Skutchan | Fort Collins Board of Realtors | |





| | | righting ream integring sign in sheet - 10/20/201 | 5 |
|------------|-----------|---|------------------|
| First Name | Last Name | Representing | Signature |
| Nicholas | Sporer | Fort Collins Streets | |
| Melody | Storgaard | Red Cross | |
| Susan | Strong | Environmental Quality | |
| Jim | Struble | Nothern Colorado Water Conservancy District | |
| Karen | Thompson | Estes Park | |
| Shawn | Tierney | Sustainable Living Association | |
| Joel | Tower | PD Traffic Division Supervisor | |
| Mark | Turner | Thompson Valley EMS | |
| Kelly | Unger | Town of Windsor | |
| John | Vazquez | Town of Windsor | |
| Gerry | Wagner | Red Feather Fire Department | |
| Sherry | Wagner | DD | |
| Angela | Walsh | Platte River Power Authority | |
| Carol | Webb | Water Utility Director | |
| Justin | Whitesell | Sheriff's Office EM/ES | 14 15 14 |
| Richard | Wilcox | Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District | the of the third |
| Gary | Wockner | Save the Poudre | |
| Chris | Wolf | OEM Specialist | - |
| Pete | Wray | Planner | 411(1) |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

-Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan Planning Team Meeting Sign In Sheet - 10/20/





Appendix B – Community Profiles





The following Community Profiles were produced to provide additional, specific information that is unique to each participating jurisdiction included in this Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Town of Berthoud

"Garden Spot of Colorado, where good things grow. A small progressive community which endeavors to provide the quality of life enjoyed by past and present generations while ensuring its position for the future within the dynamic Front Range economic corridor. A town that works together to control its own destiny by being proactive in planning for future growth while preserving and enhancing its rural character."

-- 2014 Berthoud Comprehensive Plan

Berthoud's Comprehensive Plan states that in the face of future population growth and development, the town will remain a small to medium-sized community featuring a "vibrant mixed use commercial and residential core as well as a state-of-the-art mixed use residential, educational, employment and commercial presence at I-25. Downtown will be surrounded by vibrant strong neighborhoods, and regional business and commercial facilities will be featured along U.S. 287, I-25 and Larimer County Road 17. Outside of Berthoud neighborhoods, the rural pattern of development will be a mix of agricultural, open space and large lot residential property. Parks, open spaces, neighborhoods and outlying areas will be connected by community and regional trails." This vision will guide planning and development decisions as well as future hazard mitigation and risk reduction activities in and around the town.

Community Profile

The Town of Berthoud is located north of the Little Thompson River and west of Interstate 25 between Longmont and Loveland. The town is located in both Larimer and Weld counties. Berthoud is a small community surrounded by mostly farmland. Rich in agricultural history (wheat was the first crop to be gown, followed by alfalfa and beets), Berthoud quickly became an agricultural center of Larimer County.





LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN



The following table summarizes key demographic and development related characteristics of the Town of Berthoud.

| Town of Berthoud Statistics | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| | Town of Berthoud | Colorado | | | | |
| Population, 2010 | 5,105 | 5,029,196 | | | | |
| 2000-2010 Population Change, % | 5% | 14.5% | | | | |
| % Population under 5 years, 2010 | 5.2% | 6.8% | | | | |
| % Population under 19 years, 2010 | 29.1% | 20.3% | | | | |
| % Population 65 years and over, 2010 | 12.4% | 10.9% | | | | |
| Language other than English spoken at home, % age 5+, 2009-2013 | 5.6% | 15.9% | | | | |
| Homeownership Rate 2010 | 75.1% | 65.5% | | | | |
| Persons Per Household 2010 | 2.5 | 2.57 | | | | |
| Persons below poverty level, %, 2013 | 9.3% | 13.2% | | | | |
| Median Household Income, 2013 | \$64,025 | \$58,433 | | | | |

US Census 2010





Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The Town of Berthoud is situated in both Larimer and Weld Counties. For the purpose of this plan, spatially analyzed hazard risks have been assessed for the areas of the town that lie specifically within Larimer County.

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 3.00 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.70 |
| Tornado | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.40 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 2.30 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.20 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.10 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.90 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.70 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.50 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.00 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.00 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.00 |

HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Hazmat – Fixed and Transport

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Tornado; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Civil Disturbance; Biological Hazards / Contagion

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Utility Disruption; Fire – Wildland; Flood – Flash and Riverine; Earthquake; Erosion / Deposition; Landslide / Rockslide





Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Town of Berthoud, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Town of Berthoud.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Town of Berthoud's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.





Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

The Town of Berthoud is characterized by a mix of medium-low to low levels of social vulnerability. A closer look at the individual social vulnerability indicators within the town will give local emergency





⁵⁵ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)
managers, planners, and stakeholders an even clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on the community and its resiliency. It is important that the town continue to monitor social vulnerability levels over time as demographics and economics change in the area. To do so, local census data can be tracked for each of the social vulnerability indicators outlined in Chapter 4 of the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Town of Berthoud has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Town of Berthoud is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Berthoud can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes 5,105 people, or 100% of the Town's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the town. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the Town's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Town of Berthoud including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of Berthoud.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Town of Berthoud will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in town at least once every year.





Hazmat – Fixed and Transport

Previous Occurrences

Based on data supplied by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's (PHMSA) Incident Reports Database there has been 1 reported HAZMAT incidents within the Town of Berthoud between 1971 and 2015. There were no injuries or fatalities resulting from the incident.

Inventory Exposed

We can't accurately predict when or where a HAZMAT incident may occur. Therefore, for the purpose of this plan, all existing and future buildings, facilities, and populations in the Town of Berthoud are considered to be equally exposed and couple potentially be impacted. This includes 299,630 people, or 100% of the Town's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the Town.

When hazardous materials are being transported they are particularly vulnerability to transportation related accidents, misuse, or terrorist threats. Most hazardous materials are transported in large quantities in order to reduce costs and security is difficult to maintain around moving vehicles that cross jurisdictional boundaries. When transported close to populated areas or critical infrastructure, HAZMAT releases can have serious consequences. The inventory that is most often exposed to HAZMAT risks are railways, roadways, and fixed facilities that contain hazardous materials, and all assets that lie within a mile of the potential release areas.

Potential Losses

HAZMAT related events occur throughout the Town of Berthoud every year. The intensity and magnitude of these incidents depend on weather conditions, the location of the event, the time of day, and the process by which the materials are released. *Was is raining when the event happened? Were the hazardous materials being transported by rail when they were released or were they at a fixed facility? Did the spill happen during rush hour traffic or in the middle of the night?* All of these considerations matter when determining the risk and potential damages associated with a HAZMAT incident.

HAZMAT events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. Moreover, HAZMAT incidents can cause serious environmental contamination to non-renewable resources such as air, ground, and water sources.

Probability of Future Occurrences

As with most hazards that have limited spatial predictability or warning time, the probability of future occurrences of HAZMAT events is difficult to predict. However, as development continues to encroach into existing industrial areas and becomes more dense along high-risk designated hazardous materials transportation routes, the risk of future occurrences becomes greater. Even if the frequency of HAZMAT spills remains the same over time, population growth will increase the probability of a disaster event.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Town of Berthoud to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the Town's hazard mitigation program.





<u>Local Personnel</u>

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the town's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain Administrator | | | Х |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | | Х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the town's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | - |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | - |
| A Stormwater Plan | Ν |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Ν |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Ν |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | - |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance. In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and codes. The Town of Berthoud has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Town of Berthoud has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the town will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.





| "The Town, Fire District and Sheriff's Department will meet at a minimum annually to discuss items that need to be updated and look at progress of actio items. All items with budgetary requirements would need to be approved by the Town of Berthoud | Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|--|------------------|--|
| <i>"The Town will post information on the website and utilize the marketing and communications firm to get information to citizens and businesses."</i> | Town of Berthoud | "The Town, Fire District and Sheriff's Department will meet at a minimum annually to discuss items that need to be updated and look at progress of action items. All items with budgetary requirements would need to be approved by the Town Board of Trustees." "The Town will post information on the website and utilize the marketing and communications firm to get information to citizens and businesses." |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Town of Berthoud based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|------------------|---|
| Town of Berthoud | "The Town has a Comprehensive Master Plan that is continually updated. All actions will be documented or planned in advance. Budgeted items will be reviewed annually." |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present Berthoud's mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Town of Berthoud: Full Adoption of Updated FEMA Floodplains | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Priority 1 HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | | | | |
| LOCATION: Town of Berthoud GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives A, B, C, D and | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2020 | | | | |
| ISSUE: Floodplain mapping is out of date and the 2013 Flood caused extensive changes to current | | | | |
| floodplains. The Little Thompson River has never been mapped. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Work with FEMA on updating current floodplain mapping in coordination with | | | | |
| Larimer County. | | | | |
| ACTION: By 2020, the Little Thompson River through the Town of Berthoud will be mapped and | | | | |
| adopted by FEMA. | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Berthoud | EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Colorado State Flood | | | |
| Community Development and Office of | Hazard Mapping Project | | | |
| Emergency Management | | | | |





PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Little Thompson Floodplain Mapped
- Review and Comment Period / Public Review Process
- Community Outreach
- Follow the County process for zoning changes per county policy (Flood Review Board, Planning Commission, BCC, etc.)

| Town of Berthoud: Flood Recovery Mitigation | n Activities | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: 2 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm | | | |
| LOCATION: 2013 Flood Impacted Areas | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, and 5 | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives B, C, and E | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2018 | | | | |
| ISSUE: The Town of Berthoud and surrounding areas continue to move through the recovery from the | | | | |
| 2013 Flood. Many projects remain unfinished, allowing the Town of Berthoud to look at mitigation | | | | |
| opportunities for the future. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Assess all unfinished recovery projects for possible mitigation opportunities and | | | | |
| implement alternatives when appropriate | | | | |
| ACTION: Include mitigation alternatives in flood recovery efforts whenever possible | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Berthoud | EXPECTED COST: Cost will depend upon each specific | | | |
| | recovery project | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Public | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: FEMA Public | | | |
| Works Division, Community Development | Assistance funding, HMGP funding, county resources | | | |
| Division and Office of Emergency | | | | |
| Management | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | | | |
| Assess all unfinished flood recovery projects for mitigation alternatives | | | | |

- Work with CDOT and FHWA on joint projects where mitigation opportunities are warranted
- Incorporate mitigation actions into future town efforts and infrastructure upgrades

| Town of Berthoud / Emergency Operations Plan (Berthoud – 1) | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Priority 3 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land | | |
| | Subsidence or large sinkholes, Extreme Temperatures, | | |
| | Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, Structural and | | |
| | Wildland Fire, Public Health Emergencies, Hazardous | | |
| | Material Releases, Civil Unrest and Terrorist Attack | | |
| LOCATION: 328 Massachusetts Ave., | GOALS ADDRESSED: The following goals are addressed; | | |
| Berthoud, CO 80513 | Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3, Goal 4 and Goal 5. | | |





| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/19/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: The following objectives are |
|---|---|
| | addressed; Objective A, Objective B, Objective C, |
| | Objective D and Objective E. |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: | 02/01/2016 |
| ISSUE: The Town of Berthoud does not have a | an "Emergency Operations Plan." |
| RECOMMENDATION: Review the Larimer Cou | nty Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, draft |
| an emergency operations plan for the Town of | of Berthoud. |
| ACTION: Adopt the Larimer County Comprehe | ensive Emergency Management Plan, draft as an Annex |
| an Emergency Operations Plan for the Town of | of Berthoud for adoption and implementation. |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Berthoud | EXPECTED COST: Minimal, staff time |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Revenues from |
| Sheriff's Office, Larimer County, CO | property and sales taxes / Grants |
| Berthoud Fire Protection District, Berthoud, | |
| СО | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project Funding | |

| Town of Berthoud / Continuity of Operations Plan (Berthoud – 2) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Priority 4 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land Subsidence or large sinkholes, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, Structural and Wildland Fire, Public Health Emergencies, Hazardous Material Releases, Civil Unrest and Terrorist Attack | | | |
| LOCATION: 328 Massachusetts Ave., | GOALS ADDRESSED: The following goals are addressed; | | | |
| Berthoud, Co 80513 (Town of Berthoud, Town Limits) | Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3, Goal 4 and Goal 5. | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/19/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: The following objectives are addressed; Objective A, Objective B, Objective C, Objective D and Objective E. | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: | 06/30/2016 | | | |
| ISSUE: The Town of Berthoud does not have a | Continuity of Operations Plan. | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Draft a Continuity of Op | perations Plan through committee involvement. | | | |
| ACTION: Draft and adopt a Continuity of Open | rations Plan for the Town of Berthoud. | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Berthoud | EXPECTED COST: Staff time, minimal cost | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Office of Emergency Management , Larimer County, CO Berthoud Fire Protection District, Berthoud, CO | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Revenues from property and sales tax / Grants | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project Funding | | | | |

Town of Berthoud / Severe Weather Warning System (Berthoud – 3)





| PRIORITY: Priority 5 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Severe Weather and Tornado | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| LOCATION: 328 Massachusetts Ave., | GOALS ADDRESSED: The following goals are addressed; | | | |
| Berthoud, CO | Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3, Goal 4 and Goal 5. | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/19/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: The following Objectives are | | | |
| | addressed; Objective A, Objective B, Objective C, | | | |
| | Objective D and Objective E. | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: | 12/31/2020 | | | |
| ISSUE: The Town of Berthoud does not have | a severe weather warning system. An F3 tornado strike | | | |
| an area south west of the Town of Berthoud | in June, 2014. | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: To secure funding to co | ontract the design and installation of a severe weather | | | |
| warning system for the Town of Berthoud to | include all annexed areas. | | | |
| ACTION: Contact vendors who design and ins | tall severe weather warning systems, obtain funding | | | |
| through a grant or donations and award a bio | l to complete the project. | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Berthoud | EXPECTED COST: \$219,273 | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Office | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Grants / Donations | | | |
| of Emergency Management, Larimer | | | | |
| County, CO | | | | |
| Berthoud Fire Protection District, Berthoud, | | | | |
| СО | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Grant Feasibility | | | | |

| Jurisdiction or Organization: Town of Berthoud, Update Snow Removal Plan (Berthoud – 4) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Priority 6 HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Extreme Temperatures, Se | | | | |
| Storm, Public Health | | | | |
| LOCATION: Project location GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/15/2016 OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, B, C, and E | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 10/15/2017 | | | | |
| ISSUE: The Town needs to update the snow removal policy and coordinate with the County | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Written document explaining snow removal procedures based on accumulation | | | | |
| and road conditions | | | | |
| ACTION: A written plan adopted by the governing body and accessible by the public online and at | | | | |
| Town facilities | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Berthoud | EXPECTED COST: Staff time/minimal cost | | | |
| UPPORT AGENCIES: Sheriff's Department, POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: None necessa | | | | |
| Larimer County | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Draft, final and adoption of the document are the major milestone | | | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate

Town of Berthoud 328 Massachusetts Ave. P.O. Box 1229 Berthoud, CO 80513-2229 Ph. 970-532-2643 Fax 970-532-0640

LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

November 26, 2014

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (JIMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans, the Town of Berthoud is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that Town of Berthoud has agreed to participate in the Latimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning. Town of Berthoud agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely number to Latimer County OFM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Town of Berthoud understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's Local Mitigation Planning Handbook dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning
 process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any
 planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on
 drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understancing of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Iurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I Ian Dowker, Mayor Pro-Tem, hereby advise you that the Town of Benbuud intends to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this Zerilay of November, 2014 Jan Dowker, Mayor Pro-Tem







Berthoud Fire Protection District

"To Serve, To Care, To Support" – Mission Statement, Berthoud Fire Protection District

Community Profile

The Berthoud Fire Protection District is a Special District under Title 32, Colorado Revised Statutes. The District celebrated 125 years of service to the Berthoud community in 2013. The District serves more than 17,500 residents within its 103 square mile area. Fire protection, emergency medical, rescue, hazardous material response and emergency management services are provided to portions of Larimer, Weld and Boulder Counties. The District has maintained a vision to provide the highest quality and cost effective service, community involvement, and excellence as a public service agency to the Town of Berthoud and surrounding area.



Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

Berthoud Fire Protection District is situated in both Larimer and Weld Counties. For the purpose of this plan, spatially analyzed hazard risks have been assessed for the areas of the district that lie specifically within Larimer County.

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.





| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3.10 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.80 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.50 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.50 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.40 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.30 |
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.30 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.80 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.30 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.30 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.30 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.30 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | : Winter Storm (| Blizzard Co | nditions, H | eavy Snow Ad | cumulation); | Spring / |

Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Fire – Wildland; Flood – Flash and Riverine;

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Utility Disruption; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Tornado

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Biological Hazards / Contagion; Civil Disturbance; Earthquake; Erosion / Deposition; Landslide / Rockslide

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Berthoud Fire Protection District, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Berthoud Fire Protection District.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the





county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Berthoud Fire Protection District's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the district.



Social Vulnerability Map – Berthoud Fire Protection District⁵⁶

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

Berthoud Fire Protection District is characterized by a mix of medium-low to low levels of social vulnerability. A deeper-dive into the individual social vulnerability indicators within the district will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders an even clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on the community and its resiliency. It is important





⁵⁶ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

that the District continue to monitor social vulnerability levels over time as demographics and economics change in the area.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Berthoud Fire Protection District has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Berthoud Fire Protection District is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Berthoud Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes more than 17,500 people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Berthoud Fire Protection District including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Berthoud Fire Protection District.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Berthoud Fire Protection District will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the district at least once every year.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there was 1 reported injury, and no reported deaths, property damage, or crop damage in the Berthoud Fire Protection District due to hail. There have been





18 hail events reported in the District between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.





According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no injuries, deaths, property loss or crop loss in the Berthoud Fire Protection District due to thunderstorm wind. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on Larimer County, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time in the District.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there has been 1 lightning event in the Berthoud Fire Protection District between 1996 and 2014. There have been no reported injuries, deaths, property damage, or crop damage resulting from lightning events within the district.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 8 windstorm events in the Berthoud Fire Protection District between 1996 and 2014. There have been no reported injuries, deaths, property damage, or crop damage resulting from a windstorm event.





⁵⁷ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf



Historical High Wind Events in Berthoud Fire Protection District⁵⁸

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Berthoud Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes more than 17,500 people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures





⁵⁸ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Berthoud Fire Protection District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Berthoud Fire Protection District. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Berthoud Fire Protection District will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Berthoud Fire Protection District at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Berthoud Fire Protection District experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 8 severe wind events since 1996, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.





Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported wildfire events in the Berthoud Fire Protection District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on Larimer County, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time in the Berthoud Fire Protection District.

Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones in the district are located in the western region, in areas where there are lower population densities.



Berthoud Fire Protection District Wildfire Hazard Zone Map⁵⁹

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the western and central region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





⁵⁹ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.



Berthoud Fire Protection District Wildfire Risk Index Map⁶⁰

There are a number of areas in the central and western region of the district that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





⁶⁰ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.



Berthoud Fire Protection District WUI Map⁶¹

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Berthoud Fire Protection District depends. There are no identified critical facilities located in areas with the *moderate-high* wildfire threat total.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Berthoud Fire Protection District. The appraisal value of the structures within these *moderate-high* threat areas is approximately \$8,986,171. The risk assessment uses





⁶¹ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide, within Berthoud Fire Protection District values present span this entire range.

worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.



Berthoud Fire Protection District Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Berthoud Fire Protection District that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.







Flood – Flash and Riverine

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported injuries, property loss, or crop damage in the Berthoud Fire Protection District caused by flooding. On September 12, 2013 there were two reported deaths caused by flooding. From September 12-16, 2013 nearly 6-18 inches of rain fell across Colorado's front range and I-25 corridor. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for flooding events to occur at any given time.





⁶² This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.



Berthoud Fire Protection District 2013 Flood Extent⁶³

Maximum flood extent—a key data need for disaster response and mitigation—is rarely quantified due to storm-related cloud cover and the low temporal resolution of optical sensors. While change detection approaches can circumvent these issues through the identification of inundated land and soil from post-flood imagery, their accuracy can suffer in the narrow and complex channels of increasingly developed and heterogeneous floodplains. The data depicted above is from a study that explored the utility of the Operational Land Imager (OLI) and Independent Component Analysis (ICA) for addressing these challenges in the unprecedented 2013 Flood along the Colorado Front Range, USA. The approach was able to simultaneously distinguish flood-related water and soil moisture from pre-existing water bodies and other spectrally similar classes within the narrow and braided channels of the study site.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."





⁶³ Multi-Temporal Independent Component Analysis and Landsat 8 for Delineating Maximum Extent of the 2013 Colorado Front Range Flood

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are no critical facilities and 12 parcels/structures in the Berthoud Fire Protection District that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of these exposed structures is over \$2.8 million dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Berthoud Fire Protection District that for a 100-year flood event, approximately 12 buildings will experience flood damage. The estimated building loss is over \$343 thousand dollars, content loss over \$313 thousand dollars, and inventory loss \$189.5 thousand dollars.



Berthoud Fire Protection District 1% Annual Flood Loss Estimation and Flood Depth Grid Map⁶⁴





⁶⁴ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Berthoud Fire Protection District provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the District will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the district. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Berthoud Fire Protection District to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the district's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the district's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | ^ |
| Community Planner | | | Х |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | | Х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the district's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Ν |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Ν |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Ν |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Y |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |





| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Ν |
|---------------------------|---|
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance. In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and codes. The Berthoud Fire Protection District has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Berthoud Fire Protection District has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the District will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|---------------------|--|
| | "Our mitigation actions will be reviewed by staff and the District's Board of |
| | Directors on annual basis." |
| Berthoud Fire | |
| Protection District | |
| | <i>"Changes to our mitigation actions and priorities will be announced publically and posted on the District's website for public review and comment."</i> |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Berthoud Fire Protection District based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Berthoud Fire Protection District | "We will continue to identify specific hazards in our community and address them by completing a risk and vulnerability assessment, policy and/or codes will be adopted to address the issues." |
| | <i>"We've completed a Community Wildfire Protection Plan and an R / A on the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad which transverses our community."</i> |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present the District's mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Berthoud Fire Protection District / Emergency Operations Plan (Berthoud FPD – 1) | | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Priority 1 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land Subsidence or large sinkholes, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, Structural and Wildland Fire, Public Health Emergencies, Hazardous Material Releases, Civil Unrest and Terrorist Attack | |
| LOCATION: 275 Mountain Ave., Berthoud, CO 80513 | GOALS ADDRESSED: The following goals are addressed; Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3, Goal 4 and Goal 5. | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/19/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: The following objectives are addressed; Objective A, Objective B, Objective C, Objective D and Objective E. | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 02/01/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: The Berthoud Fire Protection District does not have an "Emergency Operations Plan." | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Review the Larimer County Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, draft an emergency operations plan for the Berthoud Fire Protection District. | | |
| ACTION: Adopt the Larimer County Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, draft as an Annex an Emergency Operations Plan for the Berthoud Fire Protection District for adoption and implementation. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Berthoud Fire Protection District | EXPECTED COST: 58 staff hours / staff cost \$3,322 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Sheriff's Office, Larimer County, CO | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: District revenues from property taxes (gas/oil included) / specific ownership taxes / Grants | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project Funding | | |





| Berthoud Fire Protection District / Continuity of Operations Plan (Berthoud FPD – 2) | | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Priority 2 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land Subsidence or large sinkholes, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, Structural and Wildland Fire, Public Health Emergencies, Hazardous Material Releases, Civil Unrest and Terrorist Attack | |
| LOCATION: 275 Mountain Ave., Berthoud, Co 80513 | GOALS ADDRESSED: The following goals are addressed; Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3, Goal 4 and Goal 5. | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/19/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: The following objectives are addressed; Objective A, Objective B, Objective C, Objective D and Objective E. | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 06/30/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: The Berthoud Fire Protection District does not have a Continuity of Operations Plan. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Draft a Continuity of Operations Plan through committee involvement. | | |
| ACTION: Draft and adopt a Continuity of Operations Plan for the Berthoud Fire Protection District. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Berthoud Fire Protection District | EXPECTED COST: 107 staff hours / staff cost \$6,094 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Office of Emergency Management , Larimer County, CO | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: District revenues from property taxes (gas/oil included) and specific ownership taxes / Grants | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project Funding | | |

Berthoud Fire Protection District / Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Threat and Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan (Berthoud FPD – 3)

| PRIORITY: Priority 3 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Chemical Fire, Public Health |
|--|---|
| | Emergencies and Hazardous Material Release |
| LOCATION: 275 Mountain Ave., Berthoud, | GOALS ADDRESSED: The following goals are addresses; |
| CO 80513 | Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3, Goal 4 and Goal 5. |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/19/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: The following objectives are |
| | addressed; Objective A, Objective B, Objective C, |
| | Objective D and Objective E. |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 08/01/2016

ISSUE: The Berthoud Fire Protection District has identified the need to update the 2011 Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Threat and Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan.

RECOMMENDATION: Update the 2011 Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Threat and Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan.

ACTION: Review current plan, complete risk identification and risk analysis, assess vulnerability and plan mitigation strategies.





| LEAD AGENCY: Berthoud Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: 40 staff hours / staff cost \$2,278 |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| District | The Blue Cell, LLC cost \$3,500 / total cost \$5,778 |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: The Blue Cell, LLC. | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: District revenues from property taxes (gas/oil revenue included) and specific ownership taxes / grants |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project Funding. | |

| Berthoud Fire Protection District / Community Wildfire Protection Plan (Berthoud FPD – 4) | | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: Priority 4 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Wildfire / Urban Interface Wildfire | |
| LOCATION: 275 Mountain Ave., Berthoud, CO 80513 | GOALS ADDRESSED: The following goals are addressed; Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3, Goal 4 and Goal 5. | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/19/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: The following objectives are addressed; Objective A, Objective B, Objective C, Objective D and Objective E. | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/30/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: The Berthoud Fire Protection District has identified the need to update the District's 2007 Community Wildfire Plan. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Contact Anchor Point Fire Management, Boulder, CO to contract the update of this plan with staff assistance. | | |
| ACTION: Contact Chris White of Anchor Point Fire Management and request a bid to update the 2007 Community Wildfire Protection Plan. The purpose of the Community Wildfire Protection Plan is risk analysis, fire behavior analysis and community wildfire hazard rating (WHR). The results of the Community Wildfire Protection Plan is to provide a comprehensive, scientifically-based assessment of the wildfire hazards and risk within our jurisdiction. | | |
| The LEAD AGENCY: Berthoud Fire Protection District | EXPECTED COST: staff hours 40 / staff cost \$2,012 Anchor Point Fire Management \$3,750 / total cost \$5,752 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Sheriff's Office, Emergency Services Anchor Point Fire Management, Boulder, CO | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: District revenues from property taxes (gas/oil revenue included) and specific ownership taxes | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project Funding | | |

| Berthoud Fire Protection District / Standard of Cover (Berthoud FPD – 5) | |
|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Priority 5 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land |
| | Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe |
| | Storm, Wind & Tornado, Structural and Wildland Fire, |
| | Public Health Emergencies, Hazardous Material |
| | Releases, Civil Unrest and Terrorist Attacks |





| LOCATION: 275 Mountain Ave., Berthoud, | GOALS ADDRESSED: The following goals are addresses; | |
|---|---|--|
| CO 80513 | Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3, Goal 4 and Goal 5. | |
| | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/19/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: The following objectives are | |
| | addressed; Objective A, Objective B, Objective C, | |
| | Objective D and Objective E. | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 10/31/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: The Berthoud Fire Protection District h | has identified the need to update the District's 2014 | |
| Standard of Cover. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Update the 2014 Standard of Cover. | | |
| ACTION: Review current plan, complete a deployment analysis that determines the distribution and | | |
| concentration of fixed and mobile resources of the District. The Standard of Cover will include, | | |
| through research, risk assessment, critical task analysis, agency service level objectives, and | | |
| distribution and concentration measures. The Standard of Cover will also provide documentation of | | |
| reliability studies and historical performance and conclude with policy recommendations. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Berthoud Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: staff hours 80 / staff cost \$4,556 | |
| District | National Fire Services Office cost \$3,500 / total cost | |
| | \$8,056 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: National Fire Services | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: District revenues from | |
| Office, Sylvania, Georgia | property taxes (gas/oil revenue included) and specific | |
| | ownership taxes / Grants | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project Funding | | |





| Berthoud Fire Protection District / Operational Response Guidelines & Policy (Berthoud FPD – 6) | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Priority 6 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land | | | | | |
| | Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe | | | | | |
| | Storm, Wind & Tornado, Structural and Wildland Fire, | | | | | |
| | Public Health Emergencies, Hazardous Materials | | | | | |
| | Release, Civil Unrest and Terrorist Attacks | | | | | |
| LOCATION: 275 Mountain Ave., Berthoud, | GOALS ADDRESSED: [posted on website, use number] | | | | | |
| CO 80513 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/19/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: [posted on website, use | | | | | |
| | letter] | | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 06/30/2016 | | | | | | |
| ISSUE: The Berthoud Fire Protection District has identified the need to update the District's | | | | | | |
| Operational Response Guidelines. | | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Update the District's Operational Response Guidelines. | | | | | | |
| ACTION: Contract with Lexipol, LLC of Aliso Viejo, California to work with staff to develop new | | | | | | |
| operating guidelines. | | | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Berthoud Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: staff hours 160 hours / staff cost | | | | | |
| District | \$3,884 / Lexipol, LLC cost \$3,836 / total cost \$7,720 | | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Lexipol, LLC, Aliso | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: District revenues from | | | | | |
| Viejo, California | property taxes (gas/oil revenue included) and specific | | | | | |
| | ownership taxes / Grants | | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project Funding | | | | | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



LETTER OF INTENT TO PARATICIPATE

September 16, 2014

Larimer County Office of Emergency Management Lori R. Hodges, Director 300 West Oak Street, 2º4 Floor Fort Collins, CO 80522-1190

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in Larimer County Office of Emergency Management, Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (JIMP)

Dear Director Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Kazard Mitigation Plan (ILMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6 which specifically identify criteria that allow fur multi-jurisdictional mitigation plan, the Berthoud Pire Protection District is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that Larimer County Office of Emergency Management has agreed to participate in the Larimer County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, Berthoud Fire Protection District agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to the Larimer County Office of Emergency Management, to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Berthoud Fire Protection District understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's Local Mitigation Planning Handbook dated March 2013 including but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they
 differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be intentified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for
 participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of
 participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending
 meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts
 of the plan. etc);
- Documentation of an effective process, to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Box 570 • 275 Mountair. Ave. • Berthoud, CO 80513 (970) 532-2264 Phone • (970) 537-4744 Fax • www.berthoudfire.org





Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District

Community Profile

The Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District (CLFPD) covers an area of approximately 4,800 acres and is surrounded by the Roosevelt National Forest fifty miles northwest of Fort Collins. The vegetation at this elevation (8,000 to 9,500 feet) ranges from grassy meadows to stands of aspen and pine and there are several lakes in the area. The District encompasses more than 600 cabins and residences on 1,700 lots, a community center, a small mountain resort (Beaver Meadows and associated land), and approximately 95 miles of unpaved roads. The only road in and out of the District is North County Road 73C, which is in good condition south of the district, but is often difficult to pass to the north-east (it becomes primarily single-lane, gets very rough, and has several hairpin turns). This results in the community having only one viable evacuation route (except for those driving high-clearance 4WD vehicles). There is a private dirt airstrip which is owned by Hank's Flying Service, Inc., north of Ottawa Way at Tami Road.

The fire district's community partners are Crystal Lakes Water & Sewer Association and Crystal Lakes Road & Recreation Association. Water & Sewer handles the Water Mitigation Plan for the area, maintaining several man-made lakes and reservoirs. Only a couple of dozen properties in the district have water and sewer-line service. All other properties are on wells/cisterns and septic systems/vaults. There is one hydrant (gravity-fed) near the community center. The primary source of water for firefighting activities is drafting out of the lakes. The large reservoir called Crystal Lakes (aka: Panhandle Reservoir) has an earthen dam, with approximately four dozen properties in the floodplain area below it. The Road & Recreation Association handles snowplowing and maintenance of the community roads, and has opened a slash-disposal depot for property owner use. They also maintain large tracts of community-owned greenbelts, mitigation of which is ongoing. There is a great deal of fire mitigation that needs to be done in this community, both on the publicly owned greenbelts and the privately owned lots. The pine beetle infestation of recent years has killed off a number of trees, and mitigation efforts are ongoing.







Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Fire – Wildland | 1.2 | 1.05 | 0.80 | 0.4 | 0.35 | 3.8 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3.25 |
| Utility Disruption | 1.05 | 0.6 | 0.70 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.95 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.05 | 0.6 | 0.60 | 0.15 | 0.25 | 2.65 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.50 | 0.3 | 0.25 | 2.55 |





| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.75 | 0.6 | 0.30 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 2.25 | |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.75 | 0.6 | 0.30 | 0.35 | 0.15 | 2.15 | |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.75 | 0.3 | 0.40 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.95 | |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.6 | 0.45 | 0.30 | 0.35 | 0.15 | 1.85 | |
| Earthquake | 0.45 | 0.3 | 0.30 | 0.4 | 0.25 | 1.7 | |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.45 | 0.3 | 0.30 | 0.3 | 0.15 | 1.5 | |
| Tornado | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.20 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Fire – Wildland: Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow | | | | | | | |

Accumulation); Utility Disruption; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Flood – Flash and Riverine

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Biological Hazards / Contagion; Landslide / Rockslide; Erosion / Deposition

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Earthquake; Civil Disturbance; Tornado

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.







Social Vulnerability Map – Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District⁶⁵

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District is characterized by medium-low levels of social vulnerability. Continual monitoring of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the district will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders an even clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on the community and its resiliency. It is important that the district continue to monitor social vulnerability levels over time as demographics and economics change in the area.





⁶⁵ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

Crystal Lakes has experienced large wildfire events caused by small plane crashes, both of which took place several decades ago. The most recent substantial wildfire took place in September of 2015, burning approximately twenty acres and no structures. According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported wildfire events within the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts near the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time within the District.





Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones are located in areas across the district. These areas are where there are lower population densities.





⁶⁶ Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.



Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District Wildfire Hazard Zone Map⁶⁷

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the southern region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





⁶⁷ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.


Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District Wildfire Risk Index Map⁶⁸

There are a number of areas in the southeastern region of the district that are within the medium level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





⁶⁸ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.



Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District WUI Map⁶⁹

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District depends. There are no areas of most negative wildfire threat according to the WUI Risk Index. There are areas of medium threat. There are no identified critical facilities or parcels located in areas with the *most negative and second most negative* wildfire threat total.





⁶⁹ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP dataset was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide, within the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District values present span from 1 to 6.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the CLFPD that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District has experienced 264 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County above 6,000 feet. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District.





Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the district at least once every year.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District does not currently track incidences of utility disruption.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the District.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.

Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Crystal Lake Fire Protection District.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries, deaths, property loss or crop loss in Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District due to hail. There have been historic hail events less than 5 miles from the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts near the District, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.







Historical Hail Events near Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District⁷⁰

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no injuries, deaths, or reported losses in Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District due to thunderstorm wind between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts near the district, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no lightning events in Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District between 1996 and 2014.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries, deaths, property loss or crop loss in Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District due to high wind. There have been historic high wind events less than 5 miles from the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts near the District, there is a great potential for high wind events to occur at any given time.

⁷⁰ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf









Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants





⁷¹ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of severe wind events in Larimer County, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Flood – Flash and Riverine

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported injuries or deaths in the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District caused by flooding. There are no identified special flood hazard areas within the district.





Inventory Exposed

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are no critical facility or parcels/structures in the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure).

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District that for a 100-year flood event, no buildings will experience flood damage.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Crystal Lake Fire Protection District provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the District will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding near the district has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the District's hazard mitigation program.

<u>Local Personnel</u>

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the District's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | |
| Administrator | | | Х |
| Community Planner | | | Х |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | | Х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the district's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.





| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | N |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | - |
| A Stormwater Plan | - |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | - |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | - |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | - |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance. In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and codes. The Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the district will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|---|--|
| Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | "As an all-volunteer fire district, we are limited in our ability to work on these kinds of projects. Community education efforts will continue to be undertaken by the fire department officers and monitored by the district board." |
| | <i>"The district has an email list for contacting community members and will work with them and the local homeowners' associations in the planning process."</i> |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.





| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|---|---|
| Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | "We can incorporate hazard mitigation into community education efforts and encourage community participation in mitigation. We have no authority over local ordinances, community association rules, how community money is spent, etc, so we're limited in our planning options." |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present the District's mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District: Community Outreach (Crystal Lakes FPD – 1) | | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Fire | |
| LOCATION: Crystal Lakes | GOALS ADDRESSED: 2, 4 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: ongoing | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, B | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: ongoing | | |
| ISSUE: Property owners in the Crystal Lakes district need education in the most effective fire | | |
| mitigation steps to take, when and how to safely evacuate in case of flood or fire, how to sign up for | | |
| LETA, and how to ensure that their insurance is sufficient to allow them to recover from a disaster. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Community outreach and education efforts. | | |
| ACTION: Hold regular educational meetings covering the subjects of fire mitigation, evacuation, and | | |
| property insurance. These meetings to take place on multiple occasions during the summer (when | | |
| more property owners are in the area). | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Crystal Lakes Volunteer Fire | EXPECTED COST: Staffing for each meeting (all | |
| Department | volunteer): one presenter, 2-3 people to set up/tear | |
| | down meeting area. Having a LETA rep on hand for at | |
| | least some of the presentations is helpful. Cost: | |
| | funding for copying and purchase of educational | |
| | handouts and refreshments. \$1500 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: LETA, possibly LCES | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Crystal Lakes Fire | |
| | Protection District; possible grants for materials costs. | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Continue to hold 4-5 presentations each summer, covering the subjects of | | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Continue to hold 4-5 presentations each summer, covering the subjects of fire mitigation, evacuation, and property insurance.

| Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District: Fire Mitigation Assessments (Crystal Lakes FPD – 2) | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire | |

| LOCATION: Crystal Lakes | GOALS ADDRESSED: 2, 4 |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: ongoing | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, B, E |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: ongoing

ISSUE: Property owners in the Crystal Lakes district need education in the most effective fire mitigation steps to take and assistance in determining if they've done all they can to mitigate their property.

RECOMMENDATION: One-on-one mitigation assessments.

ACTION: Provide fire mitigation assessments to district property owners. At the request of local property owners, teams of two or more members of the fire department will meet with them to tour their property and provide mitigation advice and assessment.

| LEAD AGENCY: Crystal Lakes Volunteer Fire | EXPECTED COST: Staffing (all volunteer) of two- |
|---|--|
| Department | member teams for assessments throughout the year |





| | (with the majority in the summer). Funding for copying and purchasing educational handouts . \$750 |
|-------------------|--|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District; grants for materials costs. |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Continue to provide assessments to property owners upon request, performing each assessment within two weeks of request as often as possible.

| Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District: Fire Mitigation of Privately Owned Land (Crystal Lakes FPD – 3) | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire | |
| LOCATION: Crystal Lakes | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 4 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 2016 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, B, E | |
| | | |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: ongoing

ISSUE: Many privately owned areas in the Crystal Lakes community are in serious need of fire mitigation, and funding and resources for mitigation are lacking. The population is older, with half or more of all properties owned by retirees, and many people either lack the ability to mitigate or the money to pay for mitigation work.

RECOMMENDATION: Property owners need grants and other assistance in their efforts to mitigate their properties. To assist with this effort, the Crystal Lakes Vol. Fire Dept. is in need of resources to identify unmitigated properties vital to the defense of the community and to contact these property owners with the offer of grants or other mitigation assistance needed to encourage them to do necessary mitigation work.

ACTION: Assist property owners in mitigating their properties. The fire district can, if necessary, administer these grants, work to identify the properties most in need of mitigation, and make contact with the property owners to determine (and where possible offer) the resources would encourage mitigation work.

| LEAD AGENCY: Crystal Lakes Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: Staffing for the administration of |
|--|--|
| District | grants – 1 or 2 volunteers, preferably with some of |
| | their time/effort reimbursed Cost: Grants on the order |
| | of \$4-5,000 each would be excellent (though less |
| | would still have an impact). |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Grants for |
| | homeowners mitigation |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Best case scenario would be to administer one to two dozen mitigation grants to Crystal Lakes property owners each year for as many years as possible. Identification of 'high hazard' zones. Gain homeowner support. Obtain funding support to finance mitigation action.

| Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District: Evacuation Routes (Crystal Lakes FPD – 4) | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire | |
| LOCATION: Crystal Lakes | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 4, 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: immediately | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C, D, E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: asap | | |

Page 336





ISSUE: Crystal Lakes, a community of more than 1600 properties, has only one evacuation route out of the area (County Road 73C to the south of the community). While 73C continues to the northeast of the community, the section of that road between Crystal Lakes subdivision and CR 67J on the way to 80C (approximately 73C mile marker 6 to 16) is extremely poor, with hairpin turns and deep potholes. Conditions on this road make it an unsuitable evacuation route for large or long vehicles (like trailers and motor homes, which are in frequent usage in the community during fire season) and any vehicle that is not high-clearance. This lack of a suitable secondary evacuation route means that a fire south of Crystal Lakes could cut off all viable evacuation routes for the community. During the summer fire season, this would trap upwards of 5,000 residents in the area who would them be at risk of being burned over by a wildfire. In addition, the lack of a secondary evacuation route impacts the neighboring community of Red Feather Lakes, through which all Crystal Lakes residents must evacuate in the current circumstances.

RECOMMENDATION: Due to the potential life-threat presented by this lack of a secondary evacuation route, we recommend that the county plan roadwork on 73C from the borders of the Crystal Lakes subdivision to 67J (approximately 73C mm 6 to 16), removing the worst of the hairpin turns and grading it periodically to ensure that it is and remains at least minimally passable to all vehicles.

ACTION: In partnership with Larimer County, work to improve access and evacuation from Crystal Lakes.

| LEAD AGENCY: Crystal Lakes &Larimer County . | EXPECTED COST: unknown |
|---|--|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Larimer County, Grants |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: In spring of 2016, begin grading 73C from Crystal Lakes to 80C at least twice and preferably more often per year. Begin work as soon after that as possible to ensure that road is passable for all vehicles, including non-high-clearance and long or wide vehicles.





| Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District: Water Storage Cisterns (Crystal Lakes FPD – 5) | | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire | | |
| LOCATION: Crystal Lakes GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 2016 OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2018 | | |
| ISSUE: Crystal Lakes is a community with no community-wide water system and no system of | | |

hydrants. Fire services must draft water from ponds and lakes, and many areas in the district are more than two miles from the nearest water source.

RECOMMENDATION: Buy and install water tanks and cisterns on greenbelt (publicly owned) areas or on private properties (with permanent easement agreed to by the property owner) in areas of the district which are significantly remote from water sources.

ACTION: Install cisterns capable of containing 2500+ gallons underground where possible, and in areas where burial is not possible due to rock substrata, install IBC Tanks capable of containing 330 gallons above ground (these would have to be drained for winter to avoid freezing). The Crystal Lakes Volunteer Fire Department would be responsible for maintaining these cisterns and keeping them filled and accessible (year-round for the underground cisterns, during the fire season for the above-ground tanks).

| LEAD AGENCY: Crystal Lakes Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: We need at least three 2500-gallon |
|--|--|
| District | cisterns (\$1500+ each) and six to twelve 330-gallon IBC |
| | tanks (\$550+ each), plus the cost of fittings and |
| | installation of the underground cisterns |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: none | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Grants, Crystal Lakes |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: In the spring of 2016, begin installation of aboveground IBC tanks in locations throughout the district which are remote from natural water sources. Begin community outreach efforts to determine potential locations for underground cisterns and make legal arrangements for those locations during 2016. At any time after the ground has thawed in 2017, begin excavation and installation of underground cisterns in the areas with the least access to water sources.





Letter of Intent to Participate

Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District

237 Blacklike Rd, Red Feather Likes, CO 80545 (970) \$81-3521

December 18, 2014

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Streat Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Lammer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federa, Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically idantify criteria that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans, the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District agrees to most the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements

The Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not limited to.

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnorability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing rasearch, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I Raymond Williams, commit the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 15th day of December

Zamand J. Hillio





Colorado State University (CSU)

Community Profile

Founded in 1870 as the Colorado Agricultural College, Colorado State University (CSU) is among the nation's leading research universities. CSU is a public research university located in Fort Collins. The university is Colorado's largest land grant university, and the flagship University of the Colorado State University System. Current enrollment is over 32,000 students, including resident and non-resident instructions students. CSU plans to increase their enrollment to 35,000 students by 2020. The University also has a Moutain Campus located 53 miles west of Fort Collins. This area is not included in the analysis within this appendix and is covered under the unincorporated County portion of this plan.



Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.





| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.70 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.60 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 2.50 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.90 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.90 |
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.80 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 1.80 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.60 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.50 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.30 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.10 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.00 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher) | : Flood – Flash a | nd Riverine | ; Winter St | orm (Blizzard | Conditions, H | leavy |

Snow Accumulation); Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): None

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Civil Disturbance; Utility Disruption; Tornado; Fire – Wildland; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Earthquake; Landslide / Rockslide; Erosion / Deposition

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for CSU, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to CSU.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the





county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). CSU's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the area.



Social Vulnerability Map – Colorado State University⁷²

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

CSU is characterized by a mix of low to medium-high levels of social vulnerability. The eastern region of the campus has higher levels of social vulnerability to disasters that the rest of the area. A closer look at the individual social vulnerability indicators within the boundaries of the University (and within Fort Collins) will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on the university and its resiliency over time. It is





⁷² Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

important that the university continues to monitor social vulnerability levels as demographics and economics change in the area.

Flood – Flash and Riverine

Source: FEMA, City of Fort Collins

CSU Special Flood Hazard Area⁷³





⁷³ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.

CSU Floodplain Map







Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 40 reported injuries and 5 deaths in the City of Fort Collins where CSU is located caused by flooding. On July 28, 1997 more than 8 inches of rain fell in southwest Fort Collins. Debris blocked a culvert along Spring Creek causing a 10-15 foot wall of water to surge through a mobile home park destroying some homes and damaging others. The CSU campus was flooded. High waters filled the CSU library basement with approximately 10 feet of water destroying many of the medical archives. There has been approximately \$190.5 million dollars in property damage and \$50,000 in crop damage from 1996 to 2014. Based on the historic occurrence of floods, CSU is extremely vulnerable to flood events at any given time.



Maximum flood extent—a key data need for disaster response and mitigation—is rarely quantified due to storm-related cloud cover and the low temporal resolution of optical sensors. While change detection approaches can circumvent these issues through the identification of inundated land and soil from post-flood imagery, their accuracy can suffer in the narrow and complex channels of increasingly developed





⁷⁴ Multi-Temporal Independent Component Analysis and Landsat 8 for Delineating Maximum Extent of the 2013 Colorado Front Range Flood

and heterogeneous floodplains. The data depicted above is from a study that explored the utility of the Operational Land Imager (OLI) and Independent Component Analysis (ICA) for addressing these challenges in the unprecedented 2013 Flood along the Colorado Front Range, USA. The approach was able to simultaneously distinguish flood-related water and soil moisture from pre-existing water bodies and other spectrally similar classes within the narrow and braided channels of the study site.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are no critical facilities or parcels/structures within the CSU boundary that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The University has stated that there are three buildings on Main Campus that will suffer flood damage during the 100-year flood event (Gibbons, Occupational Therapy, & Heating Plant). Plans are currently undersay to upgrade the heating plant door to provide 100-year protection. They also state that all buildings on Main Campus are considered by the University as being 'critical', per the state floodplain regulation.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for CSU that for a 100-year flood event, that no buildings will experience flood damage.









Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the CSU boundary provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the University will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the University. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, CSU has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. CSU is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.





⁷⁵ 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located within CSU's boundary can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes 37,220 people, or 100% of the university's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the university. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the university's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of CSU including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for CSU.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that CSU will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the university boundary at least once every year.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries, deaths, property loss or crop loss within CSU's boundary due to hail. There have been 2 reported damaging hail events within the university boundary between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the university, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.







Historical Hail Events at CSU⁷⁶

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 2 injuries and no deaths within CSU due to thunderstorm wind. There have been 14 thunderstorm wind events reported within the CSU boundary between 1955 and 2014. Of the 13 incidents, 1 reported property losses totaling \$25,000 and no crop losses. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts in the area, there is a great potential for thunderstorm wind events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 18 lightning events in the City of Fort Collins where CSU is located, between 1996 and 2014. There have been 4 reported injuries, 2 deaths, \$108,000 worth of property damage, and \$5,000 worth of crop damage.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries, deaths, property loss or crop loss within CSU's boundary due to high wind. There have been 3 high wind event reported in the university





⁷⁶ Historical hail events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

boundary between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the university, there is a great potential for high wind events to occur at any given time.



Historical High Wind Events at CSU77

Inventory Exposed

All assets located within the CSU boundary can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes 37,220 people, or 100% of the University's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the university. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the University's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.





⁷⁷ NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of CSU including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for CSU. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that CSU will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in CSU at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of CSU experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 3 severe wind events since 1954, there is a chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of CSU to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are





identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the School's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the University's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | Х | | |
| Floodplain | | | |
| Administrator | | Х | |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |
| Grant Writer | Х | | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the University's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | N |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | N |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Y |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | N |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | N |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance.





In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and codes. CSU has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

CSU has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the university will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|--------------|--|
| | <i>"CSU will continue our participation with the County Local Emergency Planning Committee; The CSU Public Safety Committee will review the Plan every two years."</i> |
| CSU | <i>"Our policies promote "public" input through various committees across our campuses."</i> |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by CSU based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|--------------|---|
| CSU | <i>"Moving forward, we will integrate hazard mitigation actions into our master plans."</i> |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present CSU's mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan. It should be noted that since the major flooding event of 1997, the University has invested over \$5 Million in flood mitigation measures and drainage improvements.

| Colorado State University: Monthly meetings and trainings (CSU – 1) | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| PRIORITY: Low | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Public Health | |
| LOCATION: Throughout Campuses GOALS ADDRESSED: [posted on website, use number] | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Posted on Web | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | |
| ISSUE: Ongoing Education | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Monthly meetings and trainings | | |





ACTION: Ongoing training and education to University staff and students with Risk Management Week, Building Proctor Trainings and the Public Safety Team LEAD AGENCY: Colorado State University EXPECTED COST: very minimal cost because it's built

| | into the daily schedules |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Throughout Campus | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Departmental |
| | Budgets |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Weekly/monthly/yearly meetings and presentations.

| Colorado State University: Ongoing emergency management exercises and drills (CSU – 2) | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|
| PRIORITY: Low | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Public Health | |
| LOCATION: Throughout Campuses GOALS ADDRESSED: [posted on website, use number | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reports and audits | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | |
| ISSUE: Ongoing emergency management exercises and drills | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Working with students and staff to execute the exercises and drills | | |
| ACTION: Ongoing exercises and drill with University students and staff on a yearly basis. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Colorado State University EXPECTED COST: No true cost associated with | | |
| exercises and drills | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Throughout Campus POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Funding built into | | |
| normal week schedules. | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Weekly/monthly/yearly meetings and presentations. | | |

| Colorado State University: Ongoing upgrading of systems and infrastructure (CSU – 3) | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Public Health | | |
| LOCATION: Throughout Campuses | GOALS ADDRESSED: [posted on website, use number] | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Code enforcement | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | | |
| ISSUE: Ongoing upgrading of fire safety systems, road and drainage enhancements, new Stadium | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Through obtaining State funding for upgrading | | | |
| ACTION: Ongoing upgrading of systems and infrastructure as the University grows. | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Colorado State University | EXPECTED COST: \$270 million | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Throughout Campus | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: State funding and private donations | | |
| | | | |
| PROGRESS MILES IONES: Weekly/monthly/yearly meetings and presentations along with various | | | |
| utilities/fire/building code inspections. | | | |

Colorado State University: Protect and mitigate University utility (steam) tunnels from flooding. (CSU- 4)PRIORITY: HighHAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood

| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood |
|-------------------------------|--|
| LOCATION: Throughout Campuses | GOALS ADDRESSED: [posted on website, use number] |
| | |





Page 354

| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Code enforcement | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | | | |
| ISSUE: Steam tunnel flood protection | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Through obtaining State funding | | | | |
| ACTION: Protect and mitigate University utility (steam) tunnels from flooding. | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Colorado State University | EXPECTED COST: \$317,460.00 | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Private Consultant | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: State funding for | | | |
| | Controlled Maintenance | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Meetings along with various utilities/fire/building code inspections. | | | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



Office of the Vice President for University Operations 518 Administration Building 6001 Campus Delivery Fort Cullins, Colorado 80525-4000 (970) 491-5257 FAX: (970) 491-5254 http://admin.colostate.edu/

LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

August 20, 2014

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County 200 West Oak Street, 2nd Floor PO Box 1190 Fort Collins. CO 80522-1190

Re. "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Lori Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans. Colorado State University is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that Colorado State University has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, Colorado State University agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Colorado State University understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending maetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between Larimer County and Colorado State University. I, Amy Parsons, commit Ken Quintana to Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 21st day of August 2014

Amy Parsons, Vice President for University Operations Colorado State University





Town of Estes Park

"The Mission of the Town of Estes Park is to provide high-quality, reliable services for the benefit of our citizens, guests and employees, while being good stewards of public resources and our natural setting."

- Estes Park 2015 Strategic Plan

Community Profile

The Town of Estes Park is located approximately 70 miles north west of Denver and is bordered to the west by Rocky Mountain National Park. Estes Park receives many visitors due to its close proximity to Rocky Mountain National Park. The town's elevation is 7,522 feet above sea level and it lies along the Big Thompson River. Based on the results of a recent Community Livability Survey, four in five residents of Estes Park rated their overall quality of life as excellent or good. Moreover, 77% of residents would be very or somewhat likely to recommend Estes Park as a place to live to someone who asks. Estes Park's overall appearance and overall image along with the Town as a place to live and retire received high ratings by at least four in five residents. Most of the aspects that contribute to community livability were rated positively and were at least similar to national benchmark comparisons. Additionally, in terms of Community Engagement, Estes Park scores high. This metric includes emergency preparedness efforts taken by local residents.

Since the mid-1980's, the Town of Estes Park and the surrounding Estes Valley have experienced rapid and complex change due to a shifting economic base, demographic shifts, growth characteristics, and increased use of their natural resources. According to the Estes Valley Comprehensive Plan, many of these changes have been caused by forces outside the community and are difficult to recognize and influence. In an effort to further understand these influences and develop a preferred future for the Valley, the Town of Estes Park and Larimer County cooperated in preparing a strategic future planning process called the Estes Park Directions.







The following table summarizes key demographic and development related characteristics of the Town of Estes Park.

| Town of Estes Park Statistics | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| | Town of Estes Park | Colorado | | | | |
| Population, 2010 | 5,858 | 5,029,196 | | | | |
| 2000-2010 Population Change, % | 7.5% | 14.5% | | | | |
| % Population under 5 years, 2010 | 4.8% | 6.8% | | | | |
| % Population under 19 years, 2010 | 18.5% | 20.3 | | | | |
| % Population 65 years and over, 2010 | 25.2% | 10.9% | | | | |
| Language other than English spoken at home, % age 5+, 2009-2013 | 20.7% | 15.9% | | | | |
| Homeownership Rate 2010 | 63.1% | 65.5% | | | | |
| Persons Per Household 2010 | 2.1 | 2.57 | | | | |
| Persons below poverty level, %, 2013 | 4.2% | 13.2% | | | | |
| Median Household Income, 2013 | \$59,826 | \$58,433 | | | | |

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.





| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING | | |
|--|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--|--|
| Fire – Wildland | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 3.3 | | |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 3.0 | | |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.9 | | |
| Utility Disruption | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.5 | | |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.3 | | |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.8 | | |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.6 | | |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.6 | | |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.4 | | |
| Tornado | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.4 | | |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 1.3 | | |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 | | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Fire – Wildland; Flood – Flash and Riverine; Winter Storm (Blizzard | | | | | | | | |
| Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Utility Disruption | | | | | | | | |
| Lightning); | | | | | | | | |

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Landslide / Rockslide; Civil Disturbance; Erosion / Deposition; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Tornado; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Earthquake

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Town of Estes Park, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to Estes Park.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Town of Estes Park's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.







Social Vulnerability Map – Town of Estes Park⁷⁸

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

Estes Park is characterized by a mix of medium-low to medium levels of social vulnerability. The northern half of the town have higher levels of social vulnerability to hazards than the southern region. Evaluating the individual social vulnerability indicators within the community over time will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders an even clearer picture of why vulnerability to disasters may be higher in the northern region of the town as well as which social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on the town and its resiliency.





⁷⁸ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)
Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to USGS there have been 3 reported wildfire events in the Town of Estes Park between 1980 and 2013. There is no data available regarding injuries, deaths, or damages. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on Estes Park, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time.



Town of Estes Park Historical Federal Wildfire Events⁷⁹

Inventory Exposed

The Town of Estes Park has established wildfire hazard zone designation to help hazard mitigation of wildfires in new developments and subdivisions. The mapped hazard areas include all areas "high-tree" fire hazard areas. Any new development or subdivision requires a mitigation plan prepared by a professional forester addressing how the development or subdivision will avoid or mitigate wildfire hazards. The following figure illustrates the high wildfire hazard zones determined by the Town of Estes Park, the Colorado State Forest Service, and Larimer County Wildfire Safety Specialist.





⁷⁹ Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.



Town of Estes Park High Wildfire Hazard Zones⁸⁰

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones are located throughout the district.



⁸⁰ High Wildfire Hazard Zones, from Town of Estes Park



Town of Estes Park Wildfire Hazard Zone Map⁸¹

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the northwestern region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





⁸¹ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.



Town of Estes Park Wildfire Risk Index Map⁸²

There are a number of areas in the town that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





⁸² Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.



Town of Estes Park WUI Map⁸³

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Town of Estes Park depends. There are many areas of high wildfire threat throughout the town according to the WUI Risk Index. There are also many areas of medium threat.

Potential Losses





⁸³ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide, within the Town of Estes Park values present span this entire range.

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Town of Estes Park. There is 1 critical facility located in areas with the *most negative* and 6 critical facilities located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the critical facilities within these *most and 2nd most negative* threat areas is approximately \$10 million dollars. There are 942 parcels/structures located in areas with the *most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these *most and 2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these *most and 2nd most negative* threat areas is approximately \$399.7 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.



Town of Estes Park Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the





wildfire risk assessment, areas within Estes Park that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Flood – Flash and Riverine



Town of Estes Park Special Flood Hazard Area⁸⁴

Previous Occurrences

Estes Park sustained severe damages during the September 2013 Colorado flood event. Evacuations began on September 12, 2013, at approximately 3:00AM and 2,428 contacts were made to warn and evacuate neighborhoods through the LETA911 emergency notification system. The information below was provided by the Town of Estes Park and provides a snapshot of just how many residents were impacted by the flood.





⁸⁴ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.

| | 606 people signed in |
|--|--|
| Red Cross Shelter Support: | 167 people sheltered in the cents |
| | 316 people outsourced to local hotels for varying amounts of time |
| | 3571 meals were served |
| Salvation Army Support: | 7000 snacks/drinks were served |
| | 9000 gallons of water distributed |
| | Estimated \$35-40 million in public infrastructure damage in the Estes |
| | Valley |
| Utilities Outages and | 3.25 miles of Fish Creek Road are destroyed or damaged |
| Restoration | Caused outages for electric, water, gas, cable and phones |
| | Approximately 4,000 sewer taps were non-functional under "No Flush" |
| | orders within the Upper Thompson Sanitation District. |
| | Rapid assessments completed for approximately 3,000 structures in the |
| | Estes Valley this week. Approximately 12 red tags were issued for |
| Structural Damage | properties that were determined to be unsafe for occupancy due to |
| Structural Damage | structural damage or electrical safety. |
| Assessments (incorporated Estas Dark) | 2,383 estimated residences affected by water, mud, sewer access, road |
| | access |
| | 183 estimated businesses affected by water, mud, sewer access, road |
| | access |







Town of Estes Park Fall River 2013 Flood Extent⁸⁵





⁸⁵ Based on high water marks collected by the Town of Estes Park.



Town of Estes Park Fish Creek 2013 Flood Extent⁸⁶

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are no critical facility and 42 structures in the Town of Estes Park that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed structures is over \$6 million dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Town of Estes Park that for a 100-year flood event, approximately 42 buildings will experience flood damage. The total economic loss estimated for the 100-year flood is over \$3.2 million dollars. The estimated building loss is \$1.8 million dollars and \$1.4 million dollars in content loss.





⁸⁶ Based on high water marks collected by the Town of Estes Park.





Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Town of Estes Park provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the town will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the town. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.





⁸⁷ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Town of Estes Park has experienced 175 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas within western Larimer County above 6,000 feet. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Town of Estes Park is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Estes Park can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes 5,858people, or 100% of the Town's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the town. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the Town's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Town of Estes Park including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of Estes Park.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Town of Estes Park will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the town at least once every year.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Town of Estes Park does not currently track incidences of utility disruption.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Estes Park are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes 5,858 people, or 100% of the Town's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the Town.





Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.

Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Town of Estes Park.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Town of Estes Park to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the Town's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the town's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | Х | |
| Floodplain Administrator | | Х | |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | | Х | |
| Grant Writer | | Х | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the town's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Y |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | N |





| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Ν |
|--|---|
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Y |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance. In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and codes. The Town of Estes Park has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Town of Estes Park has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the town will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|-----------------------|--|
| | <i>"Our Emergency Manager will manage the mitigation actions scheduling and progress by reviewing the plan annually"</i> |
| Town of Estes Park | <i>"Our PIO will manage and distribute informational releases to the public regarding mitigation actions, progress, and opportunities for public involvement."</i> |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Town of Estes Park based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|-----------------------|--|
| | <i>"Our mitigation actions will be incorporated in our capital improvement planning"</i> |
| Town of Estes Park | <i>"We have created a floodplain management team comprising of citizens, Town staff and consultants. Additional mitigation actions will form from this team and incorporate into future planning."</i> |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present the town's mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Jurisdiction or Organization: Storm Water Management (Estes Park – 1) | | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED Flood, Severe Storm | |
| LOCATION: Estes Park | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, and 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: January 2016 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives C and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: November 2017 | | |
| ISSUE: The Estes Park Street Division has purchased a Jet Culvert Cleaner and Trailer. This equipment will be used for cleaning storm drain culverts and inlet storm drain pipes. The Street Division will be developing a storm water plan to clean culverts on a regular scheduled maintenance program. These culverts are along storm water ditch lines, mostly lines that cross under streets. The jet cleaner is also used in high water rain and spring runoff events. When soil and debris are washed down to ditches and block and fill culverts, this equipment will be used to help prevent flooding and open up storm drain culverts. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Annual maintenance ar | nd inspection of equipment and mitigation planning | |
| ACTION: Inspection and mitigation planning for ground water management for flooding and run off season | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Estes Park Street Division | EXPECTED COST: \$47,260 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Town of Estes Park Public Works | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Budgetary | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Develop an annual maintenance and inspection plan for the Jet Culvert Cleaner Provide culvert clearing for the Estes Area as needed to minimize flood issues Conduct mitigation planning for ground water management | | |





| Estes Park – Town Hall – Basement Electrical | Raising/Relocation (Estes Park – 2) |
|--|---|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood-prone area containing |
| | high-priority electrical panels – Public Safety |
| LOCATION: Town Hall Basement | GOALS ADDRESSED: Raising or Relocation of most |
| | electrical components to an area not prone to flood; |
| | Help ensure continuity of service of Town |
| | Hall/PD/Emergency Services; Keep Town Hall |
| | operational |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 09/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Keep Town Hall operational in |
| | the case of another massive flood; Relocate PRPA Fiber |
| | gear; Relocate Level3 Fiber gear |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2/01/2016 | |
| ISSUE: A sub-grade room contains important | electrical panels, which power Town Hall. This building |
| powers equipment which provides all telepho | one, cell phone, internet, and virtually all |
| communications out of Estes Park. Building a | lso houses the 911 emergency center. This room had |
| one foot of water during the 2013 flood. Som | ne equipment was destroyed. |
| RECOMMENDATION: Raise/Relocate/Replace | panels which are subject to flood – Potentially change |
| out electrical panels 3+ feet, or move outside | ; Relocate a vast majority of the communications |
| equipment to a conditioned, above-grade are | d. |
| ACTION: Obtain several firm options and bids | 2 to do the same. Browisions will be made to have an |
| adequate space in the IT server room | is to do the same. Provisions will be made to have an |
| LEAD AGENCY: Estos Park | EXDECTED COST: 4 E days of ED IT staff time |
| LEAD AGENCI. Estes Faik | Numerous days of PRPA staff time: \$2000 in electrical |
| | improvements costs: \$5000 in equipment costs (via |
| | PRPA) |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: PRPA | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: PRPA will provide |
| | labor and materials at no direct charge to EP. Internal |
| | funds only for staff effort. Was not qualified for |
| | certain flood related grants. |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | |
| Sept 2015 – PRPA agreed to location, in | |
| progress. – Est. Oct 2015 completion | |
| Sept 2015 – Level3 was notified of intent. | |
| Seems amicable. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |





| Estes Park – MPEC EOC/Town Hall – Backup Site (Estes Park – 3) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Town Operations/Public Safety | |
| LOCATION: Multi-Purpose Event Center | GOALS ADDRESSED: Provide infrastructure to setup an EOC or alternative location for Town Hall staff, in case o Town Hall becomes inoperable, for any reason; including PD/Emergency Services staff, as well as general EOC. Keep Town Hall staff operational in another location | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 09/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Keep Town Hall operations functioning in the case of severe outage of Town Hall. Provide secondary EOC location. | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 6/01/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: Town Hall is older, without smoke/fire/water alarms, with some portions below grade, adjacent to flood prone areas. In the event of a building evacuation, provision MPEC to accept 40-60 staff, with electronic and communications facilities, to support all operations. Building also houses the 911 emergency center. The Town Hall basement room had one foot of water during the 2013 flood. Some equipment was destroyed. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Provide contingency connections and gear at MPEC to support an EOC as well as a majority of staff from Town Hall. | | |
| ACTION: Obtain several firm options and bids | . Put into the Public Works budget. | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Estes Park | EXPECTED COST: \$20-\$75k | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: None obvious, other than internal funding. | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Nov 2014 – acquire backup FRII fiber switch; wireless access points To Do: Adequate Electrical to IT room Adequate HVAC to IT room Install backup gear, perform tests Onsite locate other IT needed gear Setup procedures at MPEC for seating/conne | backup firewall; backup PD Verizon router; install private ctions/ configurations | |

| Town of Estes Park: Watershed Protection Group (Estes Park – 4) | | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm, Fire, Public | |
| | Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: ESTES PARK TOWN HALL | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/30/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, B, C, D, E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: ONGOING | | |
| ISSUE: Avoid duplicating efforts and miscommunication; pool resources and ideas for wiser decision- | | |
| making | | |





RECOMMENDATION: Assemble group, meet regularly, establish meeting parameters

ACTION: Collaboration between Town departments and other outside agencies to determine best practices, planning, and implementation of projects. Provide a forum to discuss issues/projects involving watershed protection, including but not limited to stormwater management, flood mitigation, floodplain administration, emergency management, public outreach, financial aspects, watershed coalition, and utility providers

| LEAD AGENCY: Community Development Department | EXPECTED COST: 7-12 staff members; monthly meeting for approximately two hours, or more often as needed |
|---|---|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Community Development Department, Police Department, Public Works Department, Utilities Department, Town Administration, Finance, Estes Valley Watershed Coalition, Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Town of Estes Park |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Monthly (at a minimum) meetings to discuss current and future issues/projects. | |

Town Board, Coalition Board updates as needed.

| Town of Estes Park: Replacement of Bridges and Widening of River Channels (Estes Park – 5) | | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm, Fire, | |
| | Public Health | |
| LOCATION: Estes Park | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 4, 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/26/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives C, D and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2030 | | |
| ISSUE: Most bridges and river channels within Town have inadequate capacity for flood flows | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Replacement of bridges and widening of river channels to accommodate flood flows. | | |
| ACTION: The Town would have to acquire funding to replace and enlarge multiple undersized bridges and widen river channels to accommodate flood flows. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Public Works | EXPECTED COST: Millions | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: FHWA, FEMA, CDOT, othe Town Departments | r POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: FEMA, FHWA, CDOT, other state and federal agencies | |





PROGRESS MILESTONES: Early/mid 2016 – begin replacement and enlargement of Moraine Ave. Bridge – completion in 2017. Early 2017 submit grant applications for bridge replacement and channel widening 2017-2018 – begin construction on new bridges/widening channels 2018 – 2030? – complete bridge construction and channel widening



Estes Park: 4th Console for Communications Center (Estes Park – 6)

| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land |
|---|--|
| | Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe |
| | Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat |
| LOCATION: Estes Park Communications Ctr | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3 |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 01/01/2017 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2017 | |

ISSUE: Due to call volume in Hazard situations we have found that having only 3 dispatch consoles is too few.

RECOMMENDATION: We want to add a full 4th console into the Communications Center

ACTION: Purchasing new furniture, CAD computer, Radio Console

| LEAD AGENCY: Estes Park Police Department | EXPECTED COST: \$120,000 |
|---|--|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: CRISP, LETA, WAC | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Homeland Security |
| | Grant, Estes Park Police Department, Town of Estes |
| | Park, LETA. |

L EVECTED COST 6420 000

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Initial plan will be to purchase the console furniture itself and an additional computer to run CAD. We already have a 4th phone station that will be moved to this location. Finally the purchase of the MCC7500 Console.







| Town of Estes Park: Non-structural Flood proofing for Downtown Estes Park (Estes Park – 7) | | |
|--|---|--|
| IORITY: Medium HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm, Fi | | |
| | Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: Downtown Estes Park | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 4, 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/26/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives C, D and E | |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2020

ISSUE: Flood proofing will help protect downtown properties from flood damage.

RECOMMENDATION: Public dialog, applicability assessment and implementation of non-structural flood proofing measures to downtown buildings, as identified during the assessment process.

ACTION: The Town would engage downtown property and business owners in a discussion of what non-structural flood proofing is and what benefits it can provide. The US Army Corps of Engineers Silver Jackets Program will be conducting a non-structural flood proofing assessment for downtown buildings and identifying potential funding sources. Flood proofing will be constructed following owner agreement and funding acquisition.

| LEAD AGENCY: Community Development | EXPECTED COST: Millions |
|---|---|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: USACE, FEMA, CWCB, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: FEMA, USACE, |
| Downtown Business Groups, EP Public Works, | State |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Summer 2016 – USACE S | jilver |
| Jackets Study Complete | |
| Spring 2016-ongoing – public info/education/dialo | g about |
| flood proofing | |
| 2017-2022 – implementation of flood proofing me | asures |
| downtown | |
| | Autor . |





Letter of Intent to Participate







Estes Park Medical Center

"To make a positive difference in the health and wellbeing of all we serve." – Estes Park Medical Center Mission Statement

Community Profile

Estes Park Medical Center (EPMC) is a 25-bed critical access hospital with a 24-hour emergency department, 24-hour Advanced Life Support Ambulance Service, medical/surgical services, obstetrics, and home health and hospice services. Emergency air transport services are available from their healthcare associates in a number of Colorado Front Range communities. EPMC's physicians are board-certified in many different areas and specialties. EPMC has served the Estes Valley and surrounding areas since 1975, and is designated as a Level IV Trauma Center.



Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.





| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|--|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Fire – Wildland | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.5 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.5 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 3.4 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.3 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.1 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.1 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.7 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.5 |
| Earthquake | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.1 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Fire – Wildland; Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Flood – Flash and Riverine; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Biological Hazards / Contagion; Utility Disruption; Landslide / Rockslide; Erosion / Deposition | | | | | | |

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Earthquake

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Civil Disturbance; Tornado; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Estes Park Medical Center service area, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Estes Park Medical Center service area.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the





county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Estes Park Medical Center's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the center.





Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

The Estes Park Medical Center service area is characterized by medium to low levels of social vulnerability. A deeper-dive into the individual social vulnerability indicators within the service area boundary will give medical center staff a clearer picture of which specific social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on resident within the area. It is important that the medical center continue to monitor social vulnerability levels over time as demographics and economics change in the area.





⁸⁸ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to USGS there have been 362 reported wildfire events within the Estes Park Medical Center service area between 1980 and 2013. There is no data available regarding injuries, deaths, or damages. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the Estes Park Medical Center service area, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time.



Estes Park Medical Center service area Historical Federal Wildfire Events⁸⁹

Inventory Exposed

The Town of Estes Park located within the Estes Park Medical Center service area, has established wildfire hazard zone designation to help hazard mitigation of wildfires in new developments and subdivisions. The mapped hazard areas include all areas "high-tree" fire hazard areas. Any new development or subdivision requires a mitigation plan prepared by a professional forester addressing how the development or subdivision will avoid or mitigate wildfire hazards. The following figure illustrates the high wildfire hazard zones determined by the Town of Estes Park, the Colorado State Forest Service, and Larimer County Wildfire Safety Specialist.





⁸⁹ Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.



The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones in the district are located in the eastern region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





⁹⁰ High Wildfire Hazard Zones, from Town of Estes Park



Estes Park Medical Center Service Area Wildfire Hazard Zone Map⁹¹

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the eastern and southeastern region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





⁹¹ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.





There are a number of areas in the central, south east and north east region of the medical center service area that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





⁹² Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.



Estes Park Medical Service Area Center WUI Map⁹³

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Estes Park Medical Center depends. There are many areas of high wildfire threat throughout the servicing area according to the WUI Risk Index. There are also many areas of medium threat.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Estes Park Medical Center service area. There are 2 critical facilities located in areas with the *most negative* and 8 critical facilities located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the critical facilities within these *most and 2nd most negative* threat areas is approximately \$10.3 million dollars. There are 1,925 parcels/structures located





⁹³ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts.

in areas with the *most negative* and 1,787 parcels/structures located in areas with the 2nd most negative wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these most and 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$788.7 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.



Estes Park Medical Center Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone94

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.





⁹⁴ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Estes Park Medical Center service area that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Estes Park Medical Center has experienced 175 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas within western Larimer County above 6,000 feet. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Estes Park Medical Center is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Estes Park Medical Center can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the Estes Park Medical Center's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the Estes Park Medical Center. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the Medical Center's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Estes Park Medical Center including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Estes Park Medical Center.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Estes Park Medical Center service area will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the service area at least once every year.







Flood – Flash and Riverine

Previous Occurrences

Estes Park sustained severe damages during the September 2013 Colorado flood event. Evacuations began on September 12, 2013, at approximately 3:00AM and 2,428 contacts were made to warn and evacuate neighborhoods through the LETA911 emergency notification system. The information below was provided by the Town of Estes Park and provides a snapshot of just home many residents were impacted by the flood.

| Red Cross Shelter Support: | 606 people signed in |
|----------------------------|---|
| | 167 people sheltered in the cents |
| | 316 people outsourced to local hotels for varying amounts of time |
| Salvation Army Support: | 3571 meals were served |
| | 7000 snacks/drinks were served |

⁹⁵ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.





| | 9000 gallons of water distributed |
|---|--|
| Utilities Outages and Restoration | Estimated \$35-40 million in public infrastructure damage in the Estes |
| | Valley |
| | 3.25 miles of Fish Creek Road are destroyed or damaged |
| | Caused outages for electric, water, gas, cable and phones |
| | Approximately 4,000 sewer taps were non-functional under "No Flush" |
| | orders within the Upper Thompson Sanitation District. |
| Structural Damage Assessments (incorporated Estes Park) | Rapid assessments completed for approximately 3,000 structures in the |
| | Estes Valley this week. Approximately 12 red tags were issued for |
| | properties that were determined to be unsafe for occupancy due to |
| | structural damage or electrical safety. |
| | 2,383 estimated residences affected by water, mud, sewer access, road |
| | access |
| | 183 estimated businesses affected by water, mud, sewer access, road |
| | access |

Estes Park Medical Fall River 2013 Flood Extent⁹⁶







⁹⁶ Based on high water marks collected by the Town of Estes Park.



Estes Park Medical Center Fish Creek 2013 Flood Extent⁹⁷

In addition to the September 2013 flood two additional floods were reported according to the NOAA's Storm Events Database. On August 2, 2007 a flash flood occurred resulting in \$20,000 in property damage. Another flash flood occurred on July 18, 2013 resulting in \$10,000 in property damage and \$5,000 in crop damage. There were no reported injuries or deaths from these two floods.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 8 critical facility and 1,352 structures in the Estes Park Medical Center service area that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$8 million dollars and the exposed structures is over \$237.8 million dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Estes Park Medical Center service area that for a 100-year flood event, no critical facilities and approximately 163 buildings will experience flood damage. The total economic loss





⁹⁷ Based on high water marks collected by the Town of Estes Park.

estimated for the 100-year flood is over \$9.6 million dollars. The estimated building loss is over \$5.3 million dollars, over \$3.7 million dollars in content loss, and over \$561 thousand dollars in inventory loss.





Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Estes Park Medical Service Area provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the service area will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.





⁹⁸ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the service area. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries or deaths in Estes Park Medical Center service area due to hail. There have been 22 hail events reported in Estes Park Medical Center service area between 1955 and 2014. Of the 22 incidents, none reported losses. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the Estes Park Medical Center service area, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.



Estes Park Medical Historical Hail Events⁹⁹

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there is no historic data for thunderstorm wind events in Estes Park Medical Center service area. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.





⁹⁹ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf
According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 9 lightning events in the Estes Park Medical Center service area between 1996 and 2014. There have been 27 reported injuries, 4 deaths, \$5,000 worth of property damage, and no reported crop damage. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the area, there is a great potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 166 Windstorm events in and near the Estes Park Medical Center service area between 1996 and 2014. There have been 2 reported injuries, no deaths, \$13.5 million dollars' worth of property damage, and no reported crop damage. There is no graphical data available showing the specific locations of these high wind events within the service area. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the area, there is a great potential for high wind events to occur at any given time.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Estes Park Medical Center service area can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the service area's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the service area's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of Estes Park Medical Center including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Estes Park Medical Center service area. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services.





Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Estes Park Medical Center service area will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Estes Park Medical Center service area at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Estes Park Medical Center service area experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 166 severe wind events since 1996, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Biological Hazards / Contagion

Biological hazards, including epidemics and pandemics, have the potential to cause serious illness and death, especially among those who have compromised immune systems due to age or underlying medical conditions. During the 2015 planning process, pandemic flu was identified as the key public health hazard in the county.

Previous Occurrences

There is no available data for historic occurrences of biological hazards specifically within the Estes Park Medical Center service area.

Inventory Exposed

Due to the regional nature of public health hazards, jurisdictions with higher numbers of socially vulnerable residents are expected to experience magnified impacts of public health hazards. This includes places with high numbers of elderly residents, young children, low income families, and homeless individuals/outdoor laborers. Future mitigation efforts related to biological hazards should focus on reaching those residents who are elderly, young children, and live in poverty or are homeless.





Potential Losses

Because there is no defined geographic boundary for public health hazards, all of the people and infrastructure within the Estes Park Medical Center service area are exposed to public health hazards. Those with elevated risk and potential loss are the homeless, infirm, elderly, young and low income families. Placing a dollar amount on the cost of a human life are beyond the scope of the Plan, annualized economic losses for the Estes Park Medical Center due to public health hazards can be best quantified in terms of number of days of work lost due to sick medical center staff.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Based on the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment annual reportable disease summary of 2,308 Reportable Diseases within Larimer County, there is great potential for biological hazards to occur at any given time in the Estes Park Medical Center service area.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Estes Park Medical Center does not currently track incidences of utility disruption within its service area.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in Estes Park Medical Center service area are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes all people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.

Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Estes Park Medical Center service area.

Landslide / Rockslide

Previous Occurrences

According to the Colorado Geological Survey there have been 23 historical landslide events within the Estes Park Medical Center service area. Recently, on September 27, 2013 a large landslide occurs behind the Aspen Lodge Resort and Spa near Estes Park.







September 2013 Landslide at Aspen Lodge Resort & Spa

Inventory Exposed

There are locations across all of the Estes Park Medical Center service Area that are vulnerable to landslides and rockslides. As population growth brings new development into available land in the area, more inventory assets may become exposed to landslides and rockslides hazards. The following figures show historical and potential landslide and rockslide areas in the Estes Park Medical Center service area. Due largely to topography, the western portion of the service area is more susceptible to landslides. Potential rockslide prone areas have been identified in the central and eastern regions of the service area.







Potential Landslide Areas – Estes Park Medical Center Service Area¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰ Historical and potential landslide areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.







Potential Rockslide Areas – Estes Park Medical Center Service Area¹⁰¹

Potential Losses

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are no critical facility and 65 parcels/structures in the Estes Park Medical Center service area that are prone to landslides (not including the total miles of landslide prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed structures is over \$2.5 million dollars.

¹⁰¹ Potential rock fall areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.







Parcels in Landslide Areas – Estes Park Medical Center Service Area¹⁰²

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 11 critical facility and 3,101 structures in the Estes Park Medical Center service area that are prone to rockslides (not including the total miles of rockslide prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$11.2 million dollars and the exposed structures is over \$690 million dollars.

¹⁰² Parcels intersecting potential & historical landslide areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.







Parcels in Landslide Areas – Estes Park Medical Center Service Area¹⁰³

Probability of Future Occurrences

Due to the uncertainty associated with existing data, it is challenging to accurately calculate probability for future events related to landslide and rockslide hazards. It can be assured however, that these hazards will continue to alter the landscape of the Estes Park Medical Center service area in the future.

Overall, the probability of future occurrences of rockslide and landslide events in the Estes Park Medical Center service area is high. Many areas of the district are prone to these types of hazard events due to their proximity to previous landslide events, their location at the base or top of steep slopes and drainage basins, or their location on infill or steep slope cuts. Individual assessments of landslide-prone areas are recommended in the future. Moreover, as development and population increase in the service area, increasing numbers of structures (and people) will be exposed to future landslide and rockslide events.

Erosion / Deposition

Previous Occurrences

Based on data provided by CGS, there are undermined areas within northeastern Larimer County that are indicative of higher subsidence, erosion, or deposition risk. Additionally, no undermined areas have been identified within the Estes Park Medical Centers service area. Currently, there is no historical data available for collapsible soil areas, expansive soil areas, or subsidence areas within the Estes Park Medical





¹⁰³ Parcels that intersect potential rockfall areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.

Center service area. This indicates a relatively low risk of erosion and deposition risk within the Estes Park Medical Center service area.

Inventory Exposed

There are locations across all of Estes Park Medical Center's service area that are vulnerable to erosion and deposition. As population growth brings new development into available land in the county, more inventory assets may become exposed to erosion and deposition hazards. The following figure shows geological hazard areas in the Estes Park Medical Center Service Area.





There are no land subsidence areas identified within the Estes Park Medical Center service area. Additionally, there are no collapsible soil areas identified within the Estes Park Medical Center service area.

The following figure presents a map identifying the locations within the Estes Park Medical Center service area that have potential for expansive soil. The Estes Park Medical Center service area consists entirely of low expansive soil potential.

¹⁰⁴ Used for identifying geologic hazard areas for land use. Source: Larimer County, CGS







Potential Expansive Soil Areas – Estes Park Medical Center Service Area¹⁰⁵

Potential Losses

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 12 critical facility and 1,752 structures in Larimer County that are prone to severe geological hazards (not including the total miles of severe geological hazard prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$13.1 million dollars and the exposed structures is over \$409.6 million dollars.





¹⁰⁵ Potential expansive soils areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.



Geologic Hazard Exposure – Estes Park Medical Center Service Area¹⁰⁶

There are no land subsidence areas or collapsible soil areas identified within the Estes Park Medical Center service area. Therefore, no parcels have been identified within land subsidence or collapsible soil areas within the Estes Park Medical Center service area. Additionally, because there are no areas of moderate expansive soil potential within Estes Park Medical Center service area no parcels have been identified within moderate expansive soil exposure.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Due to the uncertainty associated with existing data, it is challenging to accurately calculate probability for future events related to landslide and rockslide hazards. It can be assured however, that these hazards will continue to alter the landscape of the Estes Park Medical Center service area in the future.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the EPMC to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the medical center are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the organization's hazard mitigation program.





¹⁰⁶ Parcels that intersect the 'Severe' geologic hazard areas used for identifying county land use. Source: Larimer County, CGS

<u>Local Personnel</u>

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines EPMC's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | Х | |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | ^ |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | Х | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines EPMC's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | - |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Y |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Y |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Y |
| Participates in the NFIP | N |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

EPMC has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how EPMC will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|--------------|---|
| EPMC | <i>"We will attend group meetings and will participate in the annual evaluation of the plan."</i> |
| | "Post information on facility web page and leverage social media" |





Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the EPMC based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|--------------|--|
| ЕРМС | <i>"We will include hazard mitigation in our emergency planning, including updating out hazard assessment"</i> |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide presents EPMC's new mitigation action that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Estes Park medical Center: Medical Center Flood Mitigation | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | | | |
| LOCATION: Estes Park Medical Center | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 4, and 5 | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 6/1/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives B, C, and E | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE:12/31/2016 | | | | |
| ISSUE: The 2013 Flood in Estes Park illustrated | the need to ensure critical facilities, such as the Estes Park | | | |
| Medical Center and associated properties, are | protected against flooding. | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Follow techniques outl | ined in the FEMA resource guide, "Mitigation Ideas, A | | | |
| Resource for Reducing Risk to Natural Hazards, | " to protect critical facilities from flood events. | | | |
| ACTION: Upgrade facilities to mitigate agains | t future flood impacts, including 1) implementation of a | | | |
| stormwater management plan and 2) design | and construction of a rain gauge system to provide early | | | |
| warning lead time to implement flood protection | on measures throughout the facility. | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Estes Park Medical Center | EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Loveland and Larimer | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Town of Estes Park | | | |
| Offices of Emergency Management | Resources, Estes Valley Medical Center resources, grant | | | |
| | funding | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | | | |
| Partner with Larimer County on Stream and Rain Gauge monitoring system to ensure Estes Park | | | | |
| Medical Center receives notifications | | | | |
| Upgrade infrastructure to mitigate against future flood impacts, including communications, | | | | |
| energy systems, and building design and construction | | | | |
| Relocate electrical equipment, vital hospital records, and medical equipment to flood resistant | | | | |
| areas of the facility | | | | |
| Implement policies with direct mitigati | Implement policies with direct mitigation actions for staff to decrease damage and loss during | | | |
| rainfall and flood events | 5 | | | |





- Determine available funding mechanisms for areas of greatest need
- Secure funding

| Estes Park medical Center/Prospect Park Living Center Water Storage System (Estes Park Medical Center – 1) | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium-High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Water supply for Medical Center during loss of domestic water. | | | |
| LOCATION: Estes Park medical Center and adjacent Prospect Park Living Center | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1. Protect people, property and natural resources | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/30/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C. Incorporate risk reduction principles into policy documents and initiatives; other institutional plans | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2017 | | | | |
| ISSUE: In the event of a local water supply interruption, the Medical Center needs to have an alternate | | | | |
| water supply to provide continuity of operation for essential operations. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Budget and equip to provide a dependable safe water supply (create storage capability) for a minimum of 96 hours of operation for all aspects of Medical Center Operation including patient care, plant operations, and, diagnostic and testing equipment. | | | | |
| ACTION: Budgeting installation of needed equipment to store and/or receive potable water in sufficient | | | | |
| quantity, working with Town, County, and, State agencies to provide potable water to the facility. Installed | | | | |
| by Licensed contractor to insure safe dependable operation. | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Estes Park Medical Center, Prospect Park Living Center. | EXPECTED COST: \$30-50,000 | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: General operating funds | | | |

and/or potential grants.





PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Determine total number of gallons needed to provide minimum water •
- Budget equipment •
- Partner with a contractor who is licensed to install the water storage system •
- Conduct inspections and testing of the system as dictated by regulation •









Letter of Intent to Participate



555 Prospect Avenue PO Box 240 Estes Park, Colorado 80517 (970) 586-2317

LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

November 4, 2015

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans, the Estes Park Medical Center (EPMC) is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that Estes Park medical Center has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, EPMC agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

EPMC understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I Mark Gregson, interim Chief Executive Officer, commit Estes Park medical Center to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

| | \bigcap | | Fr | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|----|----|----|--|
| Executed this 4th day of November: | | 16 | V |)p | |
| | | | | | |

Member of American Hospital Association • Member of Colorado Hospital Association • Member of Voluntary Hospitals of America, Inc.







Estes Valley Fire Protection District

"The Mission of the Estes Valley Fire Protection District is to provide the citizens of and visitors to the Estes Valley with superior fire prevention, fire protection and emergency services in a safe and efficient manner."

-Mission, Estes Valley Fire Protection District

Community Profile

The Estes Valley Fire Protection District (EVFPD) was established in 2009 and became autonomous on January 1, 2010. The EVFPD is comprised of 5 District Board Members, the Estes Park Volunteer Fire Department & Dive Team, Fire Chief, Training Captain, Fire Marshal and Administrative Assistant.

The Estes Valley Fire Protection District is located in southwestern Larimer County and is composed of a portion of unincorporated Larimer County and the Town of Estes Park, encompassing a 66.3 square mile area. There are 2 Fire Stations that serve the Estes Valley community:

- Station 1 Dannels Fire Station at 901 N. St. Vrain Ave.
- Station 2 1600 Mills Drive.







Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Fire – Wildland | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.6 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 3.3 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 3.3 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 3.3 |
| Utility Disruption | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 3.2 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.7 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 2.3 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.2 |
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.6 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Fire – Wildland; Flood – Flash and Riverine; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Utility Disruption; Landslide / Rockslide | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Erosion / Deposition; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | | | | | | |
| Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Tornado; Earthquake; Civil Disturbance; Biological Hazards / Contagion | | | | | | |

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Estes Valley Fire Protection District, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis





was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Estes Valley Fire Protection District.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Estes Valley Fire Protection District's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the district.



Social Vulnerability Map – Estes Valley Fire Protection District¹⁰⁷

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.





¹⁰⁷ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

The Estes Valley Fire Protection District is characterized by a mix of low (bottom 20%) to medium levels of social vulnerability. This does not mean, however, that there a not any vulnerable populations within the District. Over time, the district should continue to monitor their social vulnerability as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change..

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to USGS there have been 47 reported wildfire events in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District between 1980 and 2013. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the Estes Valley Fire Protection District, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time in the Estes Valley Fire Valley Fire Protection District.



Estes Valley Fire Protection District Historical Federal Wildfire Map

Inventory Exposed

The Town of Estes Park located within the Estes Valley Fire Protection District, has established wildfire hazard zone designation to help hazard mitigation of wildfires in new developments and subdivisions. The mapped hazard areas include all areas "high-tree" fire hazard areas. Any new development or subdivision requires a mitigation plan prepared by a professional forester addressing how the development or subdivision will avoid or mitigate wildfire hazards. The following figure illustrates the high wildfire hazard zones determined by the Town of Estes Park, the Colorado State Forest Service, and Larimer County Wildfire Safety Specialist.

Page 416









The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. There are the highest wildfire hazard zones throughout the district.



¹⁰⁸ High Wildfire Hazard Zones, from Town of Estes Park





The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the western and eastern regions, in areas where there are lower population densities.





¹⁰⁹ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.





There are a number of areas in the eastern and western regions of the district that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





¹¹⁰ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk.



Estes Valley Fire Protection District WUI Map¹¹¹

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Estes Valley Fire Protection District depends. There are many areas of high wildfire threat throughout the town according to the WUI Risk Index. There are also many medium threat areas.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District. There is 1 critical facility located in areas with the *most negative* and 6 critical facilities located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the critical facilities within these *most and 2nd most negative* threat areas is approximately \$10 million dollars. There are 1,450 parcels/structures located in areas with the *most negative* wildfire threat total 1,338 parcels/structures located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat





¹¹¹ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts.

total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these *most and 2nd most negative* threat areas is over \$657.79 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.



Estes Valley Fire Protection District Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone¹¹²

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.





¹¹² Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Estes Valley Fire Protection District that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Flood – Flash and Riverine



Previous Occurrences

Estes Park sustained severe damages during the September 2013 Colorado flood event. Evacuations began on September 12, 2013, at approximately 3:00AM and 2,428 contacts were made to warn and evacuate neighborhoods through the LETA911 emergency notification system. The information below was provided by the Town of Estes Park and provides a snapshot of just home many residents were impacted by the flood.





¹¹³ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.

| Red Cross Shelter Support: | 606 people signed in | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 167 people sheltered in the cents | | | |
| | 316 people outsourced to local hotels for varying amounts of time | | | |
| Salvation Army Support: | 3571 meals were served | | | |
| | 7000 snacks/drinks were served | | | |
| | 9000 gallons of water distributed | | | |
| | Estimated \$35-40 million in public infrastructure damage in the Estes | | | |
| | Valley | | | |
| Utilities Outages and | 3.25 miles of Fish Creek Road are destroyed or damaged | | | |
| Restoration | Caused outages for electric, water, gas, cable and phones | | | |
| | Approximately 4,000 sewer taps were non-functional under "No Flush" | | | |
| | orders within the Upper Thompson Sanitation District. | | | |
| | Rapid assessments completed for approximately 3,000 structures in the | | | |
| | Estes Valley this week. Approximately 12 red tags were issued for | | | |
| Structural Damage | properties that were determined to be unsafe for occupancy due to | | | |
| Assessments (incorporated Estes Park) | structural damage or electrical safety. | | | |
| | 2,383 estimated residences affected by water, mud, sewer access, road | | | |
| | access | | | |
| | 183 estimated businesses affected by water, mud, sewer access, road | | | |
| | access | | | |







Estes Valley Fire Protection District Fall River 2013 Flood Extent¹¹⁴





¹¹⁴ Based on high water marks collected by the Town of Estes Park.



Estes Valley Fire Protection District Fish Creek 2013 Flood Extent¹¹⁵

In addition to the September 2013 flood two additional floods were reported according to the NOAA's Storm Events Database. On August 2, 2007 a flash flood occurred resulting in \$20,000 in property damage. Another flash flood occurred on July 18, 2013 resulting in \$10,000 in property damage and \$5,000 in crop damage. There were no reported injuries or deaths from these two floods.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 5 critical facility and 750 structures in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$7.17 million dollars and the exposed structures is over \$187.57 million dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Estes Valley Fire Protection District that for a 100-year flood event, no critical facilities and approximately 106 buildings will experience flood damage. The total economic loss





¹¹⁵ Based on high water marks collected by the Town of Estes Park.

estimated for the 100-year flood is over \$7.4 million dollars. The estimated building loss is over \$4.2 million dollars, over \$2.9 million dollars in content loss, and over \$240.9 thousand dollars in inventory loss.



Estes Valley Fire Protection District 1% Annual Flood Loss Estimation and Flood Depth Grid Map¹¹⁶





¹¹⁶ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the district. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries, deaths, or loss in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District due to hail. There have been 6 hail events reported in the District between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.









According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there is no historic data for thunderstorm wind events in the Estes Park Medical service area. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 9 lightning events in the Estes Park Medical service area between 1996 and 2014. There have been 27 reported injuries, 4 deaths, \$5,000 worth of property damage, and no reported crop damage. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the area, there is a great potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 166 Windstorm events in and near the Estes Park Medical service area between 1996 and 2014. There have been 2 reported injuries, no deaths, \$13.5 million dollars' worth of property damage, and no reported crop damage. There is no graphical data available showing the specific locations of these high wind events within the service area. Based on the





¹¹⁷ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

historic data showing hazardous impacts on the area, there is a great potential for high wind events to occur at any given time.





Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption





¹¹⁸ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Estes Valley Fire Protection District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Estes Valley Fire Protection District. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Estes Valley Fire Protection District will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Estes Valley Fire Protection District experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 166 severe wind events since 1996, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Estes Valley Fire Protection District has experienced 175 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas within western Larimer County above 6,000 feet. There were no deaths,





injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Estes Valley Fire Protection District is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Estes Valley Fire Protection District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Estes Valley Fire Protection District.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Estes Valley Fire Protection District will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the district at least once every year.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Estes Valley Fire Protection District does not currently track incidences of utility disruption.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in Estes Valley Fire Protection District are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes all people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the District.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.





Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Estes Valley Fire Protection District.

Landslide / Rockslide

Previous Occurrences

According to the Colorado Geological Survey there have been no reported landslide events within the boundaries of the Estes Valley Fire Protection District.

Inventory Exposed

There are locations near the Estes Valley Fire Protection District that are vulnerable to landslides and rockslides. As population growth brings new development into available land in the area, more inventory assets may become exposed to landslides and rockslides hazards. The following figures show historical and potential landslide and rockslide areas that are close to the Estes Valley Fire Protection District service boundary.








¹¹⁹ Historical and potential landslide areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.









Potential Losses

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are no critical facility and 13 parcels/structures in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District that are prone to landslides (not including the total miles of landslide prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed structures is over \$388 thousand dollars.

¹²⁰ Potential rock fall areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.







Parcels in Landslide Areas –Estes Valley Fire Protection District¹²¹

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 9 critical facility and 2,668 structures in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District that are prone to rockslides (not including the total miles of rockslide prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$9.9 million dollars and the exposed structures is over \$633.3 million dollars.

¹²¹ Parcels intersecting potential & historical landslide areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.









Probability of Future Occurrences

Due to the uncertainty associated with existing data, it is challenging to accurately calculate probability for future events related to landslide and rockslide hazards. It can be assured however, that these hazards will continue to alter the landscape of the Estes Valley Fire Protection District in the future.

Overall, the probability of future occurrences of rockslide and landslide events in the Estes Valley Fire Protection District is high. Many areas of the district are prone to these types of hazard events due to their proximity to previous landslide events, their location at the base or top of steep slopes and drainage basins, or their location on infill or steep slope cuts. Individual assessments of landslide-prone areas are recommended in the future. Moreover, as development and population increase in the district, increasing numbers of structures (and people) will be exposed to future landslide and rockslide events.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Estes Valley Fire Protection District to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the district's hazard mitigation program.



¹²² Parcels that intersect potential rock fall areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.

<u>Local Personnel</u>

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the district's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | ^ |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | Х | |

In the Estes Valley Fire Protection District the Fire Chief takes on the role of emergency manager for the district. The district's Fire Marshal assists with community planning.

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the Estes Valley Fire Protection District's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Ν |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Y |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | N |
| A Stormwater Plan | N |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Y |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | N |
| Participates in the NFIP N | |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Estes Valley Fire Protection District has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the district will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.





| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|---------------------|---|
| | <i>"Our mitigation efforts will be directed and maintained through the Fire Chief and/or the Fire Marshal of the District."</i> |
| Estes Valley Fire | |
| Protection District | <i>"The District's website provides information and announcements of our mitigation efforts and plans. Any changes will be provided through our website and in the local newspapers."</i> |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Estes Valley Fire Protection District based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|--|--|
| Estes Valley Fire Protection District | "The District will integrate the hazard mitigation actions into the Community Wildfire Preparedness Plan (CWPP) and also see how it interfaces with the adopted fire codes and our emergency operations plan. Any hazard mitigation actions should coincide with our adopted CWPP and its identified high risk areas." |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide presents the District's mitigation action that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Estes Valley Fire Protection District: Wildfire Mitigation Project (Estes Valley FPD – 1) | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| PRIORITY: 1 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Wildfire risk | |
| LOCATION: Project location | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/28/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, C and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2019 | October 31, 2016 | |

ISSUE: One of the highest hazards our community faces is the threat of a wildfire. We recommend that property owners trim branches and remove dead material form their properties to reduce the spread of a wildfire on their property. We have found the largest deterrent to the property owner doing this work was the cost in removing the slash. In an effort to reduce the wildfire threat we have been providing a slash collection site for local residents to drop off slash free of charge. The slash is then chipped and hauled away. The district finances two slash collections per year, one in the spring and one in the fall. Each year we have seen an increase in the amount of slash that is brought to the site. For 2016 the district increased the funding for this effort from \$9,000 annually to \$12,000. To date we have removed thousands of cubic yards of slash thus reducing the fuel for a wildfire to our residents.





RECOMMENDATION: Provide an economical avenue for property owners to remove slash and encourage them to reduce the fuel load on their properties.

| ACTION: Continue slash removal efforts throughout the district to reduce wildfire risk overall. | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| LEAD AGENCY: Estes Valley Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: \$12,000 | | |
| District | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Town of Estes Park | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Fire District budget | | |
| provides the slash collection location and | | | |
| assists in loading the chipper and removing | | | |
| the biomass with heavy equipment. | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | | |
| Continue to provide opportunities for commu | nity members to | | |
| drop off slash free of charge. | and the second | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |





the second s

Letter of Intent to Participate



LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

August 22, 2014

Larimer County Government 200 W. Dak St. Fort Collins, CO 80522

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in Larimer County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Miligation Plan (HMP)

Dear Loni Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multijurisdictional mitigation plana, the Estea Vallay Fire Protection District (EVFPD) is submitting this lefter of intent to confirm that EVFPD has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, EVFPD agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

The EVFPD understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazerds unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the mester planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation
 actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each
 jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, allending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Larimer County and the Participating Jurisdiction, I Scott Dorman, Fire Chief, commit the Estes Valley Fire Protection District to the Larimer County's Multi-Jurisdigtional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 22nd day of August

man

Signature of Chief Elected Official or Authorized Agent

901 N. Saint Vrain Avenue • Estes Park, CO 80517 • P-970-577-0900 • F-970-577-0923





Estes Valley Recreation and Park District

"The mission of the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District is to plan, direct, organize, and implement recreational programs, manage facilities, and provide public park and recreation opportunities for residents of the District and visitors to the community. The District will implement programs that offer a wide variety of recreational opportunities for all age groups, including both active and passive experiences. The District will provide recreational services and facilities within the financial limitations and scope of the District."

-- Mission Statement, Estes Valley Recreation and Park District

Community Profile

Estes Valley Recreation & Park District (EVRPD) is a public agency providing parks and recreation programs for members of the community and visitors to Estes Park. The District provides golf, marina, boat rentals, fishing, tennis, swimming, softball, baseball, playgrounds, picnicking, youth center, and many more recreational programs.

The District encompasses approximately 320 square miles in southwestern Larimer County and northern Boulder County, and includes within its boundaries primarily unincorporated land and the Town of Estes Park. The permanent population of the Recreation District varies between 10,800 and 11,600 in any given year. The District's boundaries have remained unchanged since its organization.







Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 3.3 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 3.0 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.5 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.3 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.3 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.1 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.9 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.7 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Tornado | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Flood – Flash and Riverine; Fire – Wildland; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Utility Disruption; Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Landslide / Rockslide | | | | | | |

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Erosion / Deposition; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Civil Disturbance Earthquake; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Tornado

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis





was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the district.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Estes Valley Recreation and Park District's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the district.



Social Vulnerability Map – Estes Valley Recreation and Park District¹²³

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.





¹²³ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

The Estes Valley Recreation and Park District is characterized by a mix of low to medium levels of social vulnerability. Social vulnerability to disasters appears to increase as we move west across the district. A closer analysis of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the district will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on the district and its resiliency. It is important that the district continue to monitor social vulnerability levels over time as demographics and economics change in the area.

Flood – Flash and Riverine





Previous Occurrences

Estes Park sustained severe damages during the September 2013 Colorado flood event. Evacuations began on September 12, 2013, at approximately 3:00AM and 2,428 contacts were made to warn and evacuate neighborhoods through the LETA911 emergency notification system. The information below was





¹²⁴ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.

provided by the Town of Estes Park and provides a snapshot of just home many residents were impacted by the flood.

| | 606 people signed in |
|----------------------------|--|
| Red Cross Shelter Support: | 167 people sheltered in the cents |
| | 316 people outsourced to local hotels for varying amounts of time |
| | 3571 meals were served |
| Salvation Army Support: | 7000 snacks/drinks were served |
| | 9000 gallons of water distributed |
| | Estimated \$35-40 million in public infrastructure damage in the Estes |
| | Valley |
| Utilities Outages and | 3.25 miles of Fish Creek Road are destroyed or damaged |
| Restoration | Caused outages for electric, water, gas, cable and phones |
| | Approximately 4,000 sewer taps were non-functional under "No Flush" |
| | orders within the Upper Thompson Sanitation District. |
| | Rapid assessments completed for approximately 3,000 structures in the |
| | Estes Valley this week. Approximately 12 red tags were issued for |
| Structural Damago | properties that were determined to be unsafe for occupancy due to |
| Assessments | structural damage or electrical safety. |
| | 2,383 estimated residences affected by water, mud, sewer access, road |
| (Incorporated Estes Park) | access |
| | 183 estimated businesses affected by water, mud, sewer access, road |
| | access |













¹²⁵ Based on high water marks collected by the Town of Estes Park.



Estes Valley Recreation and Park District Fish Creek 2013 Flood Extent¹²⁶

In addition to the September 2013 flood two additional floods were reported according to the NOAA's Storm Events Database. On August 2, 2007 a flash flood occurred resulting in \$20,000 in property damage. Another flash flood occurred on July 18, 2013 resulting in \$10,000 in property damage and \$5,000 in crop damage. There were no reported injuries or deaths from these two floods.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 8 critical facility and 1,349 structures in the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$8 million dollars and the exposed structures is over \$237.87 million dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District that for a 100-year flood event, no critical facilities and approximately 163 buildings will experience flood damage. The total economic loss





¹²⁶ Based on high water marks collected by the Town of Estes Park.

estimated for the 100-year flood is over \$9.6 million dollars. The estimated building loss is over \$5.3 million dollars, over \$3.7 million dollars in content loss, and over \$561 thousand dollars in inventory loss.



Estes Valley Recreation and Park District 1% Annual Flood Loss Estimation and Flood Depth Grid Map¹²⁷

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.





¹²⁷ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the district. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 333 reported wildfire events in the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time.Estes Valley Recreation and Park District Historical Federal Wildfire Map¹²⁸



Inventory Exposed

The Town of Estes Park located within the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District, has established wildfire hazard zone designation to help hazard mitigation of wildfires in new developments and subdivisions. The mapped hazard areas include all areas "high-tree" fire hazard areas. Any new development or subdivision requires a mitigation plan prepared by a professional forester addressing how





¹²⁸ Source: Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.

the development or subdivision will avoid or mitigate wildfire hazards. The following figure illustrates the high wildfire hazard zones determined by the Town of Estes Park, the Colorado State Forest Service, and Larimer County Wildfire Safety Specialist.



Estes Valley Recreation and Park District High Wildfire Hazard Zones¹²⁹

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones are located throughout the district. Estes Valley Recreation and Park District Wildfire Hazard



¹²⁹ High Wildfire Hazard Zones, from Town of Estes Park



The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. There are areas with the highest wildfire risk throughout the





¹³⁰ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.



There are a number of areas in the central and northeastern regions of the district that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.







¹³¹ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk.



Estes Valley Recreation and Park District WUI Map¹³²

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District depends. There are many areas of high wildfire threat throughout the town according to the WUI Risk Index. There are also many areas of medium threat.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District. There is 1 critical facility located in areas with the *most negative* and 7 critical facilities located in areas with the 2nd most negative wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the critical facilities within these most and 2nd most negative threat areas is approximately \$10 million dollars. There are 1,592 parcels/structures located in





¹³² Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.

areas with the *most negative* and 1,558 parcels/structures located in areas with the 2nd most negative wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these most and 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$381.8 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.

Estes Valley Recreation and Park District Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone¹³³



Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.





¹³³ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries, deaths, or loss in the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District due to hail. There have been 19 hail events reported in the district between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.



Historical Hail Events in Estes Valley Recreation and Park District¹³⁴

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there is no historic data for thunderstorm wind events in the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is a great potential for thunderstorm wind events to occur at any given time.





¹³⁴ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 9 lightning events in the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District between 1996 and 2014. There have been 27 reported injuries, 4 deaths, \$5,000 worth of property damage, and no reported crop damage. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 115 windstorm events in and near the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District between 1996 and 2014. There have been 2 reported injuries, no deaths, \$13.5 million dollars' worth of property damage, and no reported crop damage. There is no graphical data available showing the specific locations of these high wind events within the district. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the area, there is a great potential for high wind events to occur at any given time.



Historical High Wind Events in Estes Valley Recreation and Park District¹³⁵

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail,





¹³⁵ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Estes Valley Recreation and Park District will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Estes Valley Recreation and

Page 457





Park District experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 115 severe wind events since 1996, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the district's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the district's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | Х |
| Administrator | | | |
| Community Planner | | | Х |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | Х | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the district's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Ν |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | Ν |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Ν |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Ν |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Ν |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Ν |
| Participates in the NFIP | Ν |





Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Estes Valley Recreation and Park District has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the district will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|----------------|--|
| Estes Valley | "Our Board of Directors will review our mitigation plan on an annual basis." |
| Recreation and | |
| Park District | "We will post our updates on the EVRPD website." |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|---|--|
| Estes Valley Recreation and Park District | <i>"We will base the priority of projects on the actions in our hazard mitigation plan."</i> |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide presents the District's mitigation action that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Estes Valley Recreation and Park District – Fish Creek Trail (Estes Valley Rec & Park – 1) | | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: 1 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm | |
| LOCATION: Estes Park, CO | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1. Protect people, property, and natural resources. 2. Improve capability to reduce disaster losses. | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 7/1/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E. Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impact of hazards. | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 7/1/2017 | | |
| ISSUE: Heavy flood waters down the Fish Creek Corridor in Estes Park undercut the road and several utilities along Fish Creek Rd. Though the road and the utilities are not the responsibility of the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District, we have a soft surface trail that runs the length of the corridor. The trail was supported by retaining walls, culverts, and pedestrian bridges that were all compromised during the flood event. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: In an effort to prevent future flood events from causing similar destruction, resiliency measures, including those pertained in Senate Bill 40 to wildlife habitat and riparian area, will be implemented into construction design, means, and methods. | | |
| ACTION: Rebuilding, realigning, and stabilization of Fish Creek Trail. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Estes Valley Recreation and Park District | EXPECTED COST: \$993,891.40 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: FEMA, Great Outdoors Colorado, Town of Estes Park | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: FEMA, GOCO | |
| 7.1.4 PROGRESS MILESTONES: Design of construction at 90%. Construction Start Summer 2016 Completion Summer 2017 Point of Contact: Estes Valley Recreation and Park District Matt Hines, Project Manager Matt@evrpd.com Tom Carosello, Executive Director TomC@evrpd.com | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

July 21, 2015

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans, the Estes Valley Recreation and Park District (EVRPD) is submitting this letter of Intent to confirm that EVRPD has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, EVRPD agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County DEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

EVRPD understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's Local Mitigation Planning Handbook dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning
 process by all community stakeholders (relevant involvement in any planning process, attending
 meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each Jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I Kathy Asche, commit EVRPD to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 21st day of July

Kathy Aschel, Board President

P.O. Box 1379, 690 Big Thompson Avenue Estes Park, CO 80517 info@evrpd.com http://www.ovrpd.com 970-585-8191 Phone 970-585-8193 Pax





City of Fort Collins

"Three major themes of Plan Fort Collins provide direction for the vision for the next 25 years and beyond: Innovate, Sustain, and Connect." – Plan Fort Collins, 2011

Community Profile

The City of Fort Collins is located in northern Colorado at the base of the foothills to the Rocky Mountains at approximately 5,000 feet above sea level. The City experiences on average 300 days of sunshine and approximately 14.5 inches of precipitation per year. Fort Collins was founded as a military fort in 1864 and was referred to "Camp Collins." The city is home to Colorado State University with an enrollment in 2015 of approximately 32,236 students.

There are approximately 1,600 faculty members and 4,800 additional employees at CSU, making it the largest employer in Fort Collins. The CSU campuses include the main campus in the center of Fort Collins, the Foothills Campus on the west side of town and the CSU Veterinary Teaching Hospital just south of the main campus.

Fort Collins has a mix of manufacturing and service-related businesses. Many high-tech businesses have relocated to Fort Collins because of the resources of Colorado State University and its research facilities. In addition, Fort Collins is home to many small business and entrepreneurial ventures. The brewery industry is significant in Fort Collins, ranging from small craft breweries to large national breweries, such as Anheuser Busch.

Fort Collins was incorporated in 1873. Not long ago Fort Collins was a small community, centered on Old Town and its neighborhoods. In the last 50 years the city has grown from 25,000 people in 1960 to over 140,000 people in 2010.







The table following summarizes key demographic and development related characteristics of the City of Fort Collins.

| City of Fort Collins Statistics | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------|
| | City of Fort Collins | Colorado |
| Population, 2010 | 143,986 | 5,029,196 |
| 2000-2010 Population Change, % | 18% | 14.5% |
| % Population under 5 years, 2010 | 5.7% | 6.8% |
| % Population under 19 years, 2010 | 25.7% | 20.3 |
| % Population 65 years and over, 2010 | 8.8% | 10.9% |
| Language other than English spoken at home, % age 5+, 2009-2013 | 10.4% | 15.9% |
| Homeownership Rate 2010 | 55.1% | 65.5% |
| Persons Per Household 2010 | 2.37 | 2.57 |
| Persons below poverty level, %, 2013 | 18.6% | 13.2% |
| Median Household Income, 2013 | \$53,780 | \$58,433 |





Participation in the Community Rating System

The Community Rating System (CRS) is a voluntary national program developed by FEMA that provides flood insurance premium reductions based on a participating community's implementation of floodplain management programs that exceed the minimum requirements established by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Credit points for the CRS floodplain management activities determine a community's CRS Class. Fort Collins is currently a Class 4 community and works hard to implement policies and education campaigns that help reduce flood risk in and around the community.

In addition to participating fully in the development of the Larimer County hazard mitigation plan, the City of Fort Collins leveraged the process as an opportunity to strengthen their CRS participation. Throughout the hazard mitigation planning process, Fort Collins paid special attention to the CRS 510 steps that relate specifically to hazard mitigation and floodplain management planning processes. Below is a summary of how the City augmented the ongoing Larimer County hazard mitigation planning process with a modified CRS planning approach.

| FEMA's 4-Phase Hazard Mitigation Planning Process | Community Rating System Planning Steps |
|--|--|
| Phase I - Planning Process | |
| 201.6(c)(1) | 1. Organize |
| 201.6(b)(1) | 2. Involve the Public |
| 201.6(b)(2) & (3) | 3. Coordinate with other agencies |
| Phase II - Risk Assessment | |
| 201.6(c)(2)(i) | 4. Assess the Hazard |
| 201.6(c)(2)(ii) & (iii) | 5. Assess the problem |
| Phase III - Mitigation Strategy | |
| 201.6(c)(3)(i) | 6. Set goals |
| 201.6(c)(3)(ii) | 7. Review possible mitigation activities |
| 201.6(c)(3)(iii) | 8. Draft a mitigation action guide |
| Phase IV - Plan Maintenance and Implementation | |
| 201.6(c)(5) | 9. Adopt the Plan |
| 201.6(c)(4) | 10. Implement, evaluate, revise |

Table 53. Fort Collins' Integrated CRS and HMP Process

Fort Collins' desired outcome for developing this modified process was to align their ongoing floodplain management planning with their larger mitigation framework to facilitate the selection of the best mitigation measures for the community and its hazards. Additionally, the City's effort will make them eligible for CRS planning credit and the associated points due to the planning process including non-City stakeholders as part of the planning team and public involvement efforts.

The City of Fort Collins carried out additional public information activities and outreach projects in order to align the hazard mitigation planning process with their ongoing CRS participation activities. This section outlines the efforts taken by the City of Fort Collins to go above and beyond the minimum planning requirements established by FEMA for the hazard mitigation planning process. Appendix D provides





detailed documentation of each of the activities that the City took in order to meet the CRS planning requirements.

<u>CRS Step 1 (Organize and Prepare the Plan) and Steps 3-8 (Assess the Hazards; Assess the Problems; Set</u> <u>Goals; Review Possible Activities; and Draft an Action Plan)</u>

Step 1a. CRS credit is assigned if the office responsible for the community's land use and comprehensive planning is actively involved in the hazard mitigation planning process. The "office" may be the community's planning or community development department, a consulting firm, or a regional planning agency, provided that it performs regular land use or comprehensive planning duties for the community.

To meet this requirement, Pete Wray, a member of the Fort Collins Planning and Development Department was present and active at two of the three Planning Team meetings and was briefed and provided input for the meeting he was unable to attend. He also participated in reviewing the draft plan.

Step 1b. Credit is also assigned to communities if the planning process is conducted through a committee composed of staff from those community departments that implement or have expertise in the activities that will be reviewed in Step 7 (Review Possible Mitigation Activities).

The members of the Hazard Mitigation Planning Team included staff from a comprehensive range of community departments that implement or have expertise in the activities that will be reviewed in Step 7 (see the following table of Planning Team Members who attended 2 or more of the planning meetings).

| Hazard Mitigation Planning Team Members | | |
|--|--|--|
| (A primary or alternate member attended at least 2 of 3 planning meetings) | | |
| Governmental | Other Stakeholders | |
| Larimer County Health and Environment | Estes Park FPD | |
| Larimer OEM | Crystal Lakes FPD | |
| Town of Estes Park | Glacier View FPD | |
| City of Fort Collins Stormwater | Poudre Canyon FPD | |
| City of Fort Collins Streets | Poudre FPD | |
| City of Fort Collins OEM | CSU | |
| City of Fort Collins Environmental Services | Poudre Valley EMS | |
| City of Fort Collins Environmental Quality | Big Thompson Watershed Coalition | |
| City of Fort Collins Risk Management | Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District | |
| City of Fort Collins Planning | Platte River Power Authority | |
| City of Loveland Community Partnership | Upper Thompson Sanitation District | |
| City of Loveland Facilities Management | | |
| City of Loveland Risk Management | | |
| City of Loveland OEM | | |
| City of Loveland PD | | |
| City of Loveland Stormwater | | |
| City of Loveland Public Works | | |
| City of Loveland Water & Power | | |
| Town of Timnath | | |





Specifically for Fort Collins, the departments represented on the Planning Team included: Stormwater, OEM, Risk Management, Planning, Environmental Quality, Transportation/Streets, and Environmental Services. The Large Planning Team met a total of 3 times to Assess the Hazards; Assess the Problems; Set Goals; Review Possible Activities; and Draft an Action Plan.

Each community participated in the following plan update development activities:

- Attendance at Planning Team meetings, public meetings, and open houses
- Attendance at workshops and planning partner training sessions
- Coordination of data collection and analysis
- Development of Plan Goals and Objectives
- Review of the risk and vulnerability assessment; identification of hazards
- Sharing information about mitigation projects in their departments since the adoption of the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Review mitigation alternatives and identify potential mitigation actions. Identification of at least
 one mitigation action for each 'High Priority' hazard identified for their community. Each project
 was prioritized and reviewed to identify their benefits and costs. Local agencies/individuals
 responsible for implementing and tracking these mitigation actions were also identified and
 included in the plan.
- Review of the mitigation recommendations chosen for the overall county and evaluation of any unmet needs
- Facilitation of public review and comment periods prior to adoption
- Development of plan implementation and maintenance protocol.

As per FEMA requirements, attendance was tracked at all planning activities. All attendance records are included in Appendix A and can be used to track and document participation in the planning process for CRS scoring purposes.





CRS Step 2: Involve the Public

CRS points are assigned to a community if the local hazard mitigation planning process is conducted through a planning committee that includes members of the public and meets the following criteria:

If the committee includes community staff (e.g., the planning committee credited under Step 1(b)), then at least one-half of the members must be representatives of the public or stakeholders for full credit. Note that receiving 50% of the maximum credit for this planning step is a prerequisite for Class 4 or better communities and item (a) is one-half of the credit for Step 2.

The Larimer County hazard mitigation planning committee included representatives from 8 communities and also included public stakeholders. The total number of representatives on the Planning Team that attended at least two of the three meetings was 30 and 11 of them were stakeholders. Therefore, the committee was made up of 37% public stakeholders. A full roster of the planning committee is available in Appendix D, indicating who they represent along with primary and alternate designations for some participants.

CRS credit is also possible if one or more public information meetings is held in the affected area(s) within the first two months of the planning process to obtain public input on the natural hazards, problems, and possible solutions. The meetings must be held separately from the planning committee meetings.

Fort Collins held a separate public outreach meeting on July 27th (within the first two months of the planning process) to inform the public about hazard mitigation, the planning process, risks facing Larimer County and opportunities to participate The following image shows the flier that Fort Collins prepared to announce their Hazard Mitigation Plan Open House and to seek input from the public via surveys on the Mitigation Plan website. The fliers were distributed by city staff at 14 locations as part of "Flood Awareness Week" displays.













A Resilient Fort Collins: Mitigating Hazards in our Backyard

Larimer County and its jurisdictions have recently kicked-off a planning process to update the local hazard mitigation plan and would like input from the community.

Attend a Meeting

To learn more, the Larimer County Office of Emergency Management and City of Fort Collins invite you to a casual evening of discussions about local natural hazards and what impacts can be expected. Your input regarding what you think can be done to mitigate these impacts is important.

Questions to think about:

- What natural hazards impact you?
- What can we do to reduce these impacts?
- How could natural hazards impact those you care about and services you rely on daily?
- Other details include:

• open house setting

- casual discussions facilitated by the City of Fort Collins
- high-quality, up-to-date natural hazard maps
- opportunities to learn and share ideas

LARIMER

Information regarding additional meeting locations and dates, as well as background on the project and hazard mitigation, are available at *www.larimerhmp2016.com*.

Take a Survey

Public participation is a vital component of this planning process. In addition to attending upcoming meetings, we welcome you to take a brief, anonymous survey related to this project at www.larimerhmp2016.com/home/surveys. Thank you for your time and participation.

OPEN HOUSE

Monday, July 27 Fort Collins Police Services Building 2221 S. Timberline Rd. 6:30–8:30 p.m. Short presentations will be given at 6:45 p.m. and 7:45 p.m.

Contact:

Lori Hodges, Larimer County Director of Emergency Management 303-656-3214 Mike Gavin, City of Fort Collins Emergency Manager 970-416-2878

www.larimerhmp2016.com

6/15

The Hazard Mitigation Plan Open House consisted of a short presentation about the Larimer County hazard mitigation planning process and provided community members with an opportunity to participate in a number of surveys related to risk perceptions, unmet needs, and resilience. Additionally, both county and city subject matter experts were on hand to answer any questions raised by attendees.

t Collins






Fifteen CRS points are made available for holding one or more public meetings to obtain input on the recommended plan. The meeting(s) must be at the end of the planning process, at least two weeks before submittal of the recommended plan to the community's governing body.

A public plan review session was held towards the end of the planning process on December 2 in Fort Collins, as seen in pictures after this paragraph. During this public meeting, the draft plan was presented and attendees were asked for feedback on the various proposed mitigation strategies and the overall plan. Attendees were invited to provide comments at the meeting or at another time via the project website, email, or phone. The draft plan document was made available online for public feedback and comments and revisions were incorporated into the plan as necessary.















A Resilient Larimer County: Mitigating Hazards in our Backyard

Larimer County and its jurisdictions are finalizing a planning process to update the local hazard mitigation plan and would like input from the community.

Attend a Meeting

To learn more, the Larimer County Office of Emergency Management and its major cities and towns invite you to a casual evening of discussions about local natural hazards and what impacts can be expected. Your input regarding what you think can be done to mitigate these impacts is important.

Questions to think about:

- . What natural hazards impact you?
- . What can we do to reduce these impacts?
- How could natural hazards impact those you care about and services you rely on daily?

Other details include:

- open house setting
- casual discussions facilitated by city representatives
- high-quality, up-to-date natural hazard maps
- · opportunities to learn and share ideas

Information regarding additional meeting locations and dates, as well as background on the project and hazard mitigation, are available at *www.larimerhmp2016.com*.

OPEN HOUSE

Wednesday, Dec. 2, 6-8 p.m. Larimer County Building 200 West Oak St. Boyd Lake Conference Room, 1st Floor Short presentations will be given at 6:15 p.m. and 7:15 p.m.

Contact:

Lori Hodges, Larimer County Director of Emergency Management 303-656-3214

Mike Gavin, City of Fort Collins Emergency Manager 970-416-2878

Pat Mialy, Loveland Fire Rescue Authority Emergency Manager 970-962-2534

www.larimerhmp2016.com



11/15





Finally, CRS credit is assigned for each additional public information activity implemented to explain the planning process and encourage input to the planner or planning committee (up to a maximum of 30 points).

From the start of the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning process, the City of Fort Collins prioritized a suite of multi-faceted public outreach and information activities. The City of Fort Collins implemented the following 5 public information activities during the hazard mitigation planning process:

- Public engagement and education through the Project Website (see Chapter 3, Section 3.6 of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan)
- Social Media Twitter and Facebook announcements
- Larimer County Safety Expo representatives of the committee provided info on the Hazard Mitigation Planning Process and answered questions.
- Fliers at community events and Flood Awareness Week displays. The fliers announced the Open House and provided the link to the website and public surveys.
- Public Surveys Visions for a Resilient Larimer County, Public Risk Perceptions (see Chapter 3, Section 3.6 of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan)

| | | Share your thoughts in a brief survey to help |
|-----------|----------------|--|
| 7/23/2015 | Twitter | @LarimerCounty mitigate natural hazards. |
| | | http://ow.ly/PFavJ |
| | | The Larimer County Office of Emergency Management |
| | | and City of Fort Collins are hosting an open house on |
| 7/23/2015 | Facebook | Monday, July 27 at 6:30 p.m. Share your thoughts and |
| | | help Larimer County mitigate natural hazards! |
| | | http://ow.ly/PFb5b |
| | | Discuss natural hazards that impact you what can be |
| //25/2015 | Iwitter | done to reduce these impacts http://ow.ly/PFb5b |
| | | Natural bazards pass a real threat to the people and |
| | | nroporty in our community. Take a brief survey to belo |
| 7/25/2015 | Facabaak | the Larimer County Office of Emergency Management |
| //25/2015 | Facebook | and City of Fort Colling mitigate natural bazards |
| | | http://www.larimerhmp2016.com/home/curveys |
| | | Descinder lain an even based to discuss natural |
| 7/27/2045 | T 111.0 | Reminder: Join an open house to discuss natural |
| //2//2015 | Iwitter | hazards that impact you tonight @ 6:30 p.m. |
| | | http://ow.ly/PF8P0 |
| | | Reminder: Join the Larimer County Office of Emergency |
| | | Management and City of Fort Collins for an open house |
| 7/27/2015 | Facebook | today at 6:30 p.m. at Fort Collins Police Services, 2221 |
| | | S. Timberline Road, to discuss natural hazards that |
| | | impact you. http://ow.ly/PF7PU |

Fort Collins' Social Media Tracking – Hazard Mitigation and Public Awareness





| 11/23/2015 | Facebook | Interested in learning about how Larimer County plans for potentially hazardous events? Attend an open house on December 2, 6-8 p.m. at the Larimer County Building. Learn more: <u>www.larimerhmp2016.com</u> |
|------------|----------|---|
| 11/23/2015 | Twitter | Interested in how @larimercounty plans for hazardous events? Attend an open house Dec 2. Learn more: <u>http://www.larimerhmp2016.com</u> |
| 12/2/2015 | Facebook | Reminder! If you want to learn more about how Larimer County plans for potentially hazardous events, attend an open house today, 6-8 p.m. at the Larimer County Building. Learn more: <u>www.larimerhmp2016.com</u> |
| 12/2/2015 | Twitter | Reminder! Attend an open house today 6-8 p.m. & learn how @LarimerCounty plans for potentially hazardous events. www.larimerhmp2016.com |

In addition to the information outlined in the Fort Collins Community Profile, Appendix D contains comprehensive documentation of all of the CRS-related activities that Fort Collins performed during the course of the planning project.

CRS Step 3: Coordinate

Fort Collins reviewed existing studies, reports along with the previous hazard mitigation plan to determine the community's needs and goals. This information is included in Appendix D.

Fort Collins spearheaded additional coordination, outside of the hazard mitigation planning meetings, to facilitate coordination with other agencies and to review the draft plan. Representatives from the City of Fort Collins Stormwater Department attended a meeting on July 16, 2015 with the Fort Collins Water Board that provided an overview of the mitigation planning process and asked for any additional input on the flood hazard (see Water Board meeting agenda located in Appendix D). The draft plan will also be presented to Water Board at a meeting prior to plan adoption.

In addition, emails were sent to 28 agencies seeking additional data and input, especially with regard to the flood hazard for all communities that are part of the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan (see email located in Appendix D). The list of agencies who were contacted are listed below:

- 1. NOAA
- 2. Red Cross
- 3. FEMA Region VIII
- 4. Colorado State Climatologist
- 5. Colorado Dept. of Local Affairs
- 6. CWCB





- 7. Colorado OEM
- 8. Save The Poudre
- 9. Weld County OEM
- 10. Larimer County Long Term
- 11. Recovery Group
- 12. Lutheran Family Services
- 13. Loveland Housing Authority
- 14. Boulder County OEM
- 15. Laramie County OEM
- 16. Phillips County OEM
- 17. Poudre Fire Authority
- 18. Logan County OEM
- 19. Cheyenne County OEM
- 20. City of Evans OEM
- 21. Kit Carson County OEM
- 22. Lincoln County OEM
- 23. Sedgwick County OEM
- 24. Washington County OEM
- 25. City of Greeley OEM
- 26. Yuma County OEM
- 27. Morgan County OEM
- 28. Grand County OEM

CRS Steps 4 & 5: Assess the Hazard & Assess the Problem

These steps in the process assessed the flood hazard areas in detail. Appendix D has an analysis of each basin along with basin maps, specifics about flood depths, pond and roadway overtopping information, critical facilities of concern and a discussion of problems and master planning effort specific to each basin.

CRS Step 6: Set Goals

The overall goals and objectives of the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan are discussed in Chapter 6 of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The goal of the City of Fort Collins floodplain management program is to take a proactive, comprehensive approach to dealing with potential loss of life and property damage due to flooding. Components of this program are:

- Drainage Basin Master Planning that evaluates the flood risk and examines alternatives to mitigate the risk.
- Floodplain regulations and development criteria that attempt to balance risk with regulation
- Cost effective capital projects to reduce the flood hazard.
- Educational outreach efforts to promote awareness of the flood hazard and water quality issues.
- Drainage system maintenance so that facilities can function in a flood.
- Flood warning system maintenance and technical assistance to the Office of Emergency Management for flood response.





CRS Steps 7 & 8: Review Possible Activities & Draft Action Plan

The mitigation alternatives analysis for flooding in Fort Collins along with the recommended mitigation strategy is available in Appendix D. The Mitigation Action Guides for each category of floodplain management can be found at the end of the Fort Collins Community Profile: Mitigation Action Guides with a summary under the mitigation strategies in Appendix D. The mitigation analysis and recommendation discusses why alternatives were or were not chosen, looks at the benefits of existing programs and outlines specific strategies city-wide, basin specific as well as those to be taken by private individuals. A discussion of the Implementation follows with discussion of funding sources as well as the prioritization process. There are Mitigation Action Guides for all of the flood hazard component areas from Step 6 and all of the plans propose funding possibilities. In addition, the overall mitigation plan includes action guides for other hazards and are included in the Fort Collins Community Profile.

The City's Post-Disaster procedures use policy: <u>UOPS 2.0 Substantial Damage Policy</u> (see Appendix D) which was adopted on February 3, 2012 to calculate Substantial Damage as related to the City's floodplain management ordinance. When a structure is damaged by any cause, including but not limited to fire, flood, high wind, blizzard, seismic activity, or land movement this policy requires an evaluation to determine if the structure has been substantially damaged. If a structure is found to be substantially damaged, Fort Collins Utilities in coordination with Building Services will work with property owners to explain the requirements necessary to bring the structure into compliance. The City's Program for Public Information Plan (*City of Fort Collins Floodplain Management Public Information Committee: A Program for Public Information, pages 65-70*) has detailed the flood response outreach projects to be completed post-disaster including website information, brochure displays and social media outreach. A copy of the outreach table is included in Appendix D.

CRS Step 9: Adopt the Plan

The City of Fort Collins City Council will be adopting the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

CRS Step 10: Implement, Evaluate and Revise

The City of Fort Collins will prepare an annual evaluation report that will be provided to City Council and the media, as well as posted on the City's website for the public. See Appendix D for more details.

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|-------------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.90 | 0.75 | 0.50 | 0.33 | 0.30 | 2.78 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.40 | 2.71 |





| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 0.98 | 0.60 | 0.53 | 0.25 | 0.20 | 2.56 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 0.83 | 0.45 | 0.60 | 0.15 | 0.30 | 2.33 |
| Tornado | 0.60 | 0.75 | 0.40 | 0.38 | 0.13 | 2.25 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.75 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.20 | 2.13 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.83 | 0.45 | 0.27 | 0.23 | 0.20 | 1.97 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.75 | 0.45 | 0.20 | 0.40 | 0.15 | 1.95 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.30 | 0.68 | 0.33 | 0.40 | 0.23 | 1.94 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.53 | 0.45 | 0.27 | 0.40 | 0.13 | 1.78 |
| Earthquake | 0.30 | 0.68 | 0.27 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 1.72 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.53 | 0.38 | 0.25 | 0.28 | 0.13 | 1.55 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Flood – Flash and Riverine; Fire – Wildland; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Tornado; Utility Disruption; Erosion / Deposition; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Biological Hazards / Contagion | | | | | | |

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Civil Disturbance; Earthquake; Landslide / Rockslide

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the City of Fort Collins, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to Fort Collins.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the following map. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The City of Fort Collins social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.



MMITTED TO EXCELLEN

LARIMER

COUNT





Social Vulnerability Map – City of Fort Collins¹³⁶

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

The City of Fort Collins is characterized by a mix of low (bottom 20% in the county) to high (top 20% in the county) levels of social vulnerability. The highly socially vulnerable areas are clustered in the northern part of the community. Resources and measures to reduce the social determinates of disasters may be most effectively allocated to these areas. Moreover, it is critical that the city analyze the individual social vulnerability indicators that make the northern part of the community stand out. Through ongoing evaluation, the City of Fort Collins will be able to more effectively reduce local social vulnerability and increase their resilience to hazard events.





¹³⁶ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

Flood – Flash and Riverine









¹³⁷ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.





City of Fort Collins Flood Risk Map



Previous Occurrences

The City of Fort Collins has 12 drainage basins: the Cache la Poudre, Dry Creek, Cooper Slough/Boxelder, West Vine, Old Town, Canal Importation, Spring Creek, Foothills, Mail Creek, Fox Meadows, McClellands and Fossil Creek. All have flooded in the past for various reasons. Each basin is characterized by unique features that must be taken into account when considering hazard mitigation and flood safety. The Drainage Basin Master Plan, approved by City Council in June 2004, describes the flooding history of each basin, identifies potential problem areas and recommends improvements. The Master Plan is updated regularly to reflect changes.

Elements of the "Flood Mitigation Appendix" of the Fort Collins Stormwater Master Plan is included in Appendix D of this plan as a supplement to the risk assessment. Additionally, Appendix D includes maps and mitigation actions identified by Fort Collins Stormwater.

The following image illustrates the history of flooding events in the City of Fort Collins. The flood history information was shared with the public at the Hazard Mitigation Plan Open House in July, 2015.





Fort Collins Flood History Information

| Drainage Basins | Dates | Descriptions |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Cache la Poudre River | 1844, 1864, 1891, 1904, 1923, 1930, 1976, 1983, 1999, 2010, 2011, 2013 and 2014 | The three largest floods occurred in 1864, 1891 and 1904, with peaks of approximately 21,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). For comparison, the discharge of the Poudre River at "flood stage" is about 4,000 cfs. Flooding on the Poudre is primarily from snowmelt in late May and June. However, flash flooding can occur at any time. A severe flood has not occurred in more than 100 years. |
| Spring Creek | 1902, 1904, 1938, 1949, 1951, 1961, 1977, 1983 and 1997 | The 1997 flood resulted in five deaths, destruction of 120 mobile homes and damage to 2,000 homes and businesses. This flood was considered to be greater than a 500-year event. |
| Dry Creek | No serious flooding since about 1950 | The absence of even minor flooding is generally attributed to the network of irrigation canals that have some capacity for intercepting small to moderate Dry Creek flows. |
| Fossil Creek | 1902, 1938, 1965, 1977, 1979, 1997, 1999 and 2007 | Fossil Creek is relatively undeveloped and past floods have gone unnoticed. In addition to flooding hazards, Fossil Creek also is susceptible to bank erosion. |
| Boxelder Creek/ Cooper Slough | 1909, 1922, 1930, 1937, 1947, 1963, 1967, 1969 and 2007 | Boxelder Creek has a drainage area of 251 square miles and 176 square miles now are controlled by Soil Conservation Service flood control dams near Wellington. |
| Old Town Basin | 1904, 1933, 1938, 1951, 1977, 1983, 1988, 1992, 1997 and 2009 | Street flooding is the primary problem in this basin. |
| Canal Importation Basin | 1938, 1951, 1975, 1992, 1997, 1999 and 2009 | There are several small drainage areas in this basin. Development prior to drainage criteria encroached on the channels, reduced the flow capacity and caused flooding. The irrigation canals also overflow their banks and cause flooding. |
| West Vine Basin | 1980, 1997 and 1999 (Past floods were not well documented.) | Localized flooding occurs due to encroachment on drainages and from irrigation ditch spills. |









According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 40 reported injuries and 5 deaths in the City of Fort Collins caused by flooding. On July 28, 1997 14.5 inches of rain fell in 31 hours, 10 inches of that which fell within 6 hours. Debris blocked a culvert along Spring Creek causing a 10-15 foot wall of water to surge through a mobile home park destroying some homes and damaging others. That database also notes that there has been approximately \$190.5 million dollars in property damage and \$50,000 in crop damage from 1996 to 2014. Based on the historic occurrence of floods, City of Fort Collins is extremely vulnerable to flood events at any given time.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that, using countywide criteria, there are 48 critical facilities and 3,701 parcels/structures within the City of Fort Collins that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed critical facilities is over \$171.2 million dollars and the exposed structures is over \$5 billion dollars. The critical facilities are identified for each basin in Appendix D. Fort Collins has prohibited new critical facilities in the floodplain since 1995.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the City of Fort Collins that for a 100-year flood event, that 6 critical facilities and 1,082 parcels/structures will experience flood damage. The total economic loss by critical facilities estimated for the 100-year flood is over \$424 thousand dollars. The estimated building loss is over \$135 thousand dollars, over \$289 thousand dollars in content loss, and no estimated inventory loss. The total economic loss by parcels/structures estimated for the 100-year flood is over \$79.7 million dollars. The estimated building loss is over \$34.4 million dollars, over \$30.3 million dollars in content loss, and over \$14.9 million dollars in inventory loss.









Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the City of Fort Collins provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the city. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.





¹³⁸ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Flood Insurance and Repetitive Loss Information

Fort Collins currently has a total of 433 flood insurance policies (March 3, 2015 data) with an average premium of \$586.00. The majority are Preferred Risk Policies in areas mapped outside of the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Note: many of these may be in City-designated floodplains, such as Old Town, which still qualify for the Preferred Risk Policy.

Only 76 flood policies are in the FEMA 100-year floodplain, which is approximately 40 percent of the structures mapped in the FEMA floodplain. There is one structure that is designated by FEMA as a Repetitive Loss Property because it has had two or more flood insurance claims of more than \$1,000 during a rolling 10-year period. This structure is in the Spring Creek floodplain. Examination of the claim dates and discussion with the owners indicates that the flood damage was due to local drainage issues rather than flooding from Spring Creek.

Need for Flood Warning

The City of Fort Collins operates a Flood Warning and Response system consisting of 75 gage locations that are monitored 24/7 from mid-April thru September. Low, medium and high thresholds have been established with individual emergency action plans for each location. Because of the nature of flash flooding, there is little time for flood warning and evacuation is often not a feasible option. Notifications can be sent via an auto-dialer system (LETA911.org). The City also uses social media, a local cable TV channel and the website to provide information to the public. The City has a focused public outreach effort to help residents and businesses know in advance the steps that need to be taken when a flood happens.

Natural and Beneficial Functions of the Floodplain

The City of Fort Collins recognizes the natural and beneficial functions of the floodplain. For example 66% of the Poudre River 100-year floodplain has been preserved as open space. Much of that area is managed by the City's Natural Areas program to provide beneficial habitat. These large open areas were extremely helpful in the September 2013 flood where flood water was allowed to spread out and slow down and not cause damages. The City continues to acquire new open space properties and rehabilitate areas to allow for better connectivity to the floodplain.

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported wildfire events in the City of Fort Collins. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on Larimer County, there is potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time in the city.

Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones in the district are located in the western region, in areas where there are lower population densities.







City of Fort Collins Wildfire Hazard Zone Map¹³⁹

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the southern and western and regions, in areas where there are lower population densities.

¹³⁹ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.







City of Fort Collins Wildfire Risk Index Map¹⁴⁰

There are areas in the western and northwestern regions of the district that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





¹⁴⁰ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP dataset was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk.



City of Fort Collins WUI Map¹⁴¹

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and
tourism industries, water resources, andthe critical facilities upon which the City
of Fort Collins depends. There are areaswestern portion of the city according tothe WUI Risk Index.





Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the City of Fort Collins. There are no critical facilities located in areas with the *most negative* and 2 critical facilities located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the critical facilities within the *2nd most negative* threat areas is approximately \$26.5 million dollars. There are 7 parcels/structures located in areas with the *most negative* and 11 parcels/structures located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures such the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these *most and 2nd most negative* threat areas is over \$24 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.





¹⁴¹ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.



City of Fort Collins Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone¹⁴²

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the City of Fort Collins that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.





¹⁴² Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported deaths and 1 reported injury in the City of Fort Collins due to hail. There have been 149 hail events reported in the City of Fort Collins between 1955 and 2014. Of the 149 incidents, 3 reported losses totaling \$10,000. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the city, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.



Historical Hail Events in the City of Fort Collins¹⁴³

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 2 injuries and no deaths in the City of Fort Collins due to thunderstorm wind. There have been 22 thunderstorm wind events reported in the City of Fort Collins between 1955 and 2014. Of the 22 incidents, 1 reported property losses totaling \$25,000 and no crop losses. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the city, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 18 lightning events in the City of Fort Collins between 1996 and 2014. There have been 4 reported injuries, 2 deaths, \$108,000 worth of property





¹⁴³ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

damage, and \$5,000 worth of crop damage. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the city, there is a great potential for high wind events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 35 Windstorm events in Larimer County between 1996 and 2014. There have been 2 reported injuries, 0 deaths, \$9,000 in reported loss. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the city, there is a great potential for high wind events to occur at any given time.



Historical High Wind Events in the City of Fort Collins¹⁴⁴

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the City of Fort Collins can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes 143,986 people, or 100% of the City's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the City's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

¹⁴⁴ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the City of Fort Collins including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the City of Fort Collins. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that City of Fort Collins will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the City of Fort Collins at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the City of Fort Collins experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 35 severe wind events since 1996, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.





Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the City of Fort Collins to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the City's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the City's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | Х | | |
| Floodplain | v | | |
| Administrator | ^ | | |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |
| Grant Writer X | | | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the city's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Y |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Ν |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Y |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Y |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance. In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and





codes. The City of Fort Collins has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

Fort Collins has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the city will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|----------------------|---|
| | <i>"The plan will have an annual report that is made public and presented to the City Council."</i> |
| | "As part of the City's Budgeting for Outcomes process, priorities will be reviewed and any new mitigation strategies will be incorporated." |
| | <i>"Annual review of the HMP as part of Utilities Director Work Plan. Partnership with Office of Emergency Management for presentment to City Council"</i> |
| City of Fort Collins | <i>"Any changes to the Plan will include public meetings and postings on various websites to keep the public informed and to allow for public review and comment."</i> |
| | "The City of Fort Collins continually produces reports on many of the programs that occur within our jurisdiction. These annual reports, workshops and other meetings allow for the opportunity to educate the public on the plans and actions; as well as allow the opportunity for public input." |
| | "As part of any mitigation project there is an extensive public outreach process including public open houses, newsletters, web pages, etc. Public awareness outreach related to flooding is an ongoing project that provides an opportunity for the public to be more informed on the risks, property protection measures, life-safety issues, etc." |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the City of Fort Collins based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|----------------------|---|
| City of Fort Collins | "The City of Fort Collins has a variety of plans that overlap with the HMP. This includes the Social Sustainability Strategic Plan, Economic Health Strategic Plan, |





| Debris Management Plans, Evacuation Plans and other emergency operation plans to name a few. When the HMP is approved by Colorado, FEMA and the City of Fort Collins, these action items will be cross referenced with the other appropriate plans and incorporated into them." |
|--|
| "We will continue to review our mitigation actions as part of the Budgeting for Outcomes process that prioritized projects. Public outreach related to flooding is reviewed annually as part do the City's Program for Public Information. Hazard mitigation is the key focus of any Stormwater Master Plan updates that will take place during the next 5 years." |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present the City's mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan. It is important to note that the mitigation actions included in this section include a wide-range of Stormwater actions from regulatory, to education, to capital improvements. Moreover, the mitigation actions identified by Fort Collins Stormwater cover all six of the CRS activities outlined on Page 510-20 of the CRS Manual.

In addition to the mitigation actions listed below, there are a number of possible mitigation actions/focus areas that the City of Fort Collins discussed but decided not to include in the 2016 HMP. There are as follows:

- Natural Areas
- Keeping trails and access roads clear of debris and accessible
- Creating now lines along boundaries that contain high values at risk
- Implementing forest mitigation practices on existing or newly acquired properties
- Purchase of additional hand held radios
- Additional ICS, disaster preparedness, emergency operation courses
- Appropriation of proper PPE for Natural Areas fire crew members
- Acquisition of a Type 6 Wildland Brush Rig for the Natural Areas Department

By recording these emerging ideas in the 2016 Hazard Mitigation Plan, the City of Fort Collins hopes to keep them on the radar for City Council, and for future planning, HMP updates, and grants.





| City of Fort Collins: Boxelder Basin Regional Stormwater (Fort Collins – 1) | | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: Project location | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster losses | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 08/31/2009 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impact of hazards; Continue to collaborate with area partners through mutual aid agreements and long-term planning efforts | |
| | | |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 04/30/2016

ISSUE: Early in 2005, stormwater planners in northern Larimer County took a holistic approach to addressing flood hazard and stormwater drainage problems in the Boxelder Creek watershed. The current BBRSA members have been working together for over 8 years. This watershed or basin encompasses over 265 square miles and extends from just north of the Wyoming border to the Poudre River on the south. Because the Boxelder Creek floodplain affects many property owners and several local governments, intensive efforts were made to develop a regional flood hazard mitigation plan. It should be noted that Coal Creek and Indian Creek both feed into Boxelder Creek near the Town of Wellington. The communities of Fort Collins, Wellington, Timnath, Windsor, and Larimer County all shared a common goal in mitigating the flood hazard posed by Boxelder Creek. The Alliance was formed in early 2005 to develop a "regional" solution that is more efficient, wide ranging and cost effective than the entities could develop independently.

It was determined that the best approach to basin wide flood hazard mitigation would be to prepare a common plan for flood mitigation improvements within the Basin. Members of the Alliance pooled funding to prepare a storm water Master Plan for the Boxelder Basin. The resulting Boxelder Creek Regional Stormwater Master Plan (Master Plan) was completed in October 2006.

RECOMMENDATION: The Boxelder Creek Master Plan developed a list of conceptual regional stormwater improvement projects and recommended the formation of a Stormwater Authority to fund and implement the regional stormwater improvements.

ACTION: The original Master Plan recommended the following Boxelder Creek Regional Stormwater Master Plan Phase I regional stormwater projects:

- Diversion of Coal Creek to Clark Reservoir
- Edson (East Side) Detention Reservoir
- Middle Boxelder Creek Stream Improvements
- Larimer and Weld Crossing Structure.

The Diversion of Coal Creek to Clark Reservoir (later known as the Coal Creek Flood Mitigation Project) was designed and construction completed by the BBRSA in cooperation with Larimer County in 2011. The project diverts stormwater flows from Coal Creek (which is tributary to Boxelder Creek) into the Clark Reservoir Inlet Canal and ultimately into Clark Reservoir.

Revisions were necessary to the master plan improvements due to site constraints and location of the detention facility, improvements to County Road 52 and the addition of the Town of Timnath as a financial partner to the BBRSA. The updated regional stormwater projects consist of:

• East Side Detention Facility





- Larimer Weld Canal Crossing Structure
- County Road 52 Improvements

Construction of the projects is phased. The East Side Detention Facility/County Road 52 Improvements began construction in August 2015 at a total cost of approximately \$7.5 million. The Larimer Weld Canal Crossing Structure construction will begin in October2015 at a cost of approximately \$650,000. All construction is scheduled for completion by early 2016.

| LEAD AGENCY: Boxelder Basin Regional Stormwater Authority (BBRSA) – Established by IGA between Fort Collins, Larimer County and Wellington. | EXPECTED COST: Total of \$19 million. |
|--|---|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: N/A | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: BBRSA stormwater service and system development fees, FEMA grant funding, Timnath financial contributions toward the ESDF and CR52 Improvements, and some CR 52 Improvements funding from Fort Collins, Larimer County and Timnath. |

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

Construction of ESDF began in August, 2015. Construction of LWCCS is targeted to begin after the irrigation season ends in October. Construction of County Road 52 Improvements began in September, 2015. All construction is targeted to be completed by early 2016. Letter of Map Revisions (LOMR's) will be submitted to FEMA in early 2016.







| City of Fort Collins: Flood Warning System (FV | NS) Enhancements (Fort Collins – 2) | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado | | |
| LOCATION: Poudre River, Halligan reservoir, City USC Facility, PFA EOC Facility | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster losses; Strengthen communication and coordination among public agencies, non-governmental organizations, businesses, and citizens | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 06/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impact of hazards | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 05/2016 | | | |
| ISSUE: Updating and expanding the technolog and response FWS solution | gy component of the City's real-time flood recognition | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Gage and communications infrastructure upgrades and new data management software acquisition | | | |
| ACTION: The City will upgrade its FWS telemetry and base station data management software and adding three gages to further expand its existing network of 75 locations. | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – Stormwater Utility | EXPECTED COST: \$142,900 for hardware and software | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: FEMA, Colorado DHSEM | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: FEMA HMGP grant award, 12.5% match from CO DHSEM, 12.5% match from City of Fort Collins | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Software acquisition telemetry upgrading, and three new gage ins completed by May 2016. | h, installation and setup, tallations to be | | |





| City of Fort Collins: East Vine Drive Property Acquisition (Fort Collins – 3) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: East Vine Drive, Fort Collins | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster losses | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 9/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impact of hazards | |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 9/2018

ISSUE: Structures in the Poudre River Floodway

RECOMMENDATION: Acquisition, Deconstruction and Removal of Structures

ACTION: The City of Fort Collins is proposing to purchase, demolish or relocate four (4) properties located along East Vine Drive in north Fort Collins, CO. The properties are located within the 100-year 1-foot floodway (Zone AE) floodplain for the Cache la Poudre River, and were subject to flooding in the September 2013 flood on the Poudre River.

| LEAD A | AGENCY: | City | of | Fort | Collins - | EXPECTED COST: \$1.1 million |
|--------|------------|--------|----|------|-----------|---|
| Stormw | ater Utili | .y | | | | |
| SUPPOR | RT AGE | NCIES: | FI | EMA, | Colorado | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: FEMA HMGP grant |
| DHSEM | | | | | | award, 12.5% match from CO DHSEM, 12.5% match |
| | | | | | | from City of Fort Collins |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Property Acquisition by spring of 2016, property deconstruction completed by spring of 2017, site restoration and final completion

in spring of 2018.









| City of Fort Collins: Green Infrastructure polici | es and outreach (Fort Collins – 4) |
|---|---|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flooding |
| LOCATION: City of Fort Collins | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property, and |
| | natural resources; Increase public awareness of |
| | natural hazards and mitigation options; |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 1/1/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Incorporate risk reduction |
| | principles into policy documents and initiatives; |
| | Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impact |
| | of hazards |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2019 | |
| ISSUE: Reduce Flooding by widening the polici | es that require green infrastructure, improving |
| technologies used, increasing alternatives tha | t can be used, improving available incentives, increasing |
| awareness and mitigation by City agencies and | d the public |
| RECOMMENDATION: Improved specifications | s, better technical details, easier access |
| ACTION: Enhancement of Green Infrastructure | e policies through incentives, outreach, and technical |
| support for implementation | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – | EXPECTED COST: \$300,000/year |
| Stormwater Utility | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: City of Fort Collins | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Fort Collins Utilities, |
| customer connections Department | EPA, Grants |
| | |
| | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: New construction | |
| details by end of 2016. new incentives in 2017 | |
| ongoing outreach efforts. | |
| 5 5 | are one."-Juque Curve |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |





| City of Fort Collins: Low Impact Development | Retrofits (Fort Collins – 5) | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flooding | |
| LOCATION: City of Fort Collins | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and | |
| | natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster | |
| | losses | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 12/2013 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of | |
| | local assets to the impact of hazards | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/2018 | | |
| ISSUE: Improve water quality, Reduce Urban | Flooding and Enhance community resiliency by | |
| retrofitting green infrastructure into existing City regional drainage facilities | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Incorporated into Drain | age Master Plan Updates approved by Water Board and | |
| City Council | | |
| ACTION: Retrofitting of Green Infrastructure | facilities into existing regional facilities pub | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – | EXPECTED COST: Varies from project to project can | |
| Stormwater Utility | range from S25 K to \$200K | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: City of Fort Collins | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Fort Collins Utilities, | |
| Parks, City of Fort Collins Natural Areas | City of Fort Collins Parks and Recreation, Fort Collins | |
| | Sustainability Services, Grants | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Adoption of Master | Plan | |
| Updates in 2013, construction as budget allow | WS. | |





| City of Fort Collins: Water Reclamation and Biosolids- Improvement in Processes and Infrastructure (Fort Collins – 6) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All | | | |
| LOCATION: Drake Water Treatment | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 | | | |
| Facility-3036 Environmental Dr. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/09/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2018 | | | | |
| ISSUE: Critical operations of the Fort Collin's Water Reclamation and Biosolids Facilities could be disrupted in the case of unplanned environmental emergencies, critical equipment failures, or loss of power. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Improvements to facility processes that would help ensure critical operations are maintained | | | | |
| ACTION: Increase on-site process water and biosolids storage capacity Dewatering redundancy On-site backup power generation unit. | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins: Water | EXPECTED COST: | | | |
| Reclamation and Biosolids Division | 30 million dollars for all three items. Backup power may be significantly higher. | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: CDPHE, EPA, FEMA | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Rate increased, Grants, Bonds, Third Party Financing | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | | | |
| Design and build additional sludge holding tank capacity. Design and build additional downtaring systems which may include additional contributes or | | | | |

- Design and build additional dewatering systems which may include additional centrifuges or screw presses.
- Scope, design, and build additional redundancy back up power supply.





| City of Fort Collins: Water Reclamation and Biosolids- Improvement in Technology (Fort Collins – 7) | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All | | |
| LOCATION: Drake Water Treatment | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 | | |
| Facility-3036 Environmental Dr. | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/09/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2018 | | | |
| ISSUE: Critical operations of the Fort Collin's Water Reclamation and Biosolids Facilities could be | | | |
| disrupted in the case of unplanned environmental emergencies, critical equipment failures, or loss of | | | |
| power. | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Improvements to facility processes that would help ensure critical operations | | | |
| are maintained | | | |
| ACTION: | | | |
| Improve collection system instrumentation and monitoring | | | |
| Improve perimeter and building security technology | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins: Water | EXPECTED COST: | | |
| Reclamation and Biosolids Division | 30 million dollars for all three items. Backup power | | |
| | may be significantly higher. | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: CDPHE, EPA, FEMA | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Rate increased, | | |
| | Grants, Bonds, Third Party Financing | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: To be determined after more planning. | | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Training in Disaster Management Large Scale Incidents (Fort Collins – 8) | | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All | |
| LOCATION | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1,2,3 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 1/1/2016 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: B C D | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: On Going | Continual Training | |
| ISSUE: Poudre Fire Authority needs to expand their disaster management training from fire and | | |
| wildland to all hazards. As an emergency response and rescue organization, expanding their scope in | | |
| areas other than response will increase the community's capability to be more resilient. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Increase training and knowledge in disaster management | | |
| ACTION: | | |
| Additional training in ICS (Command Staff Positions) | | |
| Additional training in EOC Operations G775 | | |
| Additional training in Disaster Management Operations MGT 317, 343, 345 | | |
| Command and Control of Major Emergency Operations | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: PFA Training Division | EXPECTED COST: \$5000 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Fort Collins OEM | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Annual Budget, EMPG | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project is dependent on scheduling courses. All training will be captured and documented and followed up with exercises for feedback and retention of skills.




| City of Fort Collins: Downtown River District Storm Sewer Improvements (Fort Collins – 9) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: Downtown Fort Collins area | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and | |
| between Jefferson Avenue and the Cache | natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster | |
| la Poudre River | losses | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: December | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of | |
| 2015 | local assets to the impact of hazards | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: June2016 | | |
| ISSUE: This area of Fort Collins has old under standards nor have a proper outfall to the Riv | rsized storm sewers that do not meet current drainage ver. | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Install a new storm sev | ver system to improve the drainage and reduce flooding | |
| for storms up to and including the 100-year e | vent and improve water quality for smaller more | |
| frequent storm events (2-year an d below). | | |
| ACTION: Flooding in the streets and downtow | vn properties | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – | EXPECTED COST: \$3M to construct | |
| Stormwater Utility | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Stormwater Utility | |
| | Fee, Grants | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: This project is in the final design phase and scheduled for construction in January 2016 | | |

Fort Collins Utilities – Public Education and Awareness (Fort Collins – 10)





| PRIORITY: Low - Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Extreme |
|---|--|
| | Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Severe Winter |
| | Weather, Wildfire |
| LOCATION: Fort Collins, Colorado | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 3, 4 |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: December 2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, D |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing

ISSUE: To enhance our overall preparedness, City staff and the residential and business community members need access to ongoing education through awareness campaigns, events, public outreach, website, social media and education workshops.

RECOMMENDATION: Continue to identify, promote and present education workshops, awareness campaigns and training opportunities for City staff, residents, non-profit organizations and business owners.

ACTION(s):

Drought:

The Water Conservation Program provides the following to achieve optimal conservation:

- Rebates for low-flow showerheads, toilets, dishwashers, clothes washer and sprinkler equipment
- Sprinkler system irrigation audits
- Home efficiency and conservation tips on website, social media and web portal
- Low Income retrofit program
- Continuous Consumption program in collaboration with Leak Detection
- Raw water irrigation at City parks
- Home Water Reports
- Partnering on graywater legislation to use graywater in homes to encourage water reuse
- Public information campaign on conservation
- Adult and youth (schools) education programs
- Business programs
- Water conservation giveaways and awards
- Xeriscape rebates, plant lists, clinics and garden design assistance

Extreme Temperatures:

- Formalize guidance around actions the public can take to prepare for and respond to extreme heat
- Identify and characterize vulnerable areas and populations of Fort Collins
- Develop and implement a public awareness and outreach campaign that notifies citizens on how to get information, prepare for and respond to extreme temperatures, specifically heat.
- Promote low income assistance program to assist with utility bill payments
- Educate homeowners and builders on energy and water efficiency (e.g., how to protect water pipes by locating them on the inside of building insulation or keeping them out of attics, crawl spaces and vulnerable outside walls)
- Provide conservation and maintenance information for homeowners (e.g., by allowing a faucet to drip during extreme cold weather, you can prevent the buildup of excessive pressure in the pipe and avoid bursting)

Promote web programmable thermostats for remote control of heat to prevent frozen pipes

Flood:





- Use outreach activities to share and collaborate with technical assistance programs that address measures that citizens can take to be safe and prepared
- Facilitate and manage funding for mitigation measures
- Encourage homeowners to install backflow valves to prevent reverse-flow flood damage
- Encourage residents in flood-prone areas to elevate new homes or flood-proof their home
- Educate community about the need, value and reduced premiums for flood insurance (due to the City's high Community Rating System level)
- Educate the public about securing debris, propane tanks, yard items or stored objects that may be swept away, damaged or pose a hazard if picked up and washed away by floodwaters
- Advise residents that keeping storm drains clear of debris during storms (not to rely solely on City maintenance crews) could help prevent flooding of their property
- Actively promote Flood Awareness Week during flood season with various messaging tactics, including bus benches, posters, flyers, brochures, website and social media campaigns
- Educate community about our two water sources and how we can close intakes into the treatment plant when water quality is affected thanks to early warning from sensors in the Poudre Canyon

• Use stormwater construction project communications as opportunities to educate the community about our stormwater infrastructure and long-range flood protection planning tore.

Severe Storm:

- Use appropriate outreach tactics to share important updates and contact information
- Provide messaging on service outages and restore times on website and social media Severe Winter Weather:
 - Provide messaging on service outages and restore times on website and social media
 - Promote web portal where utility customers can monitor their water use (check for leaks)
 - Educate homeowners about how to prevent frozen pipes

Wildfire:

- Provide messaging on website and social media, as well as youth education in schools, about how watersheds are managed to minimize wildfires in order to protect water quality
- Educate community about our two water sources and how we can close intakes into the treatment plant when water quality is affected by debris and runoff from a fire with early warning from sensors in the Poudre Canyon
- Facilitate and manage funding for mitigation measures

| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins | EXPECTED COST: Most costs will be absorbed within existing annual budgeted line items, which currently supports 24 x 7 on-call communications support. |
|---|--|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Annual budgets and |
| Poudre Fire Authority, Fort Collins Police, | mitigation grant opportunities. |
| LETA, United Way, American Red Cross, | |
| FEMA and other identified stakeholders and | |
| community response agencies as required | |
| to enhance overall knowledge and | |
| preparedness. | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Continue to identify educational opportunities; pursue awareness campaigns; enhance the use of consumption data with our customers; enhance website and social media effectiveness; and track attendance at events.





| City of Fort Collins - Comprehensive Plan (City Plan) Update (Fort Collins – 11) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Land Subsidence, | |
| | Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & | |
| | Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: City of Fort Collins | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 01/01/2017 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A C D E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 06/31/2018 | | |
| ISSUE: Align updated City Plan policies and recommendations with the Hazard Mitigation Plan | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: City Plan update proces | s as part of Plan Fort Collins, which also includes the | |
| Transportation Master Plan update | | |
| ACTION: Develop new City Plan policies and implementation action recommendations relating the | | |
| Hazard Mitigation Plan | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – all | EXPECTED COST: \$600,000 for consultant services, | |
| Service areas | public outreach and administrative expenses | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: NA | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: General Fund | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Review of Plan draft sections including policy and implementation in 2018. | | |
| City Plan Fort Collins | | |
| | innovate-sustain-connect | |





| City of Fort Collins: Magnolia Storm Sewer (Fort Collins – 12) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: Old Town Fort Collins area along Magnolia Street to the Cache la Poudre River | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster losses | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 2017 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impact of hazards | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2019 | | |
| ISSUE: This area of Fort Collins has old undersized storm sewers that do not meet current drainage standards nor have a proper outfall to the River. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Install a new storm sewer system to improve the drainage and reduce flooding for storms up to and including the 100-year event and improve water quality for smaller more frequent storm events (2-year and below). | | |
| ACTION: Design and construct new storm sewer | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – Stormwater Utility | EXPECTED COST: \$22M | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: CDOT, CWCB, FEMA | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Stormwater Utility Fee, Grants | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Start design of this project in 2016 so that construction can be begin in 2017. This is a two phase project that will start at the downstream end (outfall to the Cache la | | |











| City of Fort Collins: Stormwater Master Planning (Fort Collins – 13) | | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: Throughout the City | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and | |
| | natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster | |
| | losses; Integrate hazard mitigation into other planning | |
| | mechanisms | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Incorporate risk reduction | |
| | principles into policy documents and initiatives, other | |
| | institutional plans; Reduce the vulnerability of local | |
| | assets to the impact hazards | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2020 | | |
| (ongoing) | | |
| ISSUE: The majority of the City's Master Plans were modeled using MODSWM software. This | | |
| software is outdate and does provide robust dynamic hydrologic modeling. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: The City is updating the hydrology in all the Master Plans to be converted to | | |
| EPA SWM. | | |
| ACTION: Update master plans to EPA SWM. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – | EXPECTED COST: \$1M over a 5 year period | |
| Stormwater Utility | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Stormwater Utility | |
| | Fee | |
| | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Revise one basin per year until all the master plans are updated. | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Mulberry-Riverside Stormwater Project (Fort Collins – 14) | | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: Riverside Avenue & Myrtle | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and | |
| Street, Fort Collins | natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster | |
| | losses | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 09/15/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of | |
| | local assets to the impact of hazards | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 09/15/2018 | | |
| ISSUE: The purpose of this stormwater collection system is to mitigate flooding, property damage, | | |
| and threats to life and infrastructure caused by rainfall driven flood events in the Old Town Basin in | | |
| Fort Collins, CO. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Feasibility study and infrastructure emplacement to be performed by City of | | |
| Fort Collins Stormwater Utility and Capital Projects Group | | |
| ACTION: New collection and conveyance structures, piping, and outfall improvements will reduce the | | |
| number of homes subject to floodwaters in the area. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – | EXPECTED COST: \$2.5 Million | |
| Stormwater Utility | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: FEMA, Colorado | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: FEMA HMGP Grant | |
| DHSEM | Award, CO-DHSEM 12.5% match, City of FC 12.5% | |
| | match | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Grant Award for Project Received September 2015, Phase I Feasibility April 2016, Project Construction complete Major project milestones and reporting of current project













| City of Fort Collins: Electric Supply (Fort Collin | ns – 15) | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Outages to the electric supply, Drought, Earthquake, Land Subsidence, Extreme | |
| | Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, | |
| | Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: Areas throughout County and | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 | |
| on city/county vehicles | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/012015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: : A, D, E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Continual | | |
| ISSUE: Communication and Information share | ed with citizens within the area. | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Utilize banners hanging in cities and surrounding area to spread the information of potential risks. Also utilize vehicles such as buses and work trucks to spread the word. Information could contain things such as where to go to get information on suggested items for a "Go | | |
| "Mosquitos", other potential risks could be advertised to make people aware. | | |
| ACTION: Coordination of hanging of banners in different areas and/or making of signs for use on vehicles. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County | EXPECTED COST: \$50,000 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: City of Loveland, City of Estes Park, City of Fort Collins, Wellington, Timnath, Red Feather | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Grants, future budgets. | |
| | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Electric Distribution (Fort | Collins – 16) | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Outages to the electric | |
| | distribution, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe | |
| | Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: City of Fort Collins | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE:11/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C, D, E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Unknown | Dependent on financing. | |
| ISSUE: Enhanced coverage of infrastructure maintenance of the City of Fort Collins L&P. (Add another full time maintenance crew) | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Fully staff another full-time maintenance crew within L&P to perform maintenance and follow up to resolve issues encountered. | | |
| ACTION: Request through BFO within the city another crew and equipment to perform maintenance of the electric infrastructure. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins L&P | EXPECTED COST: \$200,000 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Be specific | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Within L&P budget | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Major project miles reporting of current project status | tones and | |





| City of Fort Collins: Drainage System Maintenance (Fort Collins – 17) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm | |
| LOCATION: Citywide | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and | |
| | natural resources | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of | |
| | local assets to the impact of hazards | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | |
| ISSUE: Ongoing maintenance of the City drain | nage system to prevent failures and | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Assessment and maintenance plan with projects prioritized by need and funding availability. | | |
| ACTION: Replacing and repairing sections of the City drainage system as necessary. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – | EXPECTED COST: 1.45 million/year | |
| Stormwater Utility | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Residential and | |
| | Business Stormwater Rates | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Open Space Preservation | (Fort Collins – 18) | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: Citywide | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster losses | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impact of hazards | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | |
| ISSUE: Ideal use of the floodplain allows for natural flooding while limiting development to protect people and property. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Protect as much of the floodplain as possible by preserving it as open space. Work to protect and maintain the quality of streams, rivers and other vital water resources. | | |
| ACTION: Floodplain parcels owned and acquired by the City will be permanently preserved as riparian open space to reduce the flood hazard in the City. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins - Natural Areas | EXPECTED COST: \$4M over 5 years | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: City of Fort Collins- Stormwater Utility | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Natural Areas Budget; Grants | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Public Outreach (Fort Collins – 19) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm | |
| LOCATION: Citywide | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and | |
| | natural resources; Strengthen communication and | |
| | coordination among public agencies, non-governmental | |
| | organizations, businesses and citizens; Increase public | |
| | awareness of natural hazards and mitigation options | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Continue to develop and | |
| | expand public awareness and information programs | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | |
| ISSUE: Lack of public awareness concerning fl | ood hazards. | |
| RECOMMENDATION: A comprehensive public | c outreach program outlined by the City's Program for | |
| Public Information (PPI) Committee to provid | e targeted outreach for flood hazards in the community. | |
| ACTION: Utilizing the eleven Community Mes | sage Topics developed by the PPI committee the City | |
| will continue implementing numerous public | information and education projects to increase the | |
| community's awareness of flood hazards and | safety. | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – | EXPECTED COST: \$15,000/year | |
| Stormwater Utility | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: FEMA, Red Cross, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Commercial and | |
| LETA911. OEM | Residential Stormwater Rates, OEM Budget, Grants | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Regulatory Programs (Fort Collins – 20) | | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: Citywide | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and | |
| | natural resources; Strengthen communication and | |
| | coordination among public agencies, non-governmental | |
| | organizations, businesses, and citizens; Integrate | |
| | hazard mitigation into other planning mechanisms | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Incorporate risk reduction | |
| | principles into policy documents and initiatives; Reduce | |
| | the vulnerability of local assets to the impact of hazards | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | |
| ISSUE: Unregulated development in the flood | Iplain is unsafe for people and structures. | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Develop and enforce sa | fe development in the floodplain. | |
| ACTION: Enforce current regulations for deve | elopment in the floodplain and update regulations as | |
| necessary. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – | EXPECTED COST: \$300,000/year | |
| Stormwater Utility | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: FEMA, CWCB | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Utilities – Stormwater | |
| | Budget | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: n/a | Summer of the second | |
| | | |
| | Construction of the Annual | |
| | And a second sec | |
| | A REAL PROPERTY OF THE REAL PR | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Myrtle Street Stormwater Outfall (Fort Collins – 21) | |
|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood |
| LOCATION: Old Town Collins area along | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and |
| Myrtle Street | natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster |
| | losses |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 2019 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of |
| | local assets to the impact of hazards |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2020

ISSUE: Properties and structures are flooded in the vicinity of Myrtle Street

RECOMMENDATION: This project involves the enlargement of the existing storm sewer along Myrtle Street from Remington Street west to Sherwood Street, and directing this storm sewer into the proposed Magnolia Street Outfall at Remington and Magnolia.

ACTION: This project will reduce flood flows along Myrtle Street east of Sherwood Street, including overtopping of College Avenue. This reduction in flows along Myrtle Street will also serve to reduce surface flow diversions that direct runoff north to Mulberry Street along Peterson Street.

| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – | EXPECTED COST: \$15M |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Stormwater Utility | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: CDOT | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Stormwater Utility |
| | Fee, Grants |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Design for this project will begin in 2019 and construction in 2020



R-2





| City of Fort Collins: North East College Corrid | lor Outfall (NECCO) (Fort Collins – 22) |
|--|---|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood |
| LOCATION: Northern Fort Collins area generally north of East Vine Drive, west of Lemay Avenue, south of the Larimer and Weld Canal, and east of College Avenue | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster losses |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impact of hazards |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2016 | |
| ISSUE: Flooding occurs to properties along t | he Dry Creek flow path especially upstream of the RR |
| RECOMMENDATION: The project includes a significant storm) in the area generally north of Larimer and Weld Canal, and east of College storm sewer and increased detention to convert channel. The storm drainage design coordinate realignment. The project also includes the coord outlet under Vine Drive and the Railroad Yard | storm sewer system to mitigate local flooding (during a f East Vine Drive, west of Lemay Avenue, south of the Avenue. The project incorporates a combination of vey local storm runoff to the future East Vine Diversion ates with the design efforts of the East Vine Drive nstruction of a stormwater detention pond and a pond d north of Vine Drive at Dry Creek. |
| ACTION: Install storm sewer and detention po | onds |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – Stormwater Utility | EXPECTED COST: \$15M |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Stormwater Utility |
| | Fee, Grants |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Design and permitt 2016 | ting are underway and construction is expected for mid- |





| Poudre Fire Authority: Training in Disaster Management Large Scale Incidents (Fort Collins – 23) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All: Drought, Earthquake, Land | |
| | Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe | |
| | Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: Poudre Fire | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1,2,3 | |
| Authority, Training Center | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 1/1/2016 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: B, C, D | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: On Going | Continual Training | |
| ISSUE: Poudre Fire Authority needs to expand | I their disaster management training from fire and | |
| wildland to all hazards. As an emergency response of the second | ponse and rescue organization, expanding their scope in | |
| areas other than response will increase the co | ommunity's capability to be more resilient. | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Increase training and knowledge in disaster management | | |
| ACTION: | | |
| Additional training in ICS | | |
| Additional training in EOC Operations | | |
| Additional training in Disaster Management Operations | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: PFA Training Division | EXPECTED COST: \$2000 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Fort Collins OEM | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Annual Budget, EMPG | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project is dependent on scheduling courses. All training will be captured and documented. | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Stream Rehabilitation an | d Enhancement Program (Fort Collins – 24) | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm | |
| LOCATION: Throughout the City | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster losses | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impact of hazards | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2020 (ongoing) | | |
| ISSUE: In 2012, The City of Fort Collins' Stormwater Master Plan was updated to include stormwater quality and stream restoration projects. The Master Plan update utilized results and information obtained from the Stormwater Utility Repurposing program in conjunction with basin- and stream- specific recommendations obtained from the following two program efforts: A.Basin-Specific Stormwater Quality Best Management Practices (BMP) Selected Plans; and, B.Stream Restoration and Stability Study and Prioritization with the Multi Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) Tool | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Stream restoration projects were identified in an extensive study by Colorado State University (CSU). The study indicated that many of the City's streams suffer from severe bank erosion, impediments to fish passage, and have poor aquatic habitat. A Multi Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) Tool was utilized to prioritize the identified stream reaches for future restoration. The results of the MCDA Tool analysis are presented below for the 2 nd through the 6 th ranked stream | | |
| ACTION: Install WQ BMPs and construction s | stream enhancements throughout the City. | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – Stormwater Utility | EXPECTED COST: \$9M over a 5 year period | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Stormwater Utility Fee, Grants | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Construct one major stream rehabilitation project every other year and one minor project every year. | | |





| City of Fort Collins: West Vine – Forney Pond | (Fort Collins – 25) | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: Northwestern Fort Collins area | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and | |
| south of Vine Drive and east of Taft Hill | natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster | |
| Road | losses | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 2017 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of | |
| | local assets to the impact of hazards | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2018 | | |
| ISSUE: This area of Fort Collins was the histo | ric flow path of Solider Creek that has been covered up | |
| or redirected by development over the years | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: This detention pond we | e capture runoff from upstream contributing area and | |
| detain it so reduced flooding downstream. | | |
| ACTION: Flooding in downstream properties and homes | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins – | EXPECTED COST: \$4M | |
| Stormwater Utility | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Stormwater Utility | |
| | Fee, Grants | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: The City purchased | l this property | |
| and it is on the 5-year master plan priority lis | t | |
| | | |
| | and the second se | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Water Treatment Utilities-Water Treatment Process Improvements | | |
|---|---|--|
| (Fort Collins – 26) | | |
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Flood, Fire, Public Health | |
| LOCATION: Fort Collin's Water Treatment | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 | |
| Facility-4316 Laporte Ave | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/09/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2022 | | |
| ISSUE: Additional treated water storage is required to serve the citizens of Fort Collins in case of drought flood fires or public health emergencies | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Improvements to the w | rater treatment process | |
| ACTION: Construct a new 10 million gallon tre | eated water storage tank at the Water Treatment | |
| Facility. | Ŭ | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins: Water Treatment Utilities | EXPECTED COST: \$14 million | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: CDPHE | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Utilities reserves, | |
| | State DWRF | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Future demand will affect the timeline of this project. | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Water Treatment Utilities-Water Treatment Process Improvements | |
|--|---|
| (Fort Collins – 27) | |
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Public Health, Hazmat |
| LOCATION: Fort Collin's Water Treatment | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1,2 |
| Facility-4316 Laporte Ave | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/09/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2024 | |
| | |

ISSUE: The Water Treatment Facility currently provides secondary disinfection to the City's water supply through the addition of chlorine. The chlorine is delivered to the Water Treatment Facility via truck on a weekly basis. The chlorine supply is extremely hazardous and is a threat to public safety in the event of an accident during transportation or in the case of a leak at the Water Treatment Facility. The City's water supply is also vulnerable to contamination due to an interruption in the delivery of chlorine. A mitigation strategy is to construct a sodium hypochlorite generation facility at the Water Treatment Facility in lieu of chlorine gas. This will ensure a safe and reliable supply of bleach with which to disinfect the City's drinking water supply.

RECOMMENDATION: Improvements to the reliability and safety of the water treatment process ACTION:

• Replacement of Chlorine gas with on-site generation of Sodium hypochlorite

| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins: Water | EXPECTED COST: \$12 million |
|---|--|
| Treatment Utilities | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: CDPHE | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Utilities reserves, |
| | State DWRF |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Approval of the proc | ess change |

from the Colorado Department of Health and funding of the project are 2 major milestones.

(Photo: Hazardous Materials training for a Chlorine Gas release)







| City of Fort Collins: Water Treatment Utilities-Water Treatment Process Improvements | | |
|--|--|--|
| (Fort Collins – 28) | | |
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land | |
| | Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe | |
| | Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: Fort Collin's Water Treatment | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1,2 | |
| Facility-4316 Laporte Ave | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/09/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E: | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2018 | | |
| ISSUE: Rehabilitation of the existing Poudre R | iver 24" Pipeline. This pipeline serves the City of Fort | |
| Collins with the majority of its drinking water | . The line is almost 100 years old is a potential weakness | |
| in the City's supply system. The line is suscep | tible to failure from forest fires, land subsidence, and | |
| hazmat spills in the river. | | |
| | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Improvements to the d | rinking water supply process | |
| ACTION: Rehabilitate the Poudre River 24" w | ater supply line | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins: Water | EXPECTED COST: \$12 million | |
| Treatment Utilities | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Utilities Reserves, | |
| | State DWRF | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Complete evaluation | n of pipeline | |
| condition prior to design | | |
| (Photo: Cache la Poudre River, CO – source of water in the | | |
| 24 inch Poudre pipeline) | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | And the second s | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |





| City of Fort Collins: Water Treatment Utilities-Water Treatment Process Improvements (Fort Collins – 29) | | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: [delete those not applicable] Drought, Earthquake, Land Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: Fort Collin's Water Treatment Facility-4316 Laporte Ave | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/09/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2030 | | |
| ISSUE: Water Quality in the Cache la Poudre I system can be degraded due to Fires (drough fire hazards) and Pine Beetle deforestation. | River watershed and the Colorado-Big Thompson water t and extreme high temperatures create a potential for | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Improvements to the w | rater treatment process | |
| ACTION: Installation of a UV Disinfection system Installation of Granular Activated Carbon filters Installation of Biologically Active Carbon filtration | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins: Water Treatment Utilities | EXPECTED COST: \$27 million-\$100 million depending on the severity of the degradation in source water quality | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: CDPHE | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Utilities Reserves, State DWRF | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Projects are depend quality in the watershed. (Photo: Filter bays at Water Treatment Facilit | lent upon future water ry) | |





| City of Fort Collins: Water Treatment Utilities | : Redundant Second Outlet Installation (Fort Collins – 30) | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Low | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Extreme | | | | | | |
| | Temperatures, Flood, Fire, Public Health, | | | | | | |
| LOCATION: City of Fort Collins: Water | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 | | | | | | |
| Treatment Utilities | | | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/09/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: D,E | | | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2025 | | | | | | | |
| ISSUE: A second outlet from Horsetooth Rese | rvoir to the Water Treatment Facility would provide an | | | | | | |
| alternate drinking water supply to the City of | Fort Collins in the case of a wildfire or a flood in the | | | | | | |
| Colorado-Big Thompson watershed. The City | currently has an outlet from the Reservoir at a single | | | | | | |
| depth. The new outlet would allow for divers | ion for a different location and at multiple depths to | | | | | | |
| mitigate the water quality effects of a fire in t | the watershed. | | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Redundant second out | et form Horsetooth Reservoir to the Water Treatment | | | | | | |
| Facility | | | | | | | |
| ACTION: Installing a new outlet and pipeline (| redundant second outlet) from Horsetooth Reservoir to | | | | | | |
| the Water Treatment Facility. This would nee | d to be a joint project working with Bureau of | | | | | | |
| Reclamation and the Northern Colorado Wat | er Conservancy District. | | | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins: Water | EXPECTED COST: The City of Fort Collin's Cost share | | | | | | |
| | would be ~\$5 million | | | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Bureau of Reclamation, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES State of Colorado | | | | | | |
| Northern Colorado Water Conservancy | Drinking Water Revolving Fund, Fort Collins Utilities | | | | | | |
| District | Reserves | | | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILES IONES: Coordination and ap | | | | | | | |
| Poslamation is required | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |





| | 6 - C - UL | | | | | | - III IX |
|------|-----------------|--------------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| City | of Fort Collins | Mactowator (| Ollection | Sowor By | V-Dace Dur | nning (Fort | Collins = 211 |
| | UT TOLE COMMS. | | JUNECTION, | | y-r ass r un | IDING (LUCIT | COIIIIIS = SII |

| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Earthquake, Land Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, Eire, Public Health, Hazmat |
|--|--|
| LOCATION: City of Fort Collins: Wastewater | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people and natural |
| Collection System | resources |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/27/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of |
| TARGET COMPLETION RATE TRR | local assets to the impact of hazards |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: TBD | |
| ISSUE: Loss of a portion of the wastewater co | ollection system. |
| RECOMMENDATION: Sewer by-pass pumping | |
| ACTION: Setup a temporary by-pass for sewe | r flows using pumps and surface piping. Construction of |
| up to a quarter mile of temporary surface pip | e to downstream manhole. By-pass pump for up to 30 |
| days until permanent sewer line is restored. | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins: | EXPECTED COST: The City of Fort Collin's Cost share |
| Wastewater Collection | would be ~\$100,000 |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: City of Fort Collins | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Potential Federal |
| Traffic Operations; Other Wastewater | Grants. |
| Districts (Boxelder and South Fort Collins) | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project planning, de acquisition of temporary water system. | sign, and |





| | |
|---------|--|
| (11) | OT FORT (OUUDS' WATER UUSTRIDUTION' LEMPORARY WATER SUSTEM (FORT (OUUDS - 37)) |
| | O(1) O(1) O(1) O(1) O(1) O(1) O(1) O(1) |
| | |

| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Earthquake, Land Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | | | | |
| LOCATION: City of Fort Collins: Water | GOALS ADDRESSED: Protect people, property and | | | | |
| Distribution System | natural resources; Improve capability to reduce disaster | | | | |
| | losses. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/27/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Reduce the vulnerability of | | | | |
| | local assets to the impact of hazards. | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: TBD | | | | | |
| ISSUE: Loss of a portion of the water distribu | tion system. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Temporary water system | n. | | | | |
| ACTION: Construct up to a mile of temporary | water main with services until permanent service is | | | | |
| restored. Temporary system would be constr | ructed on the surface and connected to a fire hydrant | | | | |
| located outside of the damaged zone. | | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: City of Fort Collins: Water | EXPECTED COST: The City of Fort Collin's Cost share | | | | |
| Distribution | would be ~\$100,000 | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: City of Fort Collins | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Potential Federal | | | | |
| Traffic Operations; Other Water Districts | Grants. | | | | |
| (ELCO, North Weld, FCLWD) | | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project planning, de | sign, and acquisition of temporary water system. | | | | |
| | | | | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



City Manager's Office City Hall 300 LaPorte Ave. PO Box 580 Fort Collins, CO 80522 970.221.6505 970.224.6107 - fax fcgov.com

August 14, 2014

Lori Hodges Larimer County 200 West Oak Fort Collins, CO. 80524

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Lori Hodges.

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multijurisdictional mitigation plans, the City of Fort Collins is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that the City of Fort Collins has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, the City of Fort Collins agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR \$201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to the Larimer County to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

The City of Fort Collins understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's Local Mitigation Planning Handbook dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document:
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I, Darin Atteberry commit the City of Fort Collins to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.







Glacier View Fire Protection District

Community Profile

Glacier View Fire Protection District (GVFPD) is a volunteer department with over 20 firefighters and a support group of 8 members. The district covers approximately 56 miles; average response time for the first fire vehicle to arrive on scene is approximately 8 to 11 minutes after being paged. GVFPD responds to all emergencies within the district, except for strictly law enforcement calls. GVFPD is located in central portion of Larimer County in the mountains northwest of Fort Collins.



Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Fire – Wildland | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.6 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.75 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.2 |





| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.4 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.4 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.15 | 2 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.9 |
| Earthquake | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.7 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.7 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.6 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.4 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Tornado | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Fire – Wildland; Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Flood – Flash and Riverine; Utility Disruption; Spring / | | | | | | |
| Summer Storm (nan, munderstorm, wind Storm, Lightning) | | | | | | |
| Civil Disturbance; Landslide / Rockslide; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Tornado | | | | | | |

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Glacier View Fire Protection District, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the District.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The District's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the district.









Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

The Glacier View Fire Protection District is characterized by a mix of low to medium-low levels of social vulnerability. Currently, the social vulnerability indicators that contribute to higher vulnerability to hazards in the district are lower than they are in the majority of Larimer County. This does not mean, however, that there a not any vulnerable populations within the district. Over time, the district should continue to monitor their social vulnerability as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change.

¹⁴⁵ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 24 reported wildfire events in the Glacier View Fire Protection District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on district, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time.









Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. There are areas with the highest wildfire hazard zones throughout the district. These areas are characterized by lower population densities.

¹⁴⁶ Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.







Glacier View Fire Protection District Wildfire Hazard Zone Map¹⁴⁷

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. There are areas with the highest wildfire hazard zones throughout the district. These areas are characterized by lower population densities.





¹⁴⁷ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.



Glacier View Fire Protection District Wildfire Risk Index Map¹⁴⁸

There are a number of areas in the central region of the district that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





¹⁴⁸ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to higest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.



Glacier View Fire Protection District WUI Map

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Glacier View Fire Protection District depends. There are areas of high and medium wildfire threat in the central portion of the district according to the WUI Risk Index. There are no critical facilities located in areas with the *most negative* and 2nd most negative wildfire threat total.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Glacier View Fire Protection District. There are 46 parcels/structures located in areas with the *most negative* and 115 parcels/structures located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these *most and 2nd most negative* threat areas is over \$22.1 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.





Glacier View Fire Protection District Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone¹⁴⁹



Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Glacier View Fire Protection District that are characterized by





¹⁴⁹ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.
dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Glacier View Fire Protection District has experienced 175 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas within western Larimer County above 6,000 feet. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The District is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Glacier View Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Glacier View Fire Protection District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the District.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Glacier View Fire Protection District will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the district at least once every year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Glacier View Fire Protection District to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and





resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the District's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the District's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | V |
| Administrator | | | Λ |
| Community Planner | | | Х |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | | Х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the district's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Ν |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | - |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | - |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | - |
| A Stormwater Plan | - |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | - |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | - |
| Participates in the NFIP | - |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

Glacier View Fire Protection District has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the district will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.





| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|---------------------|---|
| | "Annually, the district will review the plan and determine mitigation action progress." |
| Glacier View Fire | |
| Protection District | "Monthly Board meetings will be open to public where the plan can be discussed. Additionally we have a website that information can be posted for viewing." |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the district based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|--|---|
| Glacier View Fire Protection District | "We will conduct community outreach program where we advise residents on how to mitigate their own properties, Glacier does have community slash piles. In our annual review of fire codes we'll look for opportunities to integrate and strengthen our fire codes with mitigation actions." |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide present Glacier View Fire Protection District's new mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Glacier View Fire Protection District: Community Wildfire Protection Plan (Glacier View FPD – 1) | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Wildfire / Urban Interface | | | |
| | Wildfire | | | |
| LOCATION: 1414 Green Mountain Dr., | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 | | | |
| Livermore, CO 80536 | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/11/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A - E | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2021 | | | | |
| ISSUE: The Glacier View Fire Protection District has identified the need to update the Districtwide | | | | |
| Community Wildfire Plan. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: To investigate and develop an update of this plan with staff assistance. | | | | |
| ACTION: The purpose of the Community Wildfire Protection Plan is risk analysis, fire behavior analysis | | | | |
| and community wildfire hazard rating (WHR). The results of the Community Wildfire Protection Plan | | | | |
| is to provide a comprehensive, scientifically-based assessment of the wildfire hazards and risk within | | | | |
| our jurisdiction. | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Glacier View Fire | EXPECTED COST: staff hours 40 / staff cost \$3,500.00 | | | |





| Prevention District | |
|--|--|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County Sheriff's Office, Emergency Services | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: District revenues from property taxes (gas/oil revenue included) and specific ownership taxes |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Research Community Outreach Plan, Issue RFP, Select Vendor, Create Plan, Implement Plan, Review & Update Plan as needed.

| Glacier View Fire Protection District: Commun | nity Outreach (Glacier View FPD – 2) | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood / Fire | | | |
| LOCATION: Glacier View Fire Protection | GOALS ADDRESSED: 2, 4 | | | |
| District | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/11/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, B | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: ongoing | | | | |
| ISSUE: Property owners in the Glacier View Fire Protection district need education in the most effective fire mitigation steps to take, when and how to safely evacuate in case of flood or fire, how to sign up for LETA, and how to ensure that their insurance is sufficient to allow them to | | | | |
| recover from a disaster. | and a description officials | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Community outreach a | and education efforts. | | | |
| ACTION: Hold regular educational meetings | covering the subjects of fire mitigation, evacuation, | | | |
| and property insurance. These meetings to | take place on multiple occasions during the summer | | | |
| (when more property owners are in the area). | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Glacier View Fire | EXPECTED COST: Staffing for each meeting (all | | | |
| Prevention District | volunteer): one presenter, 2-3 people to set up/tear | | | |
| | down meeting area. Having a LETA rep on hand for | | | |
| | at least some of the presentations is helpful. Cost: | | | |
| | funding for copying and purchase of educational | | | |
| | handouts and refreshments. \$2000 | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: LETA, possibly LCES | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Glacier View Fire | | | |
| Protection District; possible grants for materials | | | | |
| | costs. | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Continue to hold 4- | -5 presentations each summer, covering the subjects | | | |

of fire mitigation, evacuation, and property insurance.





| Glacier View Fire Protection District: Fire Miti | gation Assessments (Glacier View FPD – 3) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | | | | |
| LOCATION: Glacier View Fire Protection District | GOALS ADDRESSED: 2, 4 | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/11/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, B, E | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2021 | | | | | |
| ISSUE: Property owners in the Glacier View | Fire Protection district need education in the most | | | | |
| effective fire mitigation steps to take and a | ssistance in determining if they've done all they can to | | | | |
| mitigate their property. | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: One-on-one mitigation | assessments. | | | | |
| ACTION: Provide fire mitigation assessment | s to district property owners. At the request of local | | | | |
| property owners, teams of two or more me | mbers of the fire department will meet with them to | | | | |
| tour their property and provide mitigation a | advice and assessment. | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Glacier View Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: Staffing (all volunteer) of two- | | | | |
| District | member teams for assessments throughout the | | | | |
| | year (with the majority in the summer). Funding for | | | | |
| | copying and purchasing educational handouts. | | | | |
| \$1500 | | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Glacier View Fire | | | | | |
| Protection District; grants for materials costs. | | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Continue to provide assessments to property owners upon request, | | | | | |
| performing each assessment within two weeks of request as often as possible. | | | | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



GLACIER VIEW FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

December 15, 2014

Lori R. Hodgas Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Rezard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multijurisdictional mitigation plans, the Glacler View Fire Protection District is submitting this latter of intent to confirm that Glacier View Fire Protection District has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazaro Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning. Glacier View Fire Protection District agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timety manner to Larimer County OEM to complete the plan or conformance with FEMA requirements.

Glacier View Fire Protection District understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hezards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the
 planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant
 involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, cata, or other
 information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Junsdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction I David Burk, commit Glacier View Fire Protection District to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 15 day of December 2014

Burk-

David Burk Board President

1414 Green Mountain Drive Livermore, CO **\$0**536 Office 970.493.3353 Fax 970,493.3376





Town of Johnstown

The 2006 Johnstown Vision states that as Johnstown evolves, the community desires to preserve:

- The qualities of a small town
- Available neighborhoods
- Its open feel, wide streets, parks, agricultural areas, and open space
- The social atmosphere of an inclusive community, and
- The heart of the community Downtown

This vision "confidently states that the Town of Johnstown will be a community that cherishes its small town roots, its history as a service center for a large agricultural industry and a social center to the area's farm families. The Vision also looks to the future, by visualizing improvements where families of all sizes and types will live and work. The vision for the community is clear." – Johnstown Area Comprehensive Plan (2006)

Community Profile

The Town of Johnstown is located in both Larimer and Weld Counties along I-25 approximately 41 miles north of Denver. The town was incorporated in 1907, and in 20100 had an area of approximately 13.52 square miles. Johnstown was built along the Great West Railroad.

The Johnstown community has experienced rapid growth in recent years. The growth presents challenges related to infrastructure, services, and community character. It also represents opportunities, as the fiscal resources of the Town have been increasing as well.







The following table summarizes key demographic and development related characteristics of the Town of Johnstown.

| Town of Johnstown Statistics | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------|--|--|
| | Town of Johnstown | Colorado | | |
| Population, 2010 | 9,887 | 5,029,196 | | |
| 2000-2010 Population Change, % | 61% | 14.5% | | |
| % Population under 5 years, 2010 | 9.4% | 6.8% | | |
| % Population under 19 years, 2010 | 33.1% | 20.3 | | |
| % Population 65 years and over, 2010 | 8.7% | 10.9% | | |
| Language other than English spoken at home, % age 5+, 2009-2013 | 10.8% | 15.9% | | |
| Homeownership Rate 2010 | 83.9% | 65.5% | | |
| Persons Per Household 2010 | 2.95 | 2.57 | | |
| Persons below poverty level, %, 2013 | 5.1% | 13.2% | | |
| Median Household Income, 2013 | \$74,752 | \$58,433 | | |

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The Town of Johnstown is situated in both Larimer and Weld Counties. For the purpose of this plan, spatially analyzed hazard risks have been assessed for the areas of the town that lie specifically within Larimer County.

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.10 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.70 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.70 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.70 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.60 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.40 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.30 |





| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.30 |
|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Fire – Wildland | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.30 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.30 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 1.20 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.00 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): None | | | | | | |

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Tornado

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Utility Disruption; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Flood – Flash and Riverine ; Erosion / Deposition; Landslide / Rockslide; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Fire – Wildland; Earthquake; Civil Disturbance; Biological Hazards / Contagion

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Town of Johnstown, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Town of Johnstown.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Town of Johnstown's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.







Social Vulnerability Map – Town of Johnstown¹⁵⁰

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

Johnstown is characterized low levels of social vulnerability (bottom 20% in the county). This does not mean, however, that there aren't any socially vulnerable residents living in the community or that social vulnerability levels will remain the same over time. Close analysis of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the community will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors threaten the community the most and where social and economic resources should be allocated in order to reduce vulnerability. Over time, the town should continue to monitor their progress as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change.

¹⁵⁰ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of Johnstown to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the town's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the town's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | Х | |
| Floodplain | v | | |
| Administrator | ^ | | |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | | Х |

In Johnstown the Police Chief serves as the Emergency Manger as needed during an event.

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the town's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Ν |
| A Stormwater Plan | Y |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Y |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Ν |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance.





In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and codes. Johnstown has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

Johnstown has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the town will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|--------------|---|
| Town of | "Annual review of HMP and mitigation actions by Town Council" |
| Johnstown | "Provision of public information on website" |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by Johnstown based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|--------------|--|
| Town of | "We will maintain our floodplain regulations and update as needed so that they |
| Johnstown | align with the HMP" |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present Johnstown's new mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Town of Johnstown: Community Outreach Project (Johnstown – 1) | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|--|
| PRIORITY: 1 HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All | | | |
| LOCATION: Town of Johnstown GOALS ADDRESSED: 1,4 | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/23/2015 OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 9/1/2016 | | | |
| ISSUE: After the 2013 Floods, it became apparent that more outreach is needed to citizens regarding | | | |
| the hazards in our town and surrounding areas and how best to respond. | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: In partnership with Larimer County, we would like to enhance our public | | | |
| outreach program for the Town of Johnstown | | | |
| ACTION: We will use existing educational materials as well as develop materials specific to the Town | | | |
| of Johnstown to increase hazard and risk preparedness, response to educate our citizens. Provide | | | |
| additional information using our Town web site and Facebook page as a part of our ongoing social | | | |
| media program. | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Johnstown | EXPECTED COST: \$5,000 | | |
| | | | |





| SUPPORT AGENCIES: La | rimer County OEM |
|----------------------|------------------|
|----------------------|------------------|

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Town general fund, Larimer County outreach materials.

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Partner with Larimer County to distribute educational materials to citizens of the Town.
- Create town specific outreach materials and educational programs outlining risks and hazards in the area
- Participate in the Larimer Connects Project.

| Town of Johnstown: NFIP Promotion and Administration (Johnstown – 2) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: 1 HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flooding | | | | |
| LOCATION: Big Thompson River | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C & E | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | | | |
| ISSUE: As participants in the NFIP the Commu | inity will continue to promote wise use of floodplains | | | |
| through ordinance administration and period | ic update, promotion of flood insurance and staff | | | |
| training, including encouragement of Certifie | d Floodplain Manager status. | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: The benefits are to flood-prone building owners who choose to insure against | | | | |
| flood losses, and to taxpayers who no longer would be faced with subsidizing those potential losses. | | | | |
| ACTION: Continued administration of floodplain regulations and updates to town ordinances. | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Floodplain Management EXPECTED COST: Can be accomplished within existing | | | | |
| Officials budgets | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: PW Department POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: N/A | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Floodplain reviews prior to permitting any development in the floodplain. | | | | |
| Floodplain information is posted on the Town of Johnstown web site. Updates to town ordinances | | | | |

with regard to floodplain regulations.





Letter of Intent to Participate

| | x |
|--|--|
| LETTER OF IN | TENT TO PARTICIPATE |
| November 16, 2015 | |
| Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526 | |
| Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a p Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) | articipating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi- |
| Dear Ms. Hodges, | |
| n accordance with the Federal Emergency M HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, v urisdictional mitigation plans, the Town of Joh Fown of Johnstown has agreed to participate Planning effort. | lanagement Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan which specifically identify criteria that allow for multi- hnstown is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that the in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation |
| Further, as a condition to participating in the n he requirements for mitigation plans identified necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer FEMA requirements. | nitigation planning, the Town of Johnstown agrees to meet d in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with |
| The Town of Johnstown understands that it m described in FEMA's <i>Local Mitigation Plannin</i> | nust engage in the following planning process, as more fully ig Handbook dated March 2013 including, but not limited to: |
| Identification of hazards unique to the document; | e jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning |
| The conduct of a vulnerability analysis general planning area; | s and an identification of risks, where they differ from the |
| The formulation of mitigation goals re actions complementary to those goals iurisdiction; | sponsive to public input and development of mitigation s. A range of actions must be identified specific for each |
| Demonstration that there has been pr planning process by all community st involvement in any planning process. | roactively offered an opportunity for participation in the akeholders (examples of participation include relevant attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other |
| information, commenting on drafts of Documentation of an effective proces | the plan, etc.); s to maintain and implement the plan: |
| Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdicti body (each jurisdiction must officially | ional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing adopt the plan). |
| Therefore, with a full understanding of the obl lurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, .arimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard M | ligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead I, <u>Mark Romanowski</u> , commit the Town of Johnstown to the itigation Planning effort. |
| Executed this 16th day of November, 2015 | Signature |
| | |
| | |
| | |





Livermore Fire Protection District

"To limit the loss of life, injury, and property by providing emergency fire and medical services, in accordance with the Colorado Revised Statutes." — Mission Statement, Livermore Fire Protection District

Community Profile

The Livermore Fire Department was incorporated in 1991 as an all-volunteer, privately funded fire department. In 1997, by general election, Livermore Fire Protection District was formed as a Special Fire District, funded by landowner property taxes in unincorporated Larimer County and tax deductible donations from the community.

Livermore Fire Protection District (LFPD) serves one of the largest fire protection districts and covers roughly 310 square miles. This includes 28 miles of US Highway 287. LFPD currently has two stations:

- Station 1 on 311 Red Feather Lakes Road or County Road 74E
- Station 2 on 8017 W. Cherokee Park or W. County Road 80C.

LFPD is the local responding agency for 911 emergency calls including: wildland fire, structure fire, vehicle accidents, medical emergencies, and smoke reports within our district. LFPD also responds to surrounding districts with mutual aid agreements. The district has a budget of about \$120,000/year with an operations budget of about \$70,000.







Highway 287 greatly impacts the LFPD and affects its need for equipment and training. The highway is a source of severe accidents including hazmat incidents and vehicle fires. Obviously, as an important part of the US DOT infrastructure, it is an important consideration of LPFD's HMP and emergency responses. Accidents, storms, fires, hazmat; all potentially close this highway. Every year citizens die on this road due to bad weather. Many thousands of dollars in property are lost as well as lost time in shipping products over the road

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|--|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.00 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.80 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.60 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.50 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.20 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.10 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.10 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.90 |
| Tornado | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.50 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.30 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.30 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.10 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Utility | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0., 2.4), Spring (Summer Storm (Heil, Thunderstorm, Mind Storm | | | | | | |
| Lightning); Erosion / Depo | Lightning); Erosion / Deposition; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | | | | | |





Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Landslide / Rockslide; Tornado; Civil Disturbance; Earthquake; Biological Hazards / Contagion

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Livermore Fire Protection District, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Livermore Fire Protection District.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Livermore Fire Protection District's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the district.



Social Vulnerability Map – Livermore Fire Protection District¹⁵¹

¹⁵¹ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

The Livermore Fire Protection District is characterized by a mix of low to medium-low levels of social vulnerability. This does not mean, however, that there aren't any socially vulnerable people in the district or that local social vulnerability levels will remain the same over time. Close analysis of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the district's boundaries will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors threaten the community the most and where social and economic resources should be allocated in order to reduce vulnerability. Over time, the fire protection district and county should continue to monitor their progress as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change over time.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Livermore Fire Protection District has experienced 174 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$31 million in property damage below 6,000 feet to above 9,000 feet in elevation, portions of which directly impacted LFPD areas. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Livermore Fire Protection District is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Livermore Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out. Potential losses to livestock and crops (hay, alfalfa, and pasture) also need to be considered.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Livermore Fire Protection District including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Livermore Fire Protection District.





Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Livermore Fire Protection District will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the district at least once every year.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Livermore Fire Protection District does not currently track incidences of utility disruption within its service area. The Poudre Valley REA would be the best potential resource for this information relating to electrical services.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Livermore Fire Protection District are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the District.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown. Most LFPD residents depend on propane as a utility. This can be disrupted when roads are impassible by any disturbance (fire, weather, flood, etc.). Utility disruptions may also cause livestock losses if heat and water are not available.

Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Livermore Fire Protection District.

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 62 reported/documented wildfire events in the Livermore Fire Protection District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time. The LFPD has experienced years with over 18 wildland fires, so the NOAA event count does not fully represent action wildland fire occurrences. The following map only shows federally reported wildland fires. LFPD regularly experiences fires across its entire district.









Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones in the district are located in the western region, in areas where there are lower population densities.

¹⁵²Source: Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.









The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the southwestern and northwestern region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





¹⁵³ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.





Due to the low population densities within the Livermore Fire Protection District there is minimal areas of medium to the highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. The majority of the county has a lower WUI risk index scale. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





¹⁵⁴ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.



Livermore Fire Protection District WUI Map¹⁵⁵

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Livermore Fire Protection District depends. There are no critical facilities located in areas with the *most negative* and 2^{nd} most negative wildfire threat total.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Livermore Fire Protection District. There is 1 parcel/structure located in areas with the 2^{nd} most negative wildfire threat. The appraisal value of the parcel/structure





¹⁵⁵ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.

within these 2nd most negative threat areas is roughly \$5,000 dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts. Potential losses to livestock and crops (hay, alfalfa, and pasture) also need to be considered.



Livermore Fire Protection District Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone¹⁵⁶

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. Within the LFPD, lightning-caused fires account for over 50% of instances. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.





¹⁵⁶ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Livermore Fire Protection District that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Flood – Flash and Riverine





Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported injuries or deaths in the Livermore Fire Protection District caused by flooding. On July 14, 2014 a flash flood occurred in the Livermore community. This event reported \$10,000 in property loss and \$10,000 in crop loss. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for flooding events to occur at any given time. It should also be noted that residents regularly experience flooding in non-





¹⁵⁷ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.

special flood hazard areas, on many of the smaller streams in the area. These flooding events can be damaging to roads, structures, crops, and infrastructure and can also cause erosion issues.



Livermore Fire Protection District 2013 Flood Extent¹⁵⁸

Maximum flood extent—a key data need for disaster response and mitigation—is rarely quantified due to storm-related cloud cover and the low temporal resolution of optical sensors. While change detection approaches can circumvent these issues through the identification of inundated land and soil from post-flood imagery, their accuracy can suffer in the narrow and complex channels of increasingly developed and heterogeneous floodplains. The data depicted above is from a study that explored the utility of the Operational Land Imager (OLI) and Independent Component Analysis (ICA) for addressing these challenges in the unprecedented 2013 Flood along the Colorado Front Range, USA. The approach was able to





¹⁵⁸ Multi-Temporal Independent Component Analysis and Landsat 8 for Delineating Maximum Extent of the 2013 Colorado Front Range Flood

simultaneously distinguish flood-related water and soil moisture from pre-existing water bodies and other spectrally similar classes within the narrow and braided channels of the study site.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are no critical facilities and 75 parcels/structures in the Livermore Fire Protection District that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of these exposed structures is over \$8.3 million dollars. These figures do not account for numerous homes that are along many of the smaller unmapped streams and drainages throughout the LFPD area. These smaller streams oftentimes flood and cause damages during rainfall events.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Livermore Fire Protection District that for a 100-year flood event, approximately 5 buildings will experience flood damage. The estimated building loss is over \$211 thousand dollars, content loss over \$178 thousand dollars, and inventory loss \$171 thousand dollars. Potential losses to livestock and crops (hay, alfalfa, and pasture) also need to be considered.







Livermore Fire Protection District 1% Annual Flood Loss Estimation and Flood Depth Grid Map¹⁵⁹

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Livermore Fire Protection District provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the district. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.





¹⁵⁹ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario.

Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses.

^{1%} Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the LFPD to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the district's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the district's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | ^ |
| Community Planner | | | Х |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | Х | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the district's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Ν |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | N |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan N | |
| A Capital Improvements Plan N | |
| A Stormwater Plan | N |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | N |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | N |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | N |
| Participates in the NFIP | Ν |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The LFPD has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the district will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.





| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|--------------|---|
| | <i>"Our Fire District Board will help review plans in cooperation with County resources."</i> |
| LFPD | <i>"We have a newsletter which can be used to reach most homeowner and landowners. We can also use LFPD's web site and (possibly) Larimer County's web site."</i> |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by LFPD based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|--------------|---|
| LFPD | "We will continue to conduct outreach to the community HOAs and ROAs to encourage mitigation for wildfire, structure fire, and be an advocate for road safety, first aid training. We will continue to work with the county when they request assistance for reviewing development plans as they pertain to fire issues." |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present the District's new mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Livermore FPD: Cistern Mitigation (Livermore FPD – 1) | |
|--|--------------------------|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire |
| LOCATION: Livermore Fire Protection | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 and 2 |
| District | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2020 | |
| ISSUE: The Livermore Fire Protection District has no municipal water system. Water for fire | |
| protection must be obtained from a few existing cisterns or from natural water bodies. Access, | |

distance, and reliability to water sources are a problem. Some of our areas are many miles from an accessible water source.

RECOMMENDATION: Determine five areas that are in high need of reliable water for firefighting. This would be based on values to be protected, distance to reliable water, and risk of fire damage.

ACTION: After targeting areas for this improvement we would work with land owners/managers to obtain right-of-ways and easements. Once obtained we would purchase 2500 gallon cisterns and





work with contractors for installation (burial) to include marking, and protecting tanks and piping, and laying down a road base, if needed, so apparatus may access the tanks in all weather. Once installed, Livermore Fire would fill, regularly inspect, maintain the tanks, and their access.

| LEAD AGENCY: Livermore Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: \$4000 per tank, installed. \$20,000 |
|--|---|
| District | for five tanks. |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: If applicable as land | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Livermore Fire |
| managers: Larimer County, Colorado | Protection District, HOA and ROAs, Land Managers |
| Division of Wildlife, United States Forest | (USFS, Larimer County, DOW), Grants. |
| Service. | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: 1. Determine the best locations for five cisterns. 2. Obtain easements, right of ways to installation locations. 3. Obtain quotes for tanks and installations. 4. Purchase tanks, select vendors. Work with them on the installations. 5. Fill and maintain the tanks. 6. Map tank locations on LFPD maps.

| Livermore FPD: New Station (Livermore FPD – 2) | |
|---|---|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land |
| | Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe |
| | Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat |
| LOCATION: Livermore Fire Protection | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 |
| District | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, B, D, E |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2020 | |
| ISSUE: Our existing Fire Station 1 is too small | to hold needed apparatus, maintenance equipment, |
| records, training equipment, and seating for p | personnel during meetings and training. |
| RECOMMENDATION: This station needs to be | e remodeled or a new station built to accommodate our |
| needs with some room for more expansion. | |
| ACTION: Determine best location for a new s | tation with consideration given to risks, call loads, types |
| of calls, available land, and a location in keep | ing with the nature of the community. Design should |
| accommodate at least one structural engine, one water tender, one brush truck, one rescue, and a | |
| squad. Additionally, secure office space is required, a classroom/community room, decontamination | |
| room and equipment, 2000 square feet of storage for supplies and equipment. Minimum of 4000 | |
| gallon cistern to be included for fire use. Well water must not need to be treated as does our existing | |
| station. | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Livermore Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: \$840,000, based on an approximate |
| District | 80'X70' building at \$150 square foot. |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Livermore Fire |
| | Protection District, Fundraising, Grants. Potentially |
| | the sale of existing property. |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: 1. Property selection based on water availability, access to US 287 or County | |
| Rd 74 E. A relatively level tract of land able to hold building with parking and driveways and septic | |
| system. 2. Work with architect and obtain estimated building costs. 3. Obtain funding. 4. Select | |
| contractor. 5. Provide for continuation of services to the District during construction. | |





| Livermore FPD: Private Land Fire Mitigation (Livermore FPD – 3) | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire |
| LOCATION: Private wooded lands in | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 3, 4, 5 |
| Livermore Fire Protection's District | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C, D, E |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2020 | |

ISSUE: There are about 42,000 forested acres on private land. Some of these properties have been adequately mitigated to urban fire codes and some have not been touched. Most of these properties have a very high fuel load after the Mountain Pine Beetle infestation. These properties pose a risk not only to their owner's lands but also to adjoining properties. Mitigation is expensive, takes experts if "burn" operations are conducted; and some land owners have hundreds of acres which need treatment. For many of these owners the cost of making the property more fire-resistive is prohibitive.

RECOMMENDATION: Identify high risk properties and use a Community Wildfire Protection Plan to help find funding and resources to mitigate these properties. Mitigation would include removal of excess ladder fuels, dead and downed trees.

ACTION: Reach property owners, HOAs, and ROAs and perform hazard assessments. Project treatment costs and identify methods for mitigation. When possible use community resources and/or state and federal resources.

| LEAD AGENCY: Livermore Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: \$2,000,000 |
|---|---|
| District | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County, USFS, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Livermore Fire |
| State of Colorado. | Protection District, State of Colorado, Larimer County, |
| | USFS, FEMA, grants. |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: 1. Contact private landowners, HOAs, and ROAs, and obtain agreement to perform assessment in their properties. 2. Complete assessments. 3. Obtain cost estimates. 4. Look for grant funding, owner funding, for mitigation. 5. Obtain assistance from USFS or Colorado State Forest in mitigation work, consultation. 6. Observe and measure mitigation during and after work is performed. 7. Plan future mitigation for properties that do not meet standards or need further improvements.

| Livermore FPD: Snow Rescue Vehicle (Livermore FPD – 4) | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Storm, Fire |
| LOCATION: Project location | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3. |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E, D |
| | |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2019 ISSUE: In severe weather, particularly snowstorms; there are many miles of public and private roads which will not be cleared. Any emergency response (Law, Fire, EMS) may be delayed for hours or

days until roads can be cleared. Many residential roads are not maintained and can be impassable until a contractor can remove snow. Some of these roads are miles long.

RECOMMENDATION: Obtain a vehicle which is capable to transporting responders and supplies/equipment into a scene, and be capable of removing citizens trapped or in distress when over the road vehicles are not able to make access.





ACTION: Determine vehicle configurations adaptable to fire and EMS situations that can travel offroad or over snow-closed road. Obtain trailer for such vehicle, if needed, obtain storage location which will be accessible to Livermore Fire Protection Members when roads are impassable. Train members on the use operation, use, and driving. Livermore Fire would maintain and repair this vehicle. We would also make other agencies aware of this capability and of its availability for situations in their district. We would also make this available for organizations providing essential services for our area. (REA, Verizon, etc.)

| LEAD AGENCY: Livermore Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: Enclosed, heated for multiple |
|--|--|
| District | personnel and supine patients: \$110,000. |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Livermore Fire | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Livermore Fire |
| Protection District, TBD. | Protection District, fund raising, grants. |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: 1. Determine design/capacity parameters to include dimensions, weight, ability to be used over a variety or terrain and narrow roads. Ability to respond to multiple types of missions; i.e. EMS, Fire, Rescue. 2: Obtain storage facility meeting objectives above. 3. Select vendor of vehicle and determine cost. 4. Match cost with available funding and apply for grants. 5. Obtain grant and purchase equipment. Install LFPD equipment. 6. Extensive training on maintenance and operation of the vehicle for LFPD members.

| Livermore FPD: State and Federal Land Fire Mitigation (Livermore FPD – 5) | |
|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire |
| LOCATION: U.S. Forest Service and Division | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 5 |
| of Wildlife lands. | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C, D, E |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2020 | |
| ISSUE: There are 31,360 acres of USFS land and 23,680 acres of DOW and state land trust land which | |
| is intertwined with private lands in the Livermore Fire Protection District. These lands have had little | |
| or no fire mitigation and are in especially bad | condition since the Mountain Pine Beetle infestation |
| has left many trees dead and increased fire lo | bad in these forests. Fire originating on these lands will |
| threaten private property. | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Identify high value private and public risks expose to the increased fire loads | |
| next to these lands and perform mitigation to include removal of excess ladder fuels and downed | |
| trees. | |
| ACTION: Communicate and cooperate with the USFS and the DOW to target dangerous areas in our | |
| district and to encourage and facilitate mitigation actions. This should be part of a larger Community | |
| Wildfire Protection Plan which LFPD is developing. | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Livermore Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: \$2,700,000. |
| District | |

SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County, USFS, Colorado DOW. POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Livermore Fire Protection District, State of Colorado, Larimer County, USFS, FEMA, grants.

PROGRESS MILESTONES: 1. Meet with USFS and or State DOW managers and agree to assess forested lands. 2. Prioritize lands for mitigation placing higher priorities on public lands next to





occupied private land. 3. Acquire funding for mitigation projects. 4. Begin mitigation planning by USFS and DOW.





Letter of Intent to Participate



P.O. Box 28 - Livermore + Colorado 80536

Letter of Intent to Participate

June 12, 2915

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, Co 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Lerimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges.

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazerd Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, uncer 44 CFR 201.6, which specifically identify oriteria that allow for multi-jurisdiction mitigation plans, the Livermore Fire Protection District is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that Livermore Fire Protection District has agreed to participate in the Lammer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, Livermore Fire Protection District agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR 201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County QEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Livermore Fire Protection District understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* deted March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formutation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction.
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, ot other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.):
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazerd Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan)

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Junsdiction, I Don't Maynard, commit Livermore Fire Protection District to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 15 day of June, 2015

Donn Maynard/Chief LFPD





City of Loveland

"A vibrant community – surrounded by natural beauty – where you belong." – Community Vision, Create Loveland Comprehensive Plan, 2015

Community Profile

Loveland is located south of Fort Collins. Both cities have expanded steadily toward each other over the last several decades and are considered a single metropolitan area by the U.S. government. The establishment of county-owned open space between the two communities in the 1990s was intended to create a permanent buffer between them. Currently, Loveland's northern city limits are now contiguous with those of Windsor, which has expanded westward from Weld County across Interstate 25.

Loveland has aggressively expanded its incorporated limits eastward to capitalize on the interchange of Interstate 25 and U.S. Highway 34, and is currently developing the area. In the last decade, the intersection has become a primary commercial hub of northern Colorado, with the construction of shopping centers and the Budweiser Events Center. A new medical center and mall have also been built on the Interstate 25 and U.S. Highway 34 interchange. This area is known as Centerra. The interchange area is shared with its smaller neighbor Johnstown, of Weld County.



The following table summarizes key demographic and development related characteristics of the City of Loveland.




| City of Loveland Statistics | | | |
|---|------------------|-----------|--|
| | City of Loveland | Colorado | |
| Population, 2010 | 66,859 | 5,029,196 | |
| 2000-2010 Population Change, % | 24% | 14.5% | |
| % Population under 5 years, 2010 | 6.8% | 6.8% | |
| % Population under 19 years, 2010 | 26.3% | 20.3 | |
| % Population 65 years and over, 2010 | 14.9% | 10.9% | |
| Language other than English spoken at home, % age 5+, 2009-2013 | 8.3% | 15.9% | |
| Homeownership Rate 2010 | 65.9% | 65.5% | |
| Persons Per Household 2010 | 2.44 | 2.57 | |
| Persons below poverty level, %, 2013 | 10.5% | 13.2% | |
| Median Household Income, 2013 | \$54,977 | \$58,433 | |

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Winter Storm (Blizzard | | | | | | |
| Conditions, Heavy Snow | 0.99 | 0.67 | 0.65 | 0.24 | 0.29 | 2.84 |
| Accumulation) | | | | | | |
| Spring / Summer Storm | | | | | | |
| (Hail, Thunderstorm, | 0.97 | 0.62 | 0.60 | 0.28 | 0.18 | 2.66 |
| Wind Storm, Lightning) | | | | | | |
| Flood – Flash and | 0.78 | 0 72 | 0.48 | 0 31 | 0.28 | 2 57 |
| Riverine | 0.70 | 0.72 | 0.10 | 0.51 | 0.20 | 2.57 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.76 | 0.60 | 0.40 | 0.27 | 0.30 | 2.33 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.72 | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.40 | 0.21 | 2.24 |
| Tornado | 0.53 | 0.65 | 0.42 | 0.38 | 0.14 | 2.12 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.74 | 0.46 | 0.35 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 2.05 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and | 0.60 | 0.51 | 0.33 | 0.39 | 0.15 | 1.99 |
| Transport | | | | | | |
| Biological Hazards / | 0.46 | 0.55 | 0.37 | 0.30 | 0.22 | 1.90 |
| Contagion | | | | | | |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.51 | 0.39 | 0.33 | 0.39 | 0.20 | 1.83 |





| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.58 | 0.42 | 0.28 | 0.37 | 0.16 | 1.80 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Earthquake | 0.30 | 0.53 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.13 | 1.75 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Spring / | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Fire – Wildland; Utility Disruption; Tornado; Erosion / | | | | | | |
| Deposition; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | | | | | | |
| Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Biological Hazards / Contagion; Civil Disturbance; Landslide / Rockslide; | | | | | | |
| Earthquake | | | | | | |

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the City of Loveland, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the City.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The City of Loveland's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.







Social Vulnerability Map – City of Loveland¹⁶⁰

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

Loveland is characterized by a mix of low to medium-high levels of social vulnerability. The south eastern area of the city has higher levels of social vulnerability to disasters than the rest of the community. There is also a pocket of highly socially vulnerable residents in the south west portion of the city. A closer look at the individual social vulnerability indicators within Loveland will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders an even clearer picture of where resources should be prioritized in order to





¹⁶⁰ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

reduce vulnerability in the community. Over time, Loveland should continue to monitor their social vulnerability as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the City of Loveland has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The City of Loveland is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the City of Loveland can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes 66,859 people, or 100% of the City's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the city. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the City's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the City of Loveland including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the City of Loveland.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the City of Loveland will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the city at least once every year.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries or deaths in the City of Loveland due to hail. There have been 35 hail events reported in city between 1955 and 2014. Of the 35 incidents, 3 reported losses totaling \$13 thousand dollars. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the city, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.







Historical Hail Events in the City of Loveland¹⁶¹

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 7 injuries and 2 deaths in the City of Loveland due to thunderstorm wind. There have been 16 thunderstorm wind events reported in city between 1955 and 2014. Of the 16 incidents, 3 reported property losses totaling \$26 thousand dollars and no crop losses. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the city, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 9 lightning events in the City of Loveland between 1996 and 2014. There have been 12 reported injuries, 2 deaths, \$104,000 worth of property damage, and no crop damage. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the city, there is a great potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 25 Windstorm events in the City of Loveland between 1996 and 2014. There have been 14 reported injuries, 2 deaths, over \$5,000 worth of property damage, and no reported crop damage.





¹⁶¹ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf



Historical High Wind Events in the City of Loveland¹⁶²

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the City of Loveland can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes 66,859 people, or 100% of the City's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the City's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures

¹⁶² Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the City of Loveland including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the City of Loveland. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that City of Loveland will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the City of Loveland at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the City of Loveland experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 25 severe wind events since 1996, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.







Flood – Flash and Riverine

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported injuries, property loss, or crop damage in the City of Loveland caused by flooding. A flash flood was reported on June 3, 2005. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the city, there is a great potential for flooding events to occur at any given time.





¹⁶³ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.



City of Loveland 2013 Flood Extent¹⁶⁴

Maximum flood extent—a key data need for disaster response and mitigation—is rarely quantified due to storm-related cloud cover and the low temporal resolution of optical sensors. While change detection approaches can circumvent these issues through the identification of inundated land and soil from post-flood imagery, their accuracy can suffer in the narrow and complex channels of increasingly developed and heterogeneous floodplains. The data depicted above is from a study that explored the utility of the Operational Land Imager (OLI) and Independent Component Analysis (ICA) for addressing these challenges in the unprecedented 2013 Flood along the Colorado Front Range, USA. The approach was able to simultaneously distinguish flood-related water and soil moisture from pre-existing water bodies and other spectrally similar classes within the narrow and braided channels of the study site.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."





¹⁶⁴ Multi-Temporal Independent Component Analysis and Landsat 8 for Delineating Maximum Extent of the 2013 Colorado Front Range Flood

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 6 critical facilities and 374 parcels/structures in the Livermore Fire Protection District that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of these exposed critical facilities is over \$18.7 million dollars. The appraised value of these exposed structures is over \$119.1 million dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the City of Loveland that for a 100-year flood event, approximately 1 critical facility and 12 buildings will experience flood damage. The estimated critical facility building loss is over \$125 thousand dollars, content loss of over \$680 thousand dollars, and no inventory loss. The estimated building loss is over \$1.4 million dollars, content loss over \$1.7 million dollars, and inventory loss over \$388 thousand dollars.









Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the City of Loveland provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.





¹⁶⁵ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the city. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the City of Loveland to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the City's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the city's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | Х | | |
| Floodplain | v | | |
| Administrator | ^ | | |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |
| Grant Writer | | Х | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the city's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Y |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Y |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Y |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Y |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |





Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance. In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and codes. The City of Loveland has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The City of Loveland has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the city will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.





| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|------------------|--|
| City of Loveland | "Our mitigation actions will be reviewed and updated annually." |
| | <i>"Mitigation actions, activities and information will be integrated into existing public education programs and shared via website and or social media."</i> |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the City of Loveland based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|------------------|---|
| City of Loveland | <i>"We will integrate hazard Mitigation actions into our existing public education/community training programs to continually increase awareness about local hazards and potential consequences."</i> |
| | <i>"We will incorporate mitigation actions from the 2016 Larimer County Plan into our soon-to-be-developed Mitigation Master Plan."</i> |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present Loveland's new mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan. In addition to the mitigation actions listed below, the City of Loveland expects additional mitigation actions to be included in their Mitigation Master Plan, for which planning will being in early 2016.

| City of Loveland: Sodium Hypo Chlorite for W | 'ater Treatment (Loveland – 1) | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: Water Treatment Plant | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 01/01/2013 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: Compressed chlorine gas, stored in mu supply. Storing and using chlorine gas on-site of opportunity. Breathing in chlorine gas is a Elementary School is located within the toxic a high target of opportunity. | ultiple 1-ton cylinders, is used to treat municipal water pose as a threat for explosions, leaks, or even as targets deadly to all organic life, including humans. Big T footprint for accidental release plume modeling. This is | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Replacement of chlorin Sodium Hypo Chlorite | e gas as water treatment product with safer product | |
| ACTION: Eliminating chlorine gas as the meth process. We would replace chlorine gas disin and is much safer than chlorine gas. A chemic the project scope. | od to disinfect water during the water treatment ifection with sodium hypo chlorite which is in liquid form cal building specifically for storage and delivery is part of | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Water Division | EXPECTED COST: \$1m | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Building, Fire, Risk Management, CDPHE, EPA | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: city internal budget, bond, loan | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: The construction of the chemical building is underway. Funding is secured. Design and engineering are completed. | | |
| City of Loveland: Bailroad Ave Improvements | (Loveland – 2) | |
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Elood Severe Storm | |
| LOCATION: Railroad Ave at Old Fairgrounds | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1. 2 | |

RECOMMENDATION DATE: 09/12/2013 TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2017



OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E



Park

ISSUE: During the 2013 and the 1976 Floods, Railroad Ave on both sides of the bridge flooded. During both events, all of the North-South routes across the Big T river were cut off by flood waters. Motorists were forced to drive more than 30 miles east to find a viable river crossing. Emergency vehicles that were on one side of the river were unable to respond to the opposite side for emergencies.

RECOMMENDATION: Railroad Ave elevation change on both sides of the bridge and add second bridge

ACTION: The base height of Railroad Ave roadway will be raised on both sides of the bridge and a second bridge will be added. This project will provide better flood management along Railroad Ave. It will also provide the City, County, and State with an open route over the Big T River during the next large flood.

| LEAD AGENCY: Public Works | EXPECTED COST: \$3.6m |
|---|--|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Storm Water, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: FHWA, city internal |
| Engineering, FHWA, CDOT, Larimer County | budget (this would be a high priority project if funding |
| | is secured, otherwise it is a medium priority) |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Conceptual design and floodplain analysis are completed. The City needs funding for the design, engineering, and construction of this project. Project is awaiting FHWA approval for funding



| City of Loveland: Staff Gages (Loveland – 3) | | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm | |
| LOCATION: Big T River Corridor | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 4 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 09/12/2013 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: There is no means to quickly measure | river height changes. All of the Big T River telemetry | |
| gages were lost during the flood. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Install Staff gages on ke | y bridges throughout the Big T River corridor. The staff | |
| gage is used for a fast visual indication of the surface level in reservoirs, rivers, irrigation channels, | | |
| and wherever accuracy and readability are important. Staff gage information can be used in an | | |
| indirect way to estimate stream flow without having to make a detailed flow measurement. They | | |
| virtually never need replacement under normal conditions. Ideally, gauges could be placed through | | |
| the entire river corridor. | | |
| ACTION: Identify which bridges can provide a safe vantage point for gauge reading, purchase and | | |
| install gauges. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Storm Water | EXPECTED COST: \$25,000 | |

| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County, CDOT, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: City internal budget, |
|---|--|
| Big T watershed forum, Public Works, | grant |





PROGRESS MILESTONES: identify funding for gauges and staff time, identify key bridges that can provide a safe vantage point for gauge reading. Purchase gauges and schedule staff time to install gauges during low river flows.



| City of Loveland. Foothins Solar Facility (Love | ianu – 4) | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Earthquake, Land Subsidence, | |
| | Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire | |
| LOCATION: West of Mehaffey Park | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 09/12/2013 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C, D, E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: The 2013 Flood destroyed the Idylwild | e Dam, hydro plant, and Penstock power generating | |
| system that supplied power to the lower port | tion of the Big T Canyon. This solar facility, in conjunction | |
| with the Foothill Substation, will serve as red | undant power source for the city. Additional power is | |
| also needed on the west side of the city. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Construct solar power generation site (and substation) on the west side of the | | |
| city. | | |
| ACTION: Develop an 18 acre solar facility to b | e located on the city owned property between West | |
| 22nd and West 29th Streets, west of Mehaffe | ey Park. | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Power | EXPECTED COST: \$5.1m | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Building, Planning, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: City internal budget, | |
| FEMA, Platte River Power Authority, | FEMA Flood recovery ((this would be a high priority | |
| | project if funding is secured, otherwise it is a medium | |
| | priority) | |
| | | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Site is city owned. Obtain approval from FEMA for this as an Alternate Project under Disaster Recovery funds. Design and engineering are completed. Construction expected to begin 2016 Q2 and be completed by December 2016.







| City of Loveland: Foothills Substation (Loveland – 5) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Earthquake, Land Subsidence, | | | |
| | Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire | | | |
| LOCATION: West of Mehaffey Park | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1,2,3,5 | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 09/12/2013 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C, D, E | | | |
| | | | | |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 09/30/2017

ISSUE: The 2013 Flood destroyed the Idylwilde Dam and Penstock power generating system that supplied power to the lower portion of the Big T Canyon. This power substation, in conjunction with the Foothills Solar facility, will serve as redundant power source for the city.

RECOMMENDATION: Construct a power substation (and Solar power facility) on the west side of the city.

ACTION: Develop a 2.4 acre substation to be located on the city owned property between West 22nd and West 29th Streets, west of Mehaffey Park. The City elected to participate in the FEMA Alternate Program and build this substation project rather than rebuild the Idylwilde Dam and Penstock that was damaged during the 2013 Flood.

| LEAD AGENCY: Power | EXPECTED COST: \$4m | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Building, Planning, Platte River Power Authority, Larimer County, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: city internal budget | | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Site is city owned and zoned. Design and engineering are completed Construction will begin 2016 Q2 and be compl Sept 2017 | d being re- l. leted by | | | | | |





| City of Loveland: Fleet Tracking & Communications (Loveland – 6) | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & | | | | | | |
| | Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | | | | | | |
| LOCATION: 200 N. Wilson Ave | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3 | | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/15/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C, D, E | | | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2019 | | | | | | | |
| ISSUE: During daily operations or emergencie | es, not all personnel or vehicles in the field have radios | | | | | | |
| for communications and there is no means to | have a snapshot perspective of where a city vehicle is at | | | | | | |
| any given time. | | | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Add an 800 MHz radio | and GPS tracking to priority vehicles | | | | | | |
| ACTION: Determine which and how many cit | y vehicles should have GPS locators and have them | | | | | | |
| installed. Install 800 MHz radios in all city veh | nicles. | | | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Fleet Management | EXPECTED COST: \$500,000 | | | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Public Works, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: city internal budget, | | | | | | |
| Emergency Communications, WAC, GPS | grant (this would be a high priority project if funding is | | | | | | |
| vendor, NCRCN | secured, otherwise it is a medium priority) | | | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: This project is not y | et started. | | | | | | |
| Funding needs to be secured and then desigr | n and vendor | | | | | | |
| quotes need to be obtained. | SMS | | | | | | |
| GPS GPS | | | | | | | |
| 200 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | INTERNET | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



Office of Emergency Management e 410 East Fifth Street e Loveland, Colorado \$0537 (970) 962-2534 · FAX (970) 962-2912 www.cityofloveland.org

LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

August 26, 2014

Willfam Cahill, City Manager City of Loveland 500 E. 3rd Street Loveland, CO 80537

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in Northern Colorado Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Lori Hodges, EM Director,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Rezard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multi-jurisdict onal mitigation plans, the City of Loveland / Loveland Fire Rescue Authority is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that City of Loveland has agreed to participate in the Northern Colorado Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitlgation Planning offert.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning. City of Loveland agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans, dentified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County to complete the plan in conformance with HEMA requirements.

The City of Loveland understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's Local Mitigation Planning Handbook dated March 2013 Including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and no; addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an Identification of risks, where they differ from the general . planning area;
- The formulation of miligation goals responsive to public input and development of miligation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, allending meetings, contributing research, data, ur other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.).
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing budy (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I, William Cahill, commit the City of Love and to the Northern Colorado Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort. Willand Calul

Executed this all day of August 2014 Signature





Loveland Fire Rescue Authority

"Through commitment, compassion and courage, the mission of the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority (LFRA) is to protect life and property." — LFRA Mission Statement

Community Profile

The Loveland Fire Rescue Authority (LFRA) is a combination department that utilizes both career and volunteer firefighters. LFRA staff consists of approximately 90 career members (including both uniformed and civilian employees) and approximately 6 - 12 Reserve (volunteer) Firefighters. These department members operate under the leadership of a career Fire Chief. The department also receives valuable citizen input from the Fire and Rescue Advisory Commission.

The Loveland Fire Rescue Authority provides fire and rescue services in an area totaling approximately 197 square miles. The agency serves residents living within the City of Loveland, and residents living within the Loveland Rural Fire Protection District, for a combined population of approximately 97,500.







Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING | | |
|--|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--|--|
| Fire – Wildland | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.5 | | |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3.3 | | |
| Utility Disruption | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.3 | | |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.1 | | |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3.1 | | |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.0 | | |
| Tornado | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.8 | | |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.5 | | |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.4 | | |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.0 | | |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.9 | | |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.8 | | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Fire – Wildland; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind | | | | | | | | |
| Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Flood – Flash and Riverine; Tornado; Landslide / Rockslide | | | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Erosion / Deposition; Civil Disturbance; Earthquake | | | | | | | | |
| Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Earthquake; Biological Hazards / Contagion | | | | | | | | |

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was





conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Loveland Fire Rescue Authority's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the district.



Social Vulnerability Map – Loveland Fire Rescue Authority¹⁶⁶

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract





¹⁶⁶ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High.

The Loveland Fire Rescue Authority is characterized by a mix of low to medium-high levels of social vulnerability. The central eastern area of the service boundary has higher levels of social vulnerability to disasters than the rest of the community. A closer look at the individual social vulnerability indicators within the area will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders an even clearer picture of where resources should be prioritized in order to reduce vulnerability in the community. Over time, Loveland Fire Rescue Authority should continue to monitor local social vulnerability as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change.

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, there have been 63 reported damaging wildfire events in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on Larimer County, there is potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area.

Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones in the district are located in the western region, in areas where there are lower population densities.







Loveland Fire Rescue Authority Wildfire Hazard Zone Map¹⁶⁷

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the western region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





¹⁶⁷ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.



Loveland Fire Rescue Authority Wildfire Risk Index Map¹⁶⁸

There are areas in the western region of the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





¹⁶⁸ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk.



Loveland Fire Rescue Authority WUI Map¹⁶⁹

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority depends. There are areas of high and medium wildfire threat in the western portion of the district according to the WUI Risk Index. There is 1 critical facility located in areas with the most negative and 2nd most negative wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the critical facility within the most and 2nd most negative wildfire threat areas is over \$58 thousand dollars.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority. There are 385 parcels/structures located in areas with the most negative and 544 parcels/structures located in areas





¹⁶⁹ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.

with the 2nd most negative wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these most and 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$178 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.





Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.





¹⁷⁰ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries or deaths in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area due to hail. There have been 68 hail events reported in the service area between 1955 and 2014. Reported losses total \$13,000. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the service area, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.



Historical Hail Events in Loveland Fir Rescue Authority¹⁷¹

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 7 injuries and 2 deaths in the Loveland Fir Rescue Authority service area due to thunderstorm wind. There have been 16 thunderstorm wind events reported in service area between 1955 and 2014. Of the 16 incidents, 3 reported property losses totaling

¹⁷¹ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





\$26 thousand dollars and no crop losses. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the service area, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 9 lightning events in Loveland Fir Rescue Authority service area between 1996 and 2014. There have been 12 reported injuries, 2 deaths, \$104,000 worth of property damage, and no crop damage. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the service area, there is a great potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 34 Windstorm events in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area between 1996 and 2014. There have been 15 reported injuries, 2 deaths, over \$14,000 in damages.



Historical High Wind Events in Loveland Fire Rescue Authority¹⁷²

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes 97,500people, or 100% of the Authority's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the Authority's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented

¹⁷² Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to





quantify, but based on historical record of 25 severe wind events since 1996, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Loveland Fire Rescue Authority does not currently track incidences of utility disruption.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes 97,500people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.

Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area.

Hazmat – Fixed and Transport

Previous Occurrences

Based on data supplied by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's (PHMSA) Incident Reports Database there have been 68 reported HAZMAT incidents within the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority between 1972 and 2015.

Inventory Exposed

We can't accurately predict when or where a HAZMAT incident may occur. Therefore, for the purpose of this plan, all existing and future buildings, facilities, and populations in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority are considered to be equally exposed and couple potentially be impacted. This includes 97,500people, or 100% of the Authority's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the Authority.

When hazardous materials are being transported they are particularly vulnerability to transportation related accidents, misuse, or terrorist threats. Most hazardous materials are transported in large quantities in order to reduce costs and security is difficult to maintain around moving vehicles that cross jurisdictional boundaries. When transported close to populated areas or critical infrastructure, HAZMAT releases can have serious consequences. The inventory that is most often exposed to HAZMAT risks are railways, roadways, and fixed facilities that contain hazardous materials, and all assets that lie within a mile of the potential release areas.

Hwy 34 and I-25 run through and near the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area and is a designated nuclear and hazardous materials transportation route. All structures, natural resources, and people





located within one mile of these transportation routes (and railways) are exposed to the impacts of a potential HAZMAT event. Structures, people, and natural resources located outside of a one mile buffer of these routes are also at risk of exposure.

Assets and people that are located within one mile of an industrial or commercial fixed site are also at risk of exposure to the impacts of a HAZMAT release.

Potential Losses

HAZMAT related events occur throughout the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority every year. The intensity and magnitude of these incidents depend on weather conditions, the location of the event, the time of day, and the process by which the materials are released. *Was is raining when the event happened? Were the hazardous materials being transported by rail when they were released or were they at a fixed facility? Did the spill happen during rush hour traffic or in the middle of the night?* All of these considerations matter when determining the risk and potential damages associated with a HAZMAT incident.

HAZMAT events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. Moreover, HAZMAT incidents can cause serious environmental contamination to non-renewable resources such as air, ground, and water sources.

Probability of Future Occurrences

As with most hazards that have limited spatial predictability or warning time, the probability of future occurrences of HAZMAT events is difficult to predict. However, as development continues to encroach into existing industrial areas and becomes denser along high-risk designated hazardous materials transportation routes, the risk of future occurrences becomes greater. Even if the frequency of HAZMAT spills remains the same over time, population growth will increase the probability of a disaster event.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Loveland Fire Rescue Authority is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes 97,500 people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A





timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the service area at least once every year.





Flood – Flash and Riverine





Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported injuries, property loss, or crop damage in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area caused by flooding. A flash flood was reported on June 3, 2005. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on Loveland Fire Rescue Authority, there is a great potential for flooding events to occur at any given time.





¹⁷³ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.



Loveland Fire Rescue Authority 2013 Flood Extent¹⁷⁴

Maximum flood extent—a key data need for disaster response and mitigation—is rarely quantified due to storm-related cloud cover and the low temporal resolution of optical sensors. While change detection approaches can circumvent these issues through the identification of inundated land and soil from post-flood imagery, their accuracy can suffer in the narrow and complex channels of increasingly developed and heterogeneous floodplains. The data depicted above is from a study that explored the utility of the Operational Land Imager (OLI) and Independent Component Analysis (ICA) for addressing these challenges in the unprecedented 2013 Flood along the Colorado Front Range, USA. The approach was able to simultaneously distinguish flood-related water and soil moisture from pre-existing water bodies and other spectrally similar classes within the narrow and braided channels of the study site.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

¹⁷⁴ Multi-Temporal Independent Component Analysis and Landsat 8 for Delineating Maximum Extent of the 2013 Colorado Front Range Flood




The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 10 critical facilities and 1,361 parcels/structures in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of these exposed critical facilities is over \$19.6 million dollars. The appraised value of these exposed structures is over \$247.5 million dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area that for a 100-year flood event, approximately 3 critical facilities and 222 buildings will experience flood damage. The estimated critical facility total loss is over \$984 thousand dollars, building loss of over \$147 thousand dollars, content loss over \$786 thousand dollars, and over \$50 thousand dollars estimated inventory loss. The estimated structure total loss is over \$14.7 million dollars, building loss of over \$5.7 million dollars, content loss of over \$6.1 million dollars, and inventory loss of approximately \$2.8 million dollars.







Loveland Fire Rescue Authority 1% Annual Flood Loss Estimation and Flood Depth Grid Map¹⁷⁵

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Loveland Fire and Rescue Authority service area provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the service area. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.





¹⁷⁵ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Tornado

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA, no injuries or deaths have been recorded within the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area due to tornadoes. There is record of 5 tornados reported within the service area limits between 1954 and 2015. On July 7, 1983 a tornado caused over \$1,000 in property loss. Tornadoes will remain a likely occurrence for the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority.





Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area can be considered at risk from severe wind and tornadoes. This includes approximately 97,500people, or 100% of the service area's population and all buildings and infrastructure within the service area.¹⁷⁷ Most structures, including critical facilities,

¹⁷⁷ 2010 Census





¹⁷⁶ Historical tornado events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1950 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

should be able to withstand and provide adequate protection from tornadoes. Those facilities with backup generators should be fully equipped to handle tornado events should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Generally, tornadoes destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists tornado hazards, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Reported tornadoes over the past 61 years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of frequency for such events. The probability of the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area experiencing a tornado associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify. Historic tornado frequencies suggest that there is a chance of this type of event occurring somewhere in within the service area boundaries each year.





Landslide / Rockslide

Previous Occurrences

According to the Colorado Geological Survey there have been no historical landslide events within the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area.



Historic Landslide Areas – Loveland Fire Rescue Authority Service Area¹⁷⁸

Inventory Exposed

There are no identified potential locations within Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area that are vulnerable to landslides. There are portions of the western region of the service area that have the potential for rockslide events. As population growth brings new development into available land in the area, more inventory assets may become exposed to landslides and rockslides hazards. The following figures show historical and potential landslide and rockslide areas near the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area.

¹⁷⁸ Historical and potential landslide areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.







Potential Rockslide Areas – Loveland Fire Rescue Authority Service Area¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁹ Potential rock fall areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.









Potential Losses

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are no critical facility and 38 parcels/structures in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area that are prone to landslides (not including the total miles of landslide prone infrastructure). The appraised value of the exposed structures is over \$5.4 million dollars.

¹⁸⁰ Parcels intersecting potential & historical landslide areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.







Parcels in Rockslide Areas – Loveland Fire Rescue Authority Service Area¹⁸¹

Probability of Future Occurrences

Due to the uncertainty associated with existing data, it is challenging to accurately calculate probability for future events related to landslide and rockslide hazards. It can be assured however, that these hazards will continue to alter the landscape of the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area in the future.

Overall, the probability of future occurrences of rockslide and landslide events in the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority service area is low. Individual assessments of landslide-prone areas are recommended in the future. Moreover, as development and population increase in the service area, increasing numbers of structures (and people) will be exposed to future landslide and rockslide events.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the Authority's hazard mitigation program.

¹⁸¹ Parcels that intersect potential rockfall areas presently identified by the Colorado Geological Survey.





Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | Х | | |
| Floodplain | Х | | |
| Administrator | | | |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |
| Grant Writer | | | Х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines Loveland Fire Rescue Authority's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Y |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan Y | |
| A Stormwater Plan Y | |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) Y | |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) Y | |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Y* |
| Participates in the NFIP | N |

*Under development, to be completed by October 2016.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Loveland Fire Rescue Authority has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the LFRA will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.





| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|------------------|--|
| Loveland Fire | <i>"Our mitigation actions will be reviewed by OEM on an annual basis."</i> |
| Rescue Authority | <i>"Changes to our mitigation actions and priorities will be made in the document and available for public comment."</i> |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|------------------|--|
| Loveland Fire | "We will continue to integrate our mitigation actions into our operations, |
| Rescue Authority | budgeting, and prioritization planning." |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide present the Authority's mitigation actions that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Loveland Fire Rescue Authority: CWPP Development | | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire – Wildland | |
| LOCATION: Unincorporated areas of LRFA | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 04/25/2016 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, B, C, D, E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 03/01/2018 | | |
| ISSUE: Unincorporated areas of LFRA do not o | currently have Community Wildfire Protection Plans | |
| (CWPP) | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Conduct planning process for creation of CWPP(s) | | |
| ACTION: Develop CWPP(s) | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Loveland Fire Rescue | EXPECTED COST: \$30,000 | |
| Authority | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: n/a | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: LFRA | |
| | | |
| | | |
| - Identification of LERA project 'champion' | | |

- Identification of LFKA project "champion"
 Identification of planning area(s)
- Identification of planning are
 Secure plan funding



- Complete plan development

| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Tornado, Fire, Public Health, | |
|---|--|--|
| | Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: Water Treatment Plant | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 01/01/2013 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: Compressed chlorine gas, stored in mul | ltiple 1-ton cylinders, is used to treat municipal water | |
| supply. Storing and using chlorine gas on-site p | pose as a threat for explosions, leaks, or even as targets | |
| of opportunity. Breathing in chlorine gas is a c | deadly to all organic life, including humans. Big T | |
| Elementary School is located within the toxic f | footprint for accidental release plume modeling. This is | |
| a high target of opportunity. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Replacement of chlorine | e gas as water treatment product with safer product | |
| Sodium Hypo Chlorite | | |
| ACTION: Eliminating chlorine gas as the method to disinfect water during the water treatment | | |
| process. We would replace chlorine gas disinfection with sodium hypo chlorite which is in liquid form | | |
| and is much safer than chlorine gas. A chemical building specifically for storage and delivery is part of | | |
| the project scope. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Loveland Fire Rescue | EXPECTED COST: \$1m | |
| Authority, Water Division | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Building, Risk | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: city internal budget, | |
| Management, CDPHE, EPA bond, loan | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: The construction of the chemical building is underway. Funding is secured. | | |
| Design and engineering are completed. | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

Loveland Fire Rescue Authority

November <u>2</u>, 2015

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteris that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans, the Loveland Fire Rescue Authority is submitting this letter of Intent to confirm that Loveland Fire Rescue Authority has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning. Loveland Fire Rescue Authority agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Loveland Fire Rescue Authority understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's Local Mitigation Planning Handbook dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions
 complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning
 process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any
 planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, date, or other information, commenting on
 drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I Mark Miller, commit Leveland Fire Rescue Authority to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this A day of November, 2015

Mark Miller, Fire Chief - Loveland Fire Rescue Authority





Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District (Northern Water)

"Provide water resources management, project operations, and conservation services for C-BT Project beneficiaries." —Mission, Northern Water

Community Profile

Northern Water is a public agency created in 1937 to contract with the federal government to build the Colorado-Big Thompson (C-BT) Project. The C-BT collects water west of the Continental Divide and delivers it to Northeastern Colorado for agricultural, municipal, domestic and industrial uses. Northern Water and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation jointly operate and maintain the C-BT Project.

About 880,000 people live within Northern Water boundaries, which encompass 1.6 million acres in portions of eight counties: Boulder, Broomfield, Larimer, Logan, Morgan, Sedgwick, Washington and Weld. Northern Water provides cities, towns rural-domestic water districts and industries with year-round deliveries. And between April and October, the primary growing season, Northern Water also delivers water to more than 120 ditch, reservoir and irrigation companies serving thousands of farms and more than 640,000 acres.







Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|--|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Fire – Wildland | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 3.0 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.7 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.4 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.4 |
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.4 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.2 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.1 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.0 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.0 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.7 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 1.6 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Fire – Wildland; Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Flood – Flash and Riverine; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Tornado; Erosion / Deposition; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Earthquake; Utility Disruption | | | | | | |

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Landslide / Rockslide; Civil Disturbance; Biological Hazards / Contagion

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific to Northern Water, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately





from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Northern Water.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Northern Water social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the district.



Social Vulnerability Map – Northern Water¹⁸²

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract





¹⁸² Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High.

The Northern Water service area is characterized by a mix of low to medium levels of social vulnerability. A deeper-dive into the individual social vulnerability indicators within the district will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders an even clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on the community and its resiliency. It is important that the district continue to monitor social vulnerability levels over time as demographics and economics change in the area.

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 370 reported wildfire events in the Northern Water service area. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time.



Northern Water Service Area Historical Federal Wildfire Map¹⁸³

¹⁸³ Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.





Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones are located throughout the district.



Northern Water Wildfire Hazard Zone Map¹⁸⁴

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire hazard zones are located throughout the district.

¹⁸⁴ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.







Northern Water Wildfire Risk Index Map¹⁸⁵

There are a number of areas in the central and eastern region of the district that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





¹⁸⁵ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.



Northern Water WUI Map¹⁸⁶

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which Northern Water depends. There are areas of high and medium wildfire threat in the central portion of the district according to the WUI Risk Index. There is 1 critical facilities located in areas with the *most negative* and 7 critical facilities located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the critical facilities within these most and 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$10 million dollars.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Northern Water service area. There are 1,888





¹⁸⁶ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.

parcels/structures located in areas with the most negative and 1,040 parcels/structures located in areas with the 2nd most negative wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these most and 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$872 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.







Northern Water Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone¹⁸⁷

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Northern CO Water Conservation District that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.





¹⁸⁷ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, Northern Water has experienced 264 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Western Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. Northern Water is at high risk of experiencing, and being impacted by, winter storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Northern Water service area can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages from winter storm events primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of Northern Water including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for Northern Water.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the district at least once every year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the district's hazard mitigation program.





Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the district's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | Х | |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | Λ |
| Community Planner | | | Х |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |
| Grant Writer | | Х | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the district's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Ν |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | N |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Ν |
| A Capital Improvements Plan Y | |
| A Stormwater Plan | Ν |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Y |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) Y | |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Y |
| Participates in the NFIP | N |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the district will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|----------------------------|--|
| Northern Colorado Water | <i>"We participate in the C-BT Headwaters Partnership, a partnership of Northern Water, the U.S. Forest Service, Colorado State Forest Service and the Bureau of Reclamation. Our wildfire mitigation and planning activities will be incorporated</i> |





| Conservancy | into the 5-year operating plan of this group. Other mitigation activities are |
|-------------|--|
| District | incorporated into our annual O&M planning activities, which are monitored by our management team and Board of Directors." |
| | "Our mitigation actions and priorities are discussed with our Board of Directors during open session of our Planning & Action and Board meetings, which are open to the public. Mitigation activities are also discussed at our Water User's meetings, which happen twice per year, and advertised through our general electronic mailings and other public information activities." |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|---|---|
| Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District | "Our wildfire mitigation activities will be incorporated into the C-BT Headwaters Partnership 5-year operating plan. Other mitigation activities are incorporated into our annual O&M activities or capital projects activities. Northern Water is implementing a new Asset Management program that will monitor and track these activities." |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide presents Northern Water's new mitigation action that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Northern Water: Colorado-Big Thompson Headwaters Partnership (Northern Water – 1) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Fire, Public Health | | | |
| LOCATION: Larimer and Grand Counties | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3 | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 12/03/2012 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: D, E | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/03/2017 | (optional extensions likely) | | | |
| | | | | |

ISSUE:

Northern Water jointly owns, operates and maintains the Colorado Big-Thompson Project (C-BT) with the Bureau of Reclamation. C-BT delivers about 215,000 acre-feet of water annually to supplement water supplies for 860,000 people and 640,000 acres of irrigated land in northeastern Colo. Watersheds include the Upper Colorado and Big Thompson rivers in Grand and Larimer counties. C-BT water supplies are nearly entirely dependent upon snowmelt from high elevation watersheds along the Continental Divide in Northern Colorado. Forest health and fires within these watersheds can have dramatic effects on the quality of watershed runoff and the ability of C-BT water supplies to meet municipal, industrial and agricultural water uses. Catastrophic wildfires that occurred in Northern Colorado during 2012-2013 drought conditions highlighted the risk that C-BT water supplies face given deteriorated forest health conditions, drought, and urbanization at the wildland-urban interface. Northern Water, in conjunction with its partner local, State and Federal agencies is taking a pro-active approach to addressing these conditions.

RECOMMENDATION:

The C-BT Headwaters Partnership was created in December 2012 through an MOU between the US Forest Service, Colorado State Forest Service, Bureau of Reclamation and Northern Water. The goal of the partnership is to restore health and resiliency of forests and watersheds and preplan wildfire response to protect C-BT infrastructure and water supplies.

ACTION:

The following actions will be conducted by Northern Water through the Partnership:

- Conduct forest and watershed health treatments, and pre-plan post-wildfire response
- Develop a 5-year operating plan specifying treatment zones and activities
- Support creation and refinement of watershed assessments
- Coordinate to provide education, technical and financial incentives
- Engage other partners
- Develop a shared communications and media campaign
- The C-BT Headwaters Partnership meets on a monthly basis to plan and coordinate activities, review on-going projects, and perform field investigations of new projects. The partnership is currently developing its 5-year operating plan.

| LEAD AGENCY: Northern Water – Jerry | EXPECTED COST: | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Gibbens | Northern Water: \$350,000 per year (budgeted, | | | |
| | subject to annual appropriation by the Board of | | | |
| | Directors) | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: U.S. Forest Service, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: | | | |
| Colorado State Forest Service, Bureau of | Lead and support agencies | | | |





Reclamation, National Park Service, Western Area Power Administration, Larimer County

- Colorado Department of Natural Resources grants
- Colorado State Forest Service grants
- Other grants

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Major project milestones and reporting of current project status <u>Completed Actions</u>

- Upper Colorado Watershed Assessment 2013
- C-BT Watershed Assessment 2013
- Small Watershed Prioritization Report 2014
- 5-Year Operating Plan Anticipated 2015
- 2013 Wildfire Risk Reduction Grant 367 acres treated (some acreage in Grand County) <u>On-going Actions</u>
 - 2014 Wildfire Risk Reduction Grant 220 acres treated (in progress)
 - 2015 CSFS SFA Grant 100 acres treated (in progress)
 - Kawuneechee Fuels Reduction Project 153 acres treated (in progress; all in Grand County)
 - Other projects funded by Reclamation, USFS, WAPA

Future Actions

- Finalize 5-year plan (2016) and implement plan actions (2016-2017)
 - Pursue fuels reduction goals identified in the plan
 - Implement pre-planning and action requirements for post-wildfire response
- Continue to purse funding opportunities or mitigation projects (2016-2017)
 - Colorado Department of Natural Resources Wildfire Risk Reduction grants
 - Colorado State Forest Service grants
 - Cost-sharing with local, state and federal agencies
- Investigate opportunities to extend MOU and include additional partners (2015-2016) <u>Reporting</u>
 - Develop annual report for C-BT Headwaters Partnership
 - Present report to Northern Water Board of Directors annually





Letter of Intent to Participate



Northern Colorado Water Conservancy Distric; 220 Water Avenue Berboud, Colorado 80513 Phone I 800 000 7244 - Fax 1-977-851-0018 www.northenwater.org

June 16, 2015

Lori R. Ukslges Latinter County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re: "Statement of Infont to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Eatimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (ITMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FFMA) Focal Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans, Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District (Northern Water) is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that Northern Water has agreed to participate in the Larinter County Multi-Aurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning c.Tort,

Further, as a condition to participating in the miligation planning. Northern Water agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a limely manner to Latimer County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Northam Water understands that if must engage in the lo lowing plurning process, as more fully described in FEMA's Local Mitigation Planning Haudback dated March 2013 including, but not Finited (a)

- Identification of bazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the masterplanning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all composity stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, conducting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;





Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District

"Professional and Courteous Mountain Community Emergency Services"



Community Profile

The Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District is a volunteer fire protection district located in the mountains between Estes Park and Lyons along highway 36. They provides services to the communities of Pinewood Springs and Estes Park Estates. Pinewood Springs Fire Protection services include structure fire protection, wildland fire suppression, vehicle-fire suppression, basic medical response, motor vehicle accident response, hazardous material containment and mitigation; mutual aid response, and rapid intervention team services. The preceding services are provided with an emphasis on protection of life, limb, and property.







Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District is situated in both Larimer and Boulder Counties. For the purpose of this plan, spatially analyzed hazard risks have been assessed for the areas of the district that lie specifically within Larimer County.

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Fire – Wildland | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.3 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.7 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.4 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.2 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.2 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.1 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.1 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.0 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.9 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.7 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Tornado | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |

HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Fire – Wildland; Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Biological Hazards / Contagion; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Flood – Flash and Riverine; Landslide / Rockslide; Utility Disruption

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Civil Disturbance; Erosion / Deposition; Earthquake; Tornado





Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the district.



Social Vulnerability Map – Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District¹⁸⁸

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability

¹⁸⁸ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High.

The Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District is characterized by low levels of social vulnerability. This does not mean, however, that there aren't any socially vulnerable residents living in the community or that social vulnerability levels will remain the same over time. Close analysis of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the area will give the district a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors threaten the community the most and where social and economic resources should be allocated in order to reduce vulnerability. Over time, the district should continue to monitor social vulnerability levels as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change.

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 15 reported wildfire events in the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time.



Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District Historical Federal Wildfire Map¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁹ Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.





Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones are located throughout the district.



Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District Wildfire Hazard Zone Map¹⁹⁰

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the western and central region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





¹⁹⁰ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.



Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District Wildfire Risk Index Map¹⁹¹

There are a number of areas in the central and eastern region of the district that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





¹⁹¹ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.



Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District WUI Map¹⁹²

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District depends. There are areas of high and medium wildfire threat in the central portion of the district according to the WUI Risk Index. There is 1 critical facilities located in areas with the *most negative* and 2nd most negative wildfire threat total.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District. The appraisal value of the critical facilities within these most and 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$135 thousand





¹⁹² Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.

dollars. There are 383 parcels/structures located in areas with the most negative and 229 parcels/structures located in areas with the 2nd most negative wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these most and 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$88.6 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.





Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone¹⁹³



Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District that are





¹⁹³ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.
characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District has experienced 175 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas within western Larimer County above 6,000 feet. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the District at least once every year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths,





weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the district's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the district's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | Λ |
| Community Planner | | | Х |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | Х | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the district's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Ν |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Ν |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Ν |
| A Stormwater Plan | Ν |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Ν |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Ν |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Ν |
| Participates in the NFIP | Ν |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the district will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementat | ion Strategy |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|
| | LARIMER | Michael Bake |

MMITTED TO EXCELLE



| | "Our mitigation actions will be reviewed annually by the Fire District." |
|-------|---|
| PSFPD | |
| | <i>"Changes, actions and priorities communicated via monthly news information and social media"</i> |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the district based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|--------------|--|
| PSFPD | <i>"We will integrate highest risk hazards in our annual operating budget and long term planning process."</i> |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present the district's new mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District: Full Adoption of Updated FEMA Floodplains | | |
|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: Pinewood Springs Fire District | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives A, B, C, D and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2020 | | |
| ISSUE: Floodplain mapping is out of date and | the 2013 Flood caused extensive changes to current | |
| floodplains. The Little Thompson River has never been mapped. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Work with FEMA on up | dating current floodplain mapping in coordination with | |
| Larimer County | | |
| ACTION: By 2020, the Little Thompson River through the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District will | | |
| be mapped and adopted by FEMA | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Pinewood Springs | EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Colorado State Flood | |
| Community Development and Office of Hazard Mapping Project | | |
| Emergency Management | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Little Thompson Floodplain Mapped | | |
| Review and Comment Period / Public Review Process | | |
| Community Outreach | | |
| Follow the County process for zoning changes per county policy (Flood Review Board, | | |

Planning Commission, BCC, etc.)

| Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District: New Fire Station (Pinewood Springs FPD – 1) | | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood, Severe Storm, Wind, Fire | |
| LOCATION: Pinewood Springs | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 3, 4 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 01/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, B, E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2016 | | |

ISSUE: Pinewood Springs does not currently have suitable and usable space for operation of the Fire District, and Community meetings and activities during emergencies. The current building is over 50 years old and needs extensive repair and upgrading. Costs to rebuild the current structure would be as much as building a new, properly sized station that will meet community needs.

RECOMMENDATION: Replace current fire station facility that is inadequate.

ACTION: Construct a new Fire Station for the Pinewood Springs area with a community room to meet the needs of the public.

LEAD AGENCY: Pinewood Springs Fire **Protection District**

EXPECTED COST: \$750,000



LARIMER COUNT MMITTED TO EXCELLE



SUPPORT AGENCIES: None

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Fire District Reserve Funds, Community Fund raisers, DOLA Grant, Donations, Tax Mil Level increase.

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Raise funds through community fund raising, grants and tax mill levy increase.
- DOLA Grant application
- Community vote for Mil Levy increase
- Continued donations and fund raisers
- Acquire additional property
- Design new structure
- Design site plan, lighting, septic, drainage and landscape plans.
- Acquire building permits
- Select contractor
- Determine time of year to demo old building and start build of new facility

Develop plan to provide Fire District services during build process, where and how to stage equipment

| Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District: Replace the dry hydrant and reestablish access (Pinewood Springs FPD – 2) | | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire | |
| LOCATION: Pinewood Springs | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 01/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 05/30/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: The flood of 2012 destroyed Crescent | Lake and the dry hydrant that we use for access to water | |
| for firefighting for a large portion of our com | munity. The lake is being rebuilt, and the hydrant needs | |
| to be replaced. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Replace the dry hydran | t and reestablish access to it. | |
| ACTION: Raise funds through grant. Design th | e new hydrant and vehicle access in order to use it. | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Pinewood Springs Fire | EXPECTED COST: \$5,000 | |
| Protection District | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Lyons Foundation, | |
| | FEMA reimbursement | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Obtain Grant | | |
| Establish location for hydrant and access to it | | |
| Design new hydrant | | |
| Contract to build hydrant and access area | | |
| Build it | | |

| Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District: Mitigation Code Changes | | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire | |
| LOCATION: Pinewood Springs Fire | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 4, and 5 | |
| Protection District | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 6/1/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives B, C, and E | |
| | | |





 TARGET COMPLETION DATE:12/31/2016

 ISSUE: Recent large-scale disasters have caused Pinewood Springs to re-evaluate all Wildfire codes for possible mitigation actions

RECOMMENDATION: Provide recommendations for code changes to the Pinewood Springs Fire Board for reducing losses and mitigating risk to structural and wildfire

ACTION: Update fire codes with recommendations approved by the Board to decrease future risk and disaster losses.

| LEAD AGENCY: Pinewood Springs Fire | EXPECTED COST: \$0 |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Protection District | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer Community | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Staff time |
| Development Division, Office of Emergency | |
| Management | |
| | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Develop a review team to go over all codes and provide suggested changes
- Compile all recommended changes and present to the Fire Board for consideration
- Make changes as appropriate and finalize recommended actions
- Participate in the code revision process, including public meetings

Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District: Install emergency power to critical portions of the fire station. (Pinewood Springs FPD – 3)

| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Fire, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind |
|---------------------------------|--|
| LOCATION: Pinewood Springs | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3 |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 01/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2016

ISSUE: When electrical power goes out for long periods, usability of the fire station for incident command, radio communications, and medical and other community activities is impacted.

RECOMMENDATION: Install emergency power to critical portions of the fire station.

ACTION: Determine what areas of the station need power and design a back power system to fit the requirement/ Raise funds through grant.

| LEAD AGENCY: Pinewood Springs Fire | EXPECTED COST: \$6,500 |
|--|---|
| Protection District | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: State Farm Insurance |
| | Company Grant, Fire District Reserve money |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | |
| Establish requirements | |
| Design the system to meet requirements | |
| | |

Obtain Grant

Determine if work needs to be contracted or can be done in house.

Build it.









Letter of Intent to Participate

LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District

August 15, 2014

Lori Hodges Larimer County 200 West Oak St, 2nd floor Fort Collins, CO, 80522-1190

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in Larimer County CO Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Lori Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multijurisdictional mitigation plans, the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District has agreed to participate in the Lariner County CO Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to the Larimer County CO HMP to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

The Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the
 planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant
 involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other
 information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I R. L. Wilcox (Chief PSFPD), commit the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District to the Larimer County CO Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 15 day of August 2014

R. L. Wilcox (Chief PSFPD)





Platte River Power Authority

Vision: As a respected leader and responsible energy partner, improve the quality of life for the citizens served by our owner communities.

Mission: Provide safe, reliable, environmentally responsible, and competitively priced energy and services.

Values: Safety, Integrity, Customer Service, Respect, Operational Excellence, Innovation, and Sustainability

Community Profile

Platte River Power Authority is a not-for-profit wholesale electricity generation and transmission provider that delivers energy and services to its owner communities of Estes Park, Fort Collins, Longmont and Loveland, Colorado for delivery to their utility customers. Platte River's Headquarters is located in Fort Collins and its generation and transmission facilities are located along Colorado's Front Range and in northwestern Colorado.



The following map depicts Platte River Power Authority's Energy Delivery System.







Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 2.0 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.9 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.8 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |





| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Tornado | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): None | | | | | | |

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Fire – Wildland; Flood – Flash and Riverine; Utility Disruption; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Civil Disturbance; Earthquake; Erosion / Deposition; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Landslide / Rockslide; Tornado

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Platte River Power Authority, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Platte River Power Authority.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Platte River Power Authority's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the Platte River Power Authority limits.







Social Vulnerability Map – Platte River Power Authority¹⁹⁴

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

The Platte River Power Authority is characterized by a mix of low to medium-High levels of social vulnerability. A closer analysis of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the area will give local stakeholders and decision-makers a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on the community and its resiliency. It is important that the Platte River Power Authority continue to monitor social vulnerability levels over time as demographics and economics change in the area.

¹⁹⁴ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Platte River Power Authority to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the power authority's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the Platte River Power Authority's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | Х |
| Administrator | | | |
| Community Planner | | | Х |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | | х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the authority's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Ν |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | N |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | N |
| A Stormwater Plan | N |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Y |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | - |
| Participates in the NFIP | N |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Platte River Power Authority has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below





also includes a discussion of how the power authority will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Platte River Power Authority | "Our mitigation procedures will be reviewed annually or as needed." |
| | <i>"We will engage the public through social media as appropriate."</i> |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Platte River Power Authority based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Platte River Power Authority | "The mitigation action guides and mitigation plan, as they pertain to regulatory guidelines, will be reviewed annually and incorporated into our operations." |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present the Authority's mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Platte River Power Authority: Transmission Vegetative Management (Platte River PA – 1) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: [to be ranked in future meeting] | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Severe Storm, Wind & Tornado, | | | |
| | Fire | | | |
| LOCATION: Larimer County | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C | | | |
| | | | | |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Annually

ISSUE: Transmission Vegetation Management

RECOMMENDATION: The need for vegetation management is primarily determined during inspections. Any vegetation found to be in violation of clearances during inspections or estimated to grow into clearances between inspections, shall be pruned or removed as part of the annual work plan.

ACTION: To maintain a reliable electric transmission system by the control of vegetation within and adjacent to Platte River Power Authority's (Platte River) transmission right of ways thus providing safe, reliable electrical service while maintaining, and, where possible, improving the current and future use of the right-of-way (ROW) for the existing landowners.

LEAD AGENCY: Platte River Power Authority EXPECTED COST:





SUPPORT AGENCIES: N/A

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Annual Budget Costs, PRPA Funding

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Review the program annually and make changes as needed
- Determine the need for vegetative management during inspections

| Platte River Power Authority: Physical Securit | y Policy (Platte River PA – 2) | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: [to be ranked in future meeting] | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Physical security to Platte River | | | |
| | owned facilities. | | | |
| LOCATION: Fort Collins, Loveland | GOALS ADDRESSED: [1] | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/20/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: [C] | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: On Going | | | | |
| ISSUE: Addressing security vulnerabilities that could impact delivery of safe, reliable affordable energy | | | | |
| to Platte River's Owner Cities. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: All Platte River location | s will be equipped with systems to deter, and detect | | | |
| unauthorized access attempts, and to respond to such attempts. | | | | |
| ACTION: Installing cameras barriers, to restric | ct physical access to Platte River Facilities. | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Platte River | EXPECTED COST: Unknown at this time | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None | POTENTIAL FUNDING: Funding will come from internal | | | |
| | sources through the budgetary process. | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | | | |
| Completion of the Timberline Substation (Ft. Collins) wall | | | | |
| Construction on Harmony Substation (Ft. Collins) wall. | | | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



PLATTE RIVER POWER AUTHORITY Ester Park - Ton Collins - Longmant' - Lovebard

July 15, 2015

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80528

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Oear Ms. Hodges.

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multijurisdictional mitigation plans, the Platte River Power Authority is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that Platte River Power Authority has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning. Platte River Power Authority agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.5 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Platte River Power Authority understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's Local Mitigation Planning Hendbook deted March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisolation and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of art effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction. I Karin Hollohan, commit Platte River Power Authority to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Miligation Planning effort.

Executed this 15 day of July

elan ano

Karin Hollohan. Corporate Service Director

2000 East Harketoom Robol + Fon Collins, Coloropia 60525-5721 970/2264000 + www.pipa.org





Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District

"Fire and Emergency Medical Services for people who live and play in the Poudre Canyon!"



Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District Fire Station 1

Community Profile

Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District is volunteer fire department providing services for fire, emergency medical care, ice rescue, river rescue, traffic accidents, and information to residence and visitors to the Poudre Canyon. Poudre Canyon is located in the community of Bellevue, Colorado and the surrounding areas in the mountains west of Fort Collins. The district provides service to over 100 square miles along Colorado State Highway 14 from Gateway Park to Cameron Pass, along County Road 69 and County Road 68C as well as the Shambhala Mountain Center. The following map may not represent all areas of the



district, but was used as best available data. Missing areas include the north half of Sections 14-18 of Range 73W, Township 9N.







Poudre Canyon has approximately 500 full time residence with a summertime population of around 1,500. Many visitors engage in activities within the canyon including fishing, boating, and hiking, mountain biking, sightseeing, motorcycling, and exploring the back country.

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.9 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 2.7 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.5 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.4 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.4 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.3 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.1 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.6 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.5 |
| Tornado | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.4 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.4 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |

HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Fire – Wildland; Utility Disruption

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Flood – Flash and Riverine; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Landslide / Rockslide; Erosion / Deposition

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Earthquake; Tornado; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Civil Disturbance





Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.



Social Vulnerability Map – Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District¹⁹⁵

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The





¹⁹⁵ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)

pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District is characterized by low levels of social vulnerability (bottom 20% of the county). This does not mean, however, that there aren't any socially vulnerable residents living in the area or that social vulnerability levels will remain the same over time. Close analysis of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the District will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors threaten the local community the most and where social and economic resources should be allocated in order to reduce vulnerability. Over time, the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District should continue to monitor their progress as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change over time.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District has experienced 175 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas within western Larimer County above 6,000 feet. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District.





Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the district at least once every year.

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 113 reported wildfire event in the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on district, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time.



Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District Historical Federal Wildfire Map¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁶ Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.





Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones are located throughout the district.



Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District Wildfire Hazard Zone Map¹⁹⁷

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. There are areas with the highest wildfire risk throughout the district.





¹⁹⁷ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.



Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District Wildfire Risk Index Map¹⁹⁸

There are a number of areas in the eastern region of the district that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





¹⁹⁸ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk.



Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District WUI Map¹⁹⁹

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District depends. There are areas of high and medium wildfire threat in the central portion of the district according to the WUI Risk Index. There are no critical facilities located in areas with the *most negative* and 2 critical facilities located in areas with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District. The appraisal value of the critical facilities within the 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$458 thousand dollars. There are 71 parcels/structures located in areas with the most negative and 128 parcels/structures located in areas with the 2nd most negative wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these





¹⁹⁹ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.

most and 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$20.7 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.

Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI



Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the





²⁰⁰ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District does not currently track incidences of utility disruption within the service area.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes all people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.

Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the district's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the district's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | Λ |
| Community Planner | | | Х |





| GIS Specialist | | Х |
|----------------|---|---|
| Grant Writer | Х | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the district's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Ν |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | Ν |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Ν |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Ν |
| A Stormwater Plan | Ν |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Ν |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Ν |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | N |
| Participates in the NFIP | Ν |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the district will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | "Our hazard mitigation actions will be reviewed by the Fire Board annually." | | | | | |
| Poudre Canyon | | | | | | |
| Fire Protection | | | | | | |
| District | <i>"Our hazard awareness plan will be discussed at community meetings at least annually."</i> | | | | | |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.





| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|--|--|
| Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District | <i>"We have no planning or regulatory authority. We will seek grants that will allow the district to provide mitigation assistance."</i> |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide presents the district's mitigation action that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Poudre Canyon FPD: Homeowner Wildfire Hazard Awareness (Poudre Canyon FPD – 1) | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Wildfire | | | | | |
| LOCATION: Poudre Canyon | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 4 | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 08/28/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 08/31/2020 | | | | | | |
| ISSUE: Numerous properties in the district need to be better mitigated against wildfire hazards. | | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Inform home owners of best practices in mitigating properties against wildfire | | | | | | |
| ACTION: Make presentations at community meetings, include information in newsletter to property | | | | | | |
| owners, include topic in monthly newsletters to canyon association groups, one on one consultation | | | | | | |
| with property owners as requested | | | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Poudre Canyon Fire Rescue | EXPECTED COST: \$2,500 | | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Fire District budget | | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Presentations at community meetings, topic covered in newsletter to | | | | | | |
| property owners, topic included in monthly canyon association newsletter. | | | | | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



December 11, 2014

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, C0 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multijurisdictional mitigation plans, the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the
 planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant
 involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other
 information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I, Hugh Collins, commit Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 11th day of December 2014

H/L Clh.

CHIEF





Poudre Fire Authority

"To protect life and property by being prompt, skillful, and caring. Our actions are anchored in the core values of courage, leadership, and duty." — Mission, Poudre Fire Authority

Community Profile

The Poudre Fire Authority (PFA) is a Fire and Rescue service agency serving the City of Fort Collins and the Poudre Valley Fire Protection District. The PFA district service area is approximately 235 square miles and has a population of approximately 189,635 people. The PFA was established in 1981 with the merging of the City of Fort Collins and Poudre Valley Fire Departments to improve fire and rescue services.



Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.





| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING | | |
|--|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--|--|
| Fire – Wildland | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 3.5 | | |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3.2 | | |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.9 | | |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.8 | | |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.7 | | |
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.6 | | |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.4 | | |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.4 | | |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.2 | | |
| Utility Disruption | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.1 | | |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 1.6 | | |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 | | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Fire – Wildland; Flood – Flash and Riverine; Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Tornado | | | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Civil Disturbance; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Landslide / Rockslide; Utility Disruption | | | | | | | | |

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Erosion / Deposition; Earthquake

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Poudre Fire Authority, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Poudre Fire Authority.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the





county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Poudre Fire Authority's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.



Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

The Poudre Fire Authority service area consists of areas that range from low social vulnerability (the bottom 20% of the county) and high social vulnerability (the top 20% of the county). The highly socially vulnerable areas are clustered in the central part of the service area. Resources and measures to reduce the social determinates of disasters may be most effectively allocated to these areas. Moreover, it is critical that the fire authority analyze the individual social vulnerability indicators that make the central

²⁰¹ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





portion of their service area stand out. Through ongoing evaluation, the Poudre Fire Authority will be able to more effectively reduce local social vulnerability and increase their resilience to hazard events.

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there has been 1 reported wildfire events in the Poudre Fire Authority service area. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the service area, there is potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time.





²⁰² Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.





Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones in the district are located in the western region, in areas where there are lower population densities.



The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the western region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





²⁰³ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.



Poudre Fire Authority Service Area Wildfire Risk Index Map²⁰⁴

There are a number of areas in the western region of the Poudre Fire Authority service area that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





²⁰⁴ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk.



Poudre Fire Authority Service Area WUI Map²⁰⁵

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Poudre Fire Authority depends. There are areas of high and medium wildfire threat in the southern and western portions of the district according to the WUI Risk Index. There are no critical facilities located in areas with the *most negative* and 2 critical facilities located in areas with the 2^{nd} most negative wildfire threat total.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Poudre Fire Authority service area. The appraisal value of the 2 critical facilities within the 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$21.9 million dollars. There are 106 parcels/structures located in areas with the most negative and 203 parcels/structures located in





²⁰⁵ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.
LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

areas with the 2nd most negative wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these most and 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$95.8 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.



Poudre Fire Authority Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone²⁰⁶

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.





²⁰⁶ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Poudre Fire Authority service area that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Flood – Flash and Riverine



Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 40 reported injuries, 5 deaths, over \$190.5 million dollars in property loss, and over \$50,000 crop damage in the Poudre Fire Authority Service Area caused by flooding from 1996 to 2014. On July 28, 2007 more than 8 inches of rain fell is southwest Fort Collins. Debris blocked a culvert along Spring Creek causing a 10-15 foot wall of water to surge through a





²⁰⁷ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.

mobile home park destroying some homes and damaging others. Based on the historic occurrence of floods, the Poudre Fire Authority Service Area is extremely vulnerable to flood events at any given time.





Maximum flood extent—a key data need for disaster response and mitigation—is rarely quantified due to storm-related cloud cover and the low temporal resolution of optical sensors. While change detection approaches can circumvent these issues through the identification of inundated land and soil from post-flood imagery, their accuracy can suffer in the narrow and complex channels of increasingly developed and heterogeneous floodplains. The data depicted above is from a study that explored the utility of the Operational Land Imager (OLI) and Independent Component Analysis (ICA) for addressing these challenges in the unprecedented 2013 Flood along the Colorado Front Range, USA. The approach was able to simultaneously distinguish flood-related water and soil moisture from pre-existing water bodies and other spectrally similar classes within the narrow and braided channels of the study site.





²⁰⁸ Multi-Temporal Independent Component Analysis and Landsat 8 for Delineating Maximum Extent of the 2013 Colorado Front Range Flood

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 55 critical facilities and 5,276 parcels/structures in the Livermore Fire Protection District that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of these exposed critical facilities is over \$181.6 million dollars. The appraised value of these exposed structures is over \$9.8 billion dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Livermore Fire Protection District that for a 100-year flood event, approximately 10 critical facilities and 1,347 buildings will experience flood damage. The estimated critical facility building loss is over \$203 thousand dollars, content loss over \$509 thousand dollars, and inventory loss \$146.5 thousand dollars. The estimated building loss is over \$41.6 million dollars, content loss over \$35.1 million dollars, and inventory loss \$16.4 million dollars.







Poudre Fire Authority Service Area 1% Annual Flood Loss Estimation and Flood Depth Grid Map²⁰⁹

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Poudre Fire Authority service area provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the service area. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.





²⁰⁹ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Poudre Fire Authority service area has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Poudre Fire Authority service area is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Poudre Fire Authority service area can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes 189,635 people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Poudre Fire Authority service area including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Poudre Fire Authority.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Poudre Fire Authority service area will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the service area at least once every year.





Hazmat – Fixed and Transport

Previous Occurrences

Based on data supplied by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's (PHMSA) Incident Reports Database there have been 89 reported HAZMAT incidents within the Poudre Fire Authority service area between 1972 and 2015.

Inventory Exposed

We can't accurately predict when or where a HAZMAT incident may occur. Therefore, for the purpose of this plan, all existing and future buildings, facilities, and populations in the Poudre Fire Authority service area are considered to be equally exposed and couple potentially be impacted. This includes 189,635 people, or 100% of the service areas population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the service area.

When hazardous materials are being transported they are particularly vulnerability to transportation related accidents, misuse, or terrorist threats. Most hazardous materials are transported in large quantities in order to reduce costs and security is difficult to maintain around moving vehicles that cross jurisdictional boundaries. When transported close to populated areas or critical infrastructure, HAZMAT releases can have serious consequences. The inventory that is most often exposed to HAZMAT risks are railways, roadways, and fixed facilities that contain hazardous materials, and all assets that lie within a mile of the potential release areas.

I-25 runs through the Poudre Fire Authority Service area and is a designated nuclear and hazardous materials transportation route. All structures, natural resources, and people located within one mile of these transportation routes (and railways) are exposed to the impacts of a potential HAZMAT event. Structures, people, and natural resources located outside of a one mile buffer of these routes are also at risk of exposure.

Assets and people that are located within one mile of an industrial or commercial fixed site are also at risk of exposure to the impacts of a HAZMAT release.

Potential Losses

HAZMAT related events occur throughout the Poudre Fire Authority every year. The intensity and magnitude of these incidents depend on weather conditions, the location of the event, the time of day, and the process by which the materials are released. *Was is raining when the event happened? Were the hazardous materials being transported by rail when they were released or were they at a fixed facility? Did the spill happen during rush hour traffic or in the middle of the night?* All of these considerations matter when determining the risk and potential damages associated with a HAZMAT incident.

HAZMAT events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. Moreover, HAZMAT incidents can cause serious environmental contamination to non-renewable resources such as air, ground, and water sources.

Probability of Future Occurrences

As with most hazards that have limited spatial predictability or warning time, the probability of future occurrences of HAZMAT events is difficult to predict. However, as development continues to encroach into existing industrial areas and becomes more dense along high-risk designated hazardous materials





transportation routes, the risk of future occurrences becomes greater. Even if the frequency of HAZMAT spills remains the same over time, population growth will increase the probability of a disaster event.

Biological Hazards / Contagion

Biological hazards, including epidemics and pandemics, have the potential to cause serious illness and death, especially among those who have compromised immune systems due to age or underlying medical conditions. During the 2015 planning process, pandemic flu was identified as the key public health hazard in the county.

Previous Occurrences

There is no available data for historic occurrences of biological hazards specifically within the Poudre Fire Authority service area.

Inventory Exposed

Due to the regional nature of public health hazards, jurisdictions with higher numbers of socially vulnerable residents are expected to experience magnified impacts of public health hazards. This includes places with high numbers of elderly residents, young children, low income families, and homeless individuals/outdoor laborers. Future mitigation efforts related to biological hazards should focus on reaching those residents who are elderly, young children, and live in poverty or are homeless.

Potential Losses

Because there is no defined geographic boundary for public health hazards, all of the people and infrastructure within the Poudre Fire Authority service area are exposed to public health hazards. Those with elevated risk and potential loss are the homeless, infirm, elderly, young and low income families. Placing a dollar amount on the cost of a human life are beyond the scope of the Plan, annualized economic losses for the Poudre Fire Authority due to public health hazards can be best quantified in terms of number of days of work lost due to sick staff.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Based on the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment annual reportable disease summary of 2,308 Reportable Diseases within Larimer County, there is great potential for biological hazards to occur at any given time in the Poudre Fire Authority service area.

Tornado

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA, 78 injuries, 1 death, and approximately \$149 million dollars in damages have been recorded within and near the Poudre Fire Authority service area due to tornadoes. There is record of 10 tornadoes reported within the service area limits between 1954 and 2015. The most severe event occurred on May 22, 2008. This EF3 tornado traveled in a north westerly direction and reached speeds of over 165 miles per hour. This tornado event consisted of a formation of several combined tornadoes forming a wedge that was between a half and three quarters of a mile wide. The tornado caused damage to not only the Town of Windsor but also the towns of Milliken, Platteville, Gilchrest, and the City of Greeley. One person was killed at the Missile Silo Campground near Greeley. The tornado impacted area was designated a national disaster. The Rocky Mountain Insurance Information Association (RMIIA) reported that there was an estimated \$193.5 million in insured damages and approximately 24,000 auto





and homeowners claims. Tornadoes will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Poudre Fire Authority service area.





Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Poudre Fire Authority service area can be considered at risk from severe wind and tornadoes. This includes 189,635 people, or 100% of the County's population and all buildings and infrastructure within the service area.²¹¹ Most structures, including critical facilities, should be able to withstand and provide adequate protection from tornadoes. Those facilities with back-up generators should be fully equipped to handle tornado events should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Generally, tornadoes destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no

²¹¹ 2010 Census





²¹⁰ Historical tornado events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1950 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

specific, countywide loss estimation exists tornado hazards, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Reported tornadoes over the past 61 years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of frequency for such events. The probability of the Poudre Fire Authority service area experiencing a tornado associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify. Historic tornado frequencies suggest that there is a chance of this type of event occurring somewhere in within the service area boundaries each year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Poudre Fire Authority to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the Fire Authority's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the Fire Authority's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | Х | | |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | ^ |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |
| Grant Writer | | Х | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the Fire Authority's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| | NO (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Y |
| Local building codes | |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | |





| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Y |
|--|---|
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | N |
| Participates in the NFIP | N |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Poudre Fire Authority has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the organization will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|--------------------------|--|
| Poudre Fire Authority | "Annual updates and quarterly monitoring of the action items within the plan" "PFA holds monthly board meetings with the opportunity for public comment. Quarterly reports are in the board packet which covers updates of mitigation actions and priorities. These reports that cover maintenance and progress are made public and posted on the PFA website" |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Poudre Fire Authority based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|--------------------------|---|
| Poudre Fire Authority | "Items in the Hazard Mitigation plan that impact PFA will be incorporated into other plans including our strategic plan. For example: We will update our local policies and procedures to include hazard specific sections that address the highest risks within the fire service. Training and exercises that cover these hazards will also be incorporated into our training and exercise program." |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide presents the Authority's mitigation action that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Poudre Fire Authority: Training in Disaster Management Large Scale Incidents (Poudre FA – 1) | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All: Drought, Earthquake, Land | | | | |
| | Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe | | | | |
| | Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | | | | |
| LOCATION: Poudre Fire | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1,2,3 | | | | |
| Authority, Training Center | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 1/1/2016 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: B C D | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: On Going | Continual Training | | | | |
| ISSUE: Poudre Fire Authority needs to expand | d their disaster management training from fire and | | | | |
| wildland to all hazards. As an emergency res | ponse and rescue organization, expanding their scope in | | | | |
| areas other than response will increase the c | ommunity's capability to be more resilient. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Increase training and ki | nowledge in disaster management | | | | |
| ACTION: | | | | | |
| Additional training in ICS | | | | | |
| Additional training in EOC Operations | S | | | | |
| Additional training in Disaster Manage | gement Operations | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: PFA Training Division EXPECTED COST: \$2000 | | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Fort Collins OEM POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Annual Budget, EMPG | | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project is dependent on scheduling courses. All training will be captured and | | | | | |
| documented. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Poudre Fire Authority: Implementation of Capital Improvement Plans to Enhance Mitigation | | | | | |
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All | | | | |
| LOCATION: Poudre Fire Authority | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 4, and 5 | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 6/1/2015 OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives B, C, and E | | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2016 | | | | | |
| ISSUE: Recent large-scale disasters have caused Poudre Fire Authority and the City of Fort Collins to | | | | | |
| re-evaluate existing regulatory documents and programs for possible mitigation changes and actions, | | | | | |
| which has led to the development of a Capital Improvement Plan. | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Integrate the Mitigation Plan adopted by the Poudre Fire Authority into current | | | | | |
| Capital Improvement Plans to ensure that development does not encroach on known hazard areas. | | | | | |
| Partner with other organizations and agencies with similar goals to promote Building, Fire and Life | | | | | |
| Safety Codes that are more disaster resilient. | | | | | |
| ACTION: Integrate the Mitigation Plan adopted by the Poudre Fire Authority into current Capital | | | | | |

Improvement Plans to ensure that development does not encroach on known hazard areas. Partner with other organizations and agencies with similar goals to promote Building, Fire and Life Safety Codes that are more disaster resilient.

LEAD AGENCY: Poudre Fire Authority

EXPECTED COST: Project specific





LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

SUPPORT AGENCIES: City of Fort Collins, Larimer Community Development Division, Fort Collins and Larimer Offices of Emergency Management POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Staff time, Poudre Fire Authority, City of Fort Collins, grant funding

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Develop a review team to go over all regulations and codes and provide suggested changes
- Compile all recommended changes and present to the Fire Board for consideration
- Make changes as appropriate and finalize recommended actions
- Participate in the code revision process, including public meetings

| | Poudre Fire Authority | y: Critical | Infrastructure | Project |
|--|------------------------------|-------------|----------------|---------|
|--|------------------------------|-------------|----------------|---------|

| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| LOCATION: Poudre Fire Authority | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 4, and 5 |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 6/1/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives B, C, and E |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE:12/31/2016 | |

ISSUE: The Larimer Resiliency Framework and recent meetings regarding critical infrastructure have illustrated the need to ensure redundant power supplies to critical facilities in the Poudre Fire Authority and to provide for lightning mitigation measures.

RECOMMENDATION: Facilitate development and installation of uninterruptible/back up power supply for Poudre Fire Authority facilities.

ACTION: Complete the installation of uninterruptible power supply (UPS) for all Poudre Fire Authority maintained computers. The UPS system will improve the safety and communication of responders. Establish plans and begin development of the build out and installation of backup power supplies (generators) for all Poudre Fire Authority facilities. These will be installed based upon the priorities on the system, with the most critical facilities ranked the highest.

| LEAD AGENCY: Poudre Fire Authority | EXPECTED COST: \$200,000 |
|---|--|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: City of Fort Collins, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: City Resources, PFA |
| Fort Collins and Larimer Offices of | resources, grant funding |
| Emergency Management | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | |

- Through the current RRAP planning process, determine priority PFA facilities and current capabilities
- Perform a gap analysis to determine needs
- Determine available funding mechanisms for areas of greatest need
- Secure funding
- Complete the installation of UPS and generators for all PFA facilities





Letter of Intent to Participate



102 Remington Street Fort Collins, CO 80524 Phone: 970-416-2892 Fax: 970-221-6635 Internet: www.poudre-fire.org

August 14, 2014

Lori Hodges Larimer County 200 West Osk Fort Collins, CO. 80524

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Lorf Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.0, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multijurisdictional mitigation plans, the Poudre Fire Authority is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that the Poudre Fire Authority has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning offert.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, the Poudre Fire Authority agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to the Larimer County to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

The Poudre Fire Authority understands that 't must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Damonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Mult-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I, Tom Demint commit the Poudre Fire Authority to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 14th day of August.

Tom DeMint Fire Chief





Thompson Valley EMS



Thompson Valley EMS East Station Source: Thompson Valley EMS

Community Profile

The Thompson Valley EMS service covers approximately 450 square miles of southeastern Larimer County. It includes the Towns of Berthoud and Johnstown, the City of Loveland, and portions of the Windsor/Severance Fire Districts with a total estimated population of 100,000. The Thompson Valley EMS is a full service 911 ALS provider. Some of the services include providing emergency medical services, EMS education and training, EMT training, and job safety training. Thompson Valley EMS was established in 1983.







Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Tornado | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 3.2 |
| Fire – Wildland | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.1 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.1 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.9 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.8 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.8 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.8 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.3 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.3 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.1 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.1 |
| Civil Disturbance 0.6 0.3 0.2 0.4 0.2 1.7 | | | | | | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Tornado; Fire – Wildland; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Flood – Flash and Riverine; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Utility Disruption; Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Earthquake; Erosion / Deposition; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Landslide / Rockslide | | | | | | |
| Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Civil Disturbance | | | | | | |

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Thompson Valley EMS, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted





separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Thompson Valley EMS.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Thompson Valley EMS's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.



Social Vulnerability Map – Thompson Valley EMS²¹²

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

The Thompson Valley EMS service area is characterized by a mix of low to medium-high levels of social vulnerability. A closer analysis into the individual social vulnerability indicators within the service area will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders an even clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on the area and its resiliency. It is important that Thompson Valley EMS continue to monitor social vulnerability levels within their service area over time as demographics and economic conditions change.

²¹² Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





Tornado

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA, no injuries, no deaths, and between \$5,100 and \$50,000 in loss have been recorded within the Thompson Valley EMS service area due to tornadoes. There is record of 7 tornadoes reported within the service area between 1954 and 2015. Tornadoes will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Thompson Valley EMS service area.



Inventory Exposed

All assets located in Thompson Valley EMS service area can be considered at risk from severe wind and tornadoes. This includes approximately 100,000 people, or 100% of the population and all buildings and infrastructure within the service area.²¹⁴ Most structures, including critical facilities, should be able to

²¹⁴ 2010 Census





²¹³ Historical tornado events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1950 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

withstand and provide adequate protection from tornadoes. Those facilities with back-up generators should be fully equipped to handle tornado events should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Generally, tornadoes destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists tornado hazards, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Reported tornadoes over the past 61 years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of frequency for such events. The probability of the Thompson Valley EMS service area experiencing a tornado associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify. Historic tornado frequencies suggest that there is a chance of this type of event occurring somewhere in within the service area boundaries each year.





Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 169 reported wildfire events in the Thompson Valley EMS service area. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on service area, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time.



Thompson Valley EMS Service Area Historical Federal Wildfire Map²¹⁵

Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones in the district are located in the western region, in areas where there are lower population densities.

²¹⁵ Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.







Thompson Valley EMS Service Area Wildfire Hazard Zone Map²¹⁶

The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the western and central region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





²¹⁶ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.



Thompson Valley EMS Service Area Wildfire Risk Index Map²¹⁷

There are a number of areas in the central and western regions of the service area that are within the medium to highest level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is medium to high in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





²¹⁷ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk. All risk rankings are present in Larimer County.





Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Thompson Valley EMS depends. There are areas of high and medium wildfire threat in the central portion of the district according to the WUI Risk Index. There are no critical facilities located in areas with the *most negative* and 1 critical facility located in an area with the *2nd most negative* wildfire threat total.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Thompson Valley EMS service area. The appraisal value of the





²¹⁸ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.

LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

critical facility within the 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$58 thousand dollars. There are 400 parcels/structures located in areas with the most negative and 601 parcels/structures located in areas with the 2nd most negative wildfire threat total. The appraisal value of the parcels/structures within these most and 2nd most negative threat areas is over \$190.2 million dollars. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.

Thompson Valley EMS Service Area Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone²¹⁹



Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of





²¹⁹ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Thompson Valley EMS service area that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported deaths and 1 injuries in the Thompson Valley EMS service area due to hail. There have been 114 hail events reported in the Thompson Valley EMS service area between 1955 and 2014. Of the 114 incidents, 5 reported losses totaling \$21 thousand dollars. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the service area, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.







Historical Hail Events in Thompson Valley EMS²²⁰

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 7 injuries and 2 deaths in Thompson Valley EMS service area due to thunderstorm wind. There have been 30 thunderstorm wind events reported in Thompson Valley EMS service area between 1955 and 2014. Of the 30 incidents, 4 reported property losses totaling \$76,000 and no crop losses. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the area, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 11 lightning events in Thompson Valley EMS service area between 1996 and 2014. There have been 12 reported injuries, 2 deaths, \$104,000 worth of property damage, and \$10,000 worth of crop damage. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the area, there is a great potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 47 Windstorm events in Thompson Valley EMS between 1996 and 2014. There have been 15 reported injuries, 2 deaths, and \$16 thousand dollars in damage. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the area, there is a great potential for high wind events to occur at any given time.





²²⁰ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf



Historical High Wind Events in Thompson Valley EMS Service Area²²¹

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Thompson Valley EMS service area can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the service areas critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages





²²¹ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Thompson Valley EMS service area including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Thompson Valley EMS service area. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Thompson Valley EMS service area will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Thompson Valley EMS service area at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Thompson Valley EMS service area experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 47 severe wind events since 1996, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.







Flood – Flash and Riverine

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported injuries, over \$109 million dollars in property loss, and approximately \$1000 thousand dollars in crop damage in the Thompson Valley EMS service area caused by flooding. On September 12, 2013 there were two reported deaths caused by flooding. From September 12-16, 2013 nearly 6-18 inches of rain fell across Colorado's front range and I-25 corridor. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the service area, there is a great potential for flooding events to occur at any given time.





²²² This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.



Thompson Valley EMS Service Area 2013 Flood Extent²²³

Maximum flood extent—a key data need for disaster response and mitigation—is rarely quantified due to storm-related cloud cover and the low temporal resolution of optical sensors. While change detection approaches can circumvent these issues through the identification of inundated land and soil from post-flood imagery, their accuracy can suffer in the narrow and complex channels of increasingly developed and heterogeneous floodplains. The data depicted above is from a study that explored the utility of the Operational Land Imager (OLI) and Independent Component Analysis (ICA) for addressing these challenges in the unprecedented 2013 Flood along the Colorado Front Range, USA. The approach was able to simultaneously distinguish flood-related water and soil moisture from pre-existing water bodies and other spectrally similar classes within the narrow and braided channels of the study site.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."





²²³ Multi-Temporal Independent Component Analysis and Landsat 8 for Delineating Maximum Extent of the 2013 Colorado Front Range Flood

LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 10 critical facilities and 1,630 parcels/structures in the Thompson Valley EMS service area that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of these exposed critical facilities is over \$19.6 million dollars. The appraised value of these exposed structures is over \$309.7 million dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Livermore Fire Protection District that for a 100-year flood event, approximately 3 critical facilities and 242 buildings will experience flood damage. The estimated critical facility building loss is over \$147 thousand dollars, content loss over \$786 thousand dollars, and inventory loss of over \$50 thousand dollars. The estimated building loss is over \$6.3 million dollars, content loss over \$6.6 million dollars, and inventory loss of over \$3 million dollars.



Thompson Valley EMS Service Area 1% Annual Flood Loss Estimation and Flood Depth Grid Map²²⁴





²²⁴ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses,

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Thompson Valley EMS service area provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the service area. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Hazmat - Fixed and Transport

Previous Occurrences

Based on data supplied by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's (PHMSA) Incident Reports Database there have been 102 reported HAZMAT incidents within the Thompson Valley EMS service area between 1972 and 2015.

Inventory Exposed

We can't accurately predict when or where a HAZMAT incident may occur. Therefore, for the purpose of this plan, all existing and future buildings, facilities, and populations in the Thompson Valley EMS service area are considered to be equally exposed and couple potentially be impacted. This includes approximately 100,000 people, or 100% of the service area's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the service area.

When hazardous materials are being transported they are particularly vulnerability to transportation related accidents, misuse, or terrorist threats. Most hazardous materials are transported in large quantities in order to reduce costs and security is difficult to maintain around moving vehicles that cross jurisdictional boundaries. When transported close to populated areas or critical infrastructure, HAZMAT releases can have serious consequences. The inventory that is most often exposed to HAZMAT risks are railways, roadways, and fixed facilities that contain hazardous materials, and all assets that lie within a mile of the potential release areas.

I-25, US Hwy 34, and State Hwy 14 runs through the Thompson Valley EMS service area and is a designated nuclear and hazardous materials transportation route. All structures, natural resources, and people located within one mile of these transportation routes (and railways) are exposed to the impacts of a potential HAZMAT event. Structures, people, and natural resources located outside of a one mile buffer of these routes are also at risk of exposure.

Assets and people that are located within one mile of an industrial or commercial fixed site are also at risk of exposure to the impacts of a HAZMAT release.

Potential Losses

HAZMAT related events occur throughout the Thompson Valley EMS every year. The intensity and magnitude of these incidents depend on weather conditions, the location of the event, the time of day,

and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.





LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

and the process by which the materials are released. *Was is raining when the event happened? Were the hazardous materials being transported by rail when they were released or were they at a fixed facility? Did the spill happen during rush hour traffic or in the middle of the night?* All of these considerations matter when determining the risk and potential damages associated with a HAZMAT incident.

HAZMAT events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. Moreover, HAZMAT incidents can cause serious environmental contamination to non-renewable resources such as air, ground, and water sources.

Probability of Future Occurrences

As with most hazards that have limited spatial predictability or warning time, the probability of future occurrences of HAZMAT events is difficult to predict. However, as development continues to encroach into existing industrial areas and becomes more dense along high-risk designated hazardous materials transportation routes, the risk of future occurrences becomes greater. Even if the frequency of HAZMAT spills remains the same over time, population growth will increase the probability of a disaster event.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Thompson Valley EMS does not currently track incidences of utility disruption.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in Thompson Valley EMS service area are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes approximately 100,000 people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.

Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Thompson Valley EMS service area.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Thompson Valley EMS has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Thompson Valley EMS is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.





Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Thompson Valley EMS can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the Community's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the community. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the Community's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Thompson Valley EMS including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Thompson Valley EMS.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Thompson Valley EMS service area will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the service area at least once every year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of Thompson Valley EMS to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the organization's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines Thompson Valley EMS' capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | Х | | |





LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

| Floodplain | X | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Administrator | | |
| Community Planner | Х | |
| GIS Specialist | X | |
| Grant Writer | | Х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines Thompson Valley EMS' current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Y |
| Local building codes Y | |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan Y | |
| A Capital Improvements Plan Y | |
| A Stormwater Plan Y | |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) Y | |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) Y | |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan Y | |
| Participates in the NFIP | N |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

Thompson Valley EMS has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the organization will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|------------------------|---|
| | <i>"Our mitigation actions will be added to the capital budget each year and evaluated annually."</i> |
| Thompson Valley EMS | |
| | <i>"Through our accreditation process, mitigation actions will be listed as a line item for public review."</i> |





Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by Thompson Valley EMS based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|------------------------|---|
| Thompson Valley EMS | "We will integrate the plan into our annual SWOT analysis." |




Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide presents the organization's mitigation action that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Thompson Valley EMS: Wildfire Mitigation Pr | oject | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Wildfire | |
| LOCATION: Thompson Valley EMS | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 4, and 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 6/1/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives B, C, and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE:12/31/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: The Larimer Resiliency Framework and | I recent meetings regarding critical infrastructure have | |
| illustrated the need to ensure the functionali | ty of all critical systems during and after disaster. | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Mitigate against wildfire | e at all Thompson Valley EMS facilities. | |
| ACTION: Create defensible space around all d | istrict-owned facilities and infrastructure, including | |
| creating buffer zones, replacing flammable ve | egetation with less flammable species and creating | |
| defensible space around power lines, oil and | gas lines, and other infrastructure systems. | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Thompson Valley EMS | EXPECTED COST: \$200,000 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Loveland and Larimer | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: City Resources, | |
| Offices of Emergency Management | Thompson Valley EMS resources, grant funding | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| - Creating buffers around residential and non-residential structures through the removal or | | |
| reduction of flammable vegetation, including vertical clearance of tree branches. | | |
| - Replacing flammable vegetation with less flammable species. | | |
| - Creating defensible zones around power lines, oil and gas lines, and other infrastructure systems. | | |
| - Assess construction materials of roof coverings, attic vents, and gutters and replace deficient | | |
| materials with ignition-resistant construction standards | | |
| Dratest propage tanks and other external fuel courses | | |

| - | Protect propane | tanks and | other | external | fuel sources |
|---|-----------------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------|
|---|-----------------|-----------|-------|----------|--------------|

| Thompson Valley EMS: Emergency Generators (Thompson Valley EMS –1) | | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: Low-medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Emergency generators in all | |
| | EMS stations | |
| LOCATION: All TVEMS stations in Loveland | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1. Protect people, property and | |
| and Berthoud | natural resources | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/30/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C. Incorporate risk reduction | |
| | principles into policy documents and initiatives; other | |
| | institutional plans | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2022 | | |

TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2022

ISSUE: In the event of a large scale power outage that effects the power at an EMS station, an emergency generator would allow for the garage door openers to operate thus allowing the crew to be able to respond to emergency calls.

RECOMMENDATION: Budget and equip at least one EMS station with an emergency generator per year.





ACTION: Budgeting of one emergency generator and partner with contractor who is licensed to install generator. Conduct monthly inspection and testing of generators to assure their capability.

| LEAD AGENCY: Thompson Valley EMS | EXPECTED COST: \$500,000-\$1,000,000 |
|----------------------------------|--|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: General operating |
| | funds and/or potential grants. |

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Determine generator needs at each location
- Budget for one generator at a time
- Partner with a contractor who is licensed to install the generator
- Conduct monthly inspections and testing of the generator
- Repeat process with the next until every station has a generator

| Thompson Valley EMS: Mitigation Assessment (Thompson Valley EMS – 2) | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All | |
| LOCATION: All TVEMS stations in Loveland | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1. Protect people, property and | |
| and Berthoud | natural resources | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/30/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C. Incorporate risk reduction | |
| | principles into policy documents and initiatives; other | |
| | institutional plans | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2018 | | |
| ISSUE: Thompson Valley EMS covers a large portion of southern Larimer County. Many of the highest | | |
| natural hazards exist in this area, including flooding along the Little Thompson River and WUI areas. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: A determination of mitigation actions to protect Thompson EMS assets is | | |
| needed. | | |
| ACTION: Conduct a mitigation assessment of Thompson Valley EMS infrastructure and Assets to | | |
| determine key protection and mitigation actions. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Thompson Valley EMS EXPECTED COST: \$0 | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: General operating | |
| | funds and/or potential grants. | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Conduct an asset and infrastructure inventory to determine critical infrastructure in the | | |

- Conduct an asset and infrastructure inventory to determine critical infrastructure in the district
- Assess each area for hazard vulnerability and risk
- Determine key mitigation actions for each areas in the future





Letter of Intent to Participate



4480 Clydesda e Parkway Loveland, CO 80538 970-663-6025

July 30, 2015

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re: 'Statement of Intent to Participate' as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Mult-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Houges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements under 44 CFR §201.6 which specifically identify priteria that allow for multijurisdictional mitigation plans, tha Thompson Valley Health Services District DBA Thompson Valley Emergency Medical Services (TVEMS) is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that (TVEMS) has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the miligation planning (TVEMS) agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County OEM to comprete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements

(TVEMS) understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, out not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant)





Town of Timnath

Twenty-five years from now, the Town of Timnath will be:

- A well-planned and branded community that provides full services and amenities to its residents.
- An integrated and safe community with multiple physical connections and mobility options.
- Self-sustaining with a stable balance of commercial and residential growth.
- Artfully reflective of Town's history, ambience, and historical agrarian uses.
- Well-managed with intelligent use of financial resources.
- Pro-business with meaningful primary employment opportunities for the residents.
- Connected with an integrated system of parks, trails, open space and natural protected areas.
- An influential player among the regional partnerships in Northern Colorado.
- A destination community that is clean, green, and serene.

-- Town of Timnath Vision Statement

Community Profile

The Town of Timnath is located east of Interstate 25 and the cities of Fort Collins and Loveland, and northwest of Windsor. Timnath is also within short travel distance to Denver, just 56 miles to the south, and Cheyenne, 46 miles to the north. The proximity of Timnath to 1-25, makes it a prime location for development. Fort Collins and Windsor presently provide the majority of employment, service, and retail opportunities to the town and its residents.

The incorporated area of Timnath currently consists of over 3,200 acres of land. The town's Growth Management Area encompasses over 13,600 acres or 21.4 square miles. Residential development is predominantly concentrated in the eastern portion of the town both north and south of Harmony Road in the Harmony and Timnath Ranch subdivisions, north of downtown in the Serratoga Falls subdivision, and in the downtown area along Main Street between County Road 38 and County Road 40. New development is also occurring in the Wild Wing subdivision located north of Harmony west of County Line Road. Larger lot single-family residential development has occurred on agricultural lands both in the Town and in unincorporated Larimer County, a trend that is expected to continue as the town grows. Commercial activity is centered primarily within the downtown area along Main Street, and at the Interstate 25 and Harmony Road interchange. New commercial development has been approved along Harmony Road just east of the Cache la Poudre River.







The following table summarizes key demographic and development related characteristics of the Town of Timnath.

| Town of Timnath Statistics | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------|
| | Town of Timnath | Colorado |
| Population, 2010 | 625 | 5,029,196 |
| 2000-2010 Population Change, % | 64% | 14.5% |
| % Population under 5 years, 2010 | 11.4% | 6.8% |
| % Population under 19 years, 2010 | 34.3% | 20.3 |
| % Population 65 years and over, 2010 | 7.3% | 10.9% |
| Language other than English spoken at home, % age 5+, 2009-2013 | 2.1% | 15.9% |
| Homeownership Rate 2010 | 86.4% | 65.5% |
| Persons Per Household 2010 | 2.92 | 2.57 |
| Persons below poverty level, %, 2013 | 1.5% | 13.2% |
| Median Household Income, 2013 | \$113,144 | \$58,433 |





Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.9 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.7 |
| Tornado | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 2.7 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.1 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.9 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.9 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Tornado | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Flood – Flash and Riverine | | | | | | |
| Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Utility Disruption; Civil Disturbance; Earthquake; Landslide / Rockslide; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Erosion / Deposition | | | | | | |

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Town of Timnath, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted





separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Town of Timnath.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Town of Timnath's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.



Social Vulnerability Map – Town of Timnath²²⁵

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

Timnath is characterized by medium-low levels of social vulnerability. This does not mean, however, that there aren't any socially vulnerable residents living in the community or that social vulnerability levels will

²²⁵ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





remain the same over time. Close analysis of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the community will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors threaten the community the most and where social and economic resources should be allocated in order to reduce vulnerability. Over time, the town should continue to monitor their local social vulnerability as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Town of Timnath has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Town of Timnath is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Timnath can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes 625 people, or 100% of the Town's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the town. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the Town's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Town of Timnath including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of Timnath.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Town of Timnath will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the town at least once every year.





Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries, deaths, or damages in the Town of Timnath due to hail. There have been 5 hail events reported in the town between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the town, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.



Historical Hail Events in the Town of Timnath²²⁶

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no injuries, deaths, or damages in the Town of Timnath due to thunderstorm wind. There has been 1 thunderstorm wind event reported in the town between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the town, there is potential for Thunderstorm Wind events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no lightning events in the Town of Timnath between 1996 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there has been 1 Windstorm events in the Town of Timnath between 1996 and 2014. There have been no reported injuries, deaths, or damages. Based on the historic

²²⁶ NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





data showing hazardous impacts on the town, there is potential for high wind events to occur at any given time.



Historical High Wind Events in the Town of Timnath²²⁷

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Timnath can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes 625 people, or 100% of the Town's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the Town's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption

²²⁷ NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Town of Timnath including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of Timnath. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Town of Timnath will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Town of Timnath at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Town of Timnath experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 1 severe wind events since 1996, there is a chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Tornado

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA, 78 injuries, 1 death, and \$147 million in damages have been recorded within and near the Town of Timnath due to tornadoes. There is record of 2 tornadoes reported within the town limits





between 1954 and 2015. The most severe event occurred on May 22, 2008. This EF3 tornado traveled in a north westerly direction and reached speeds of over 165 miles per hour. This tornado event consisted of a formation of several combined tornadoes forming a wedge that was between a half and three quarters of a mile wide. The tornado caused damage to not only the Town of Windsor but also the towns of Milliken, Platteville, Gilchrest, and the City of Greeley. One person was killed at the Missile Silo Campground near Greeley. The tornado impacted area was designated a national disaster. The Rocky Mountain Insurance Information Association (RMIIA) reported that there was an estimated \$193.5 million in insured damages and approximately 24,000 auto and homeowners claims. Tornadoes will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of Timnath.



Town of Timnath Area Historic Tornadoes²²⁸

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Timnath can be considered at risk from severe wind and tornadoes. This includes 625 people, or 100% of the Town's population and all buildings and infrastructure within the





²²⁸ Historical tornado events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1950 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

County.²²⁹ Most structures, including the Town's critical facilities, should be able to withstand and provide adequate protection from tornadoes. Those facilities with back-up generators should be fully equipped to handle tornado events should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Generally, tornadoes destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists tornado hazards, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Reported tornadoes over the past 61 years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of frequency for such events. The probability of the Town of Timnath experiencing a tornado associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify. Historic tornado frequencies suggest that there is a chance of this type of event occurring somewhere in within the town boundaries each year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Town of Timnath to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the Town's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the town's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | Х | |
| Floodplain | | v | |
| Administrator | | ^ | |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | | Х | |
| Grant Writer | | | Х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans,





²²⁹ 2010 Census

stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the town's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Y |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Ν |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Ν |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Ν |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance. In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and codes. The Town of Timnath has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Town of Timnath has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the town will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy | | |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Town of Timnath | "We will schedule annual review by staff and adoption by the Town Council" | | |
| | <i>"We have a robust website and will post comment pages, surveys and the plan on the site."</i> | | |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Town of Timnath based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.





| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|-----------------|--|
| Town of Timnath | "Upon the update of our comprehensive plan, we will include discussion of hazard mitigation as well as any recommended action items such as necessary amendments to our zoning or building codes." |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide presents the town's mitigation action that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Town of Timnath: Full Adoption of Updated F | EMA Floodplains | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | |
| LOCATION: Town of Timnath | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/18/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives A, B, C, D and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2020 | | |
| ISSUE: Floodplain mapping is out of date and | the 2013 Flood caused extensive changes to current | |
| floodplains | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Work with FEMA on up | dating current floodplain mapping in coordination with | |
| Larimer County | | |
| ACTION: By 2020, the Cache la Poudre River t | hrough Timnath will be mapped and adopted by FEMA | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Timnath Planning EXPECTED COST: \$300,000 | | |
| Department | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Colorado State Flood | |
| Community Development and Office of Hazard Mapping Project | | |
| Emergency Management | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Floodplain maps updated | | |
| Review and Comment Period / Public Review Process | | |
| – Community Outreach | | |
| Follow the County process for zoning changes per county policy (Flood Review Board, Dispersive Country process for zoning changes per county policy (Flood Review Board, | | |
| Planning Commission, BCC, etc.) | | |

| Town of Timnath: Community Outreach Project (Timnath – 1) | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Extreme Temperatures, Severation Severati | | | |
| | Storm, Hazmat | | |
| LOCATION: Town of Timnath | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1,4 | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/23/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 9/1/2016 | | | |
| ISSUE: We are a very small but rapidly growing community. We have recently updated our website | | | |
| and other social media, but need to do more public outreach, specifically related to public awareness | | | |

and preparedness around risk and hazards that affect our community.

RECOMMENDATION: Create a public outreach program for the Town of Timnath

ACTION: We will use existing educational materials as well as develop materials specific to the Town of Timnath to increase hazard and risk preparedness, response to educate our citizens.

LEAD AGENCY: Town Manager's Office

EXPECTED COST: \$5,000





| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County OEM, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Town general fund. |
|--|---|
| Poudre Fire Authority/City of Fort Collins | |
| OEM. | |
| | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

 We will have a "check in" date of 7/1/2016 to assess the materials and distribution methodology.

| Town of Timnath: Mitigation Assessment (Timnath – 2) | | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All | |
| LOCATION: Town of Timnath | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1. Protect people, property and natural resources | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/30/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C. Incorporate risk reduction principles into policy documents and initiatives; other institutional plans | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2018 | | |

ISSUE: Timnath is currently updating all of their emergency management plans and programs. An assessment of risk has not been done before this plan. With this data, Timnath needs to conduct an assessment to determine future mitigation opportunities within the Town.

RECOMMENDATION: A determination of mitigation actions to protect the Town of Timnath is needed. ACTION: Conduct a mitigation assessment of Timnath to determine key protection and mitigation actions.

| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Timnath | EXPECTED COST: Unknown |
|------------------------------|---|
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: None | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: General operating funds and/or potential grants. |

PROGRESS MILESTONES:

- Conduct an asset and infrastructure inventory to determine critical infrastructure in the Town
- Assess each area for hazard vulnerability and risk
- Determine key mitigation actions for each area in the future





Letter of Intent to Participate



LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

November 14, 2014

Fori Hodges Larimer County 200 West Oak Fort Collins, CO. 80521

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Lori Hodges,

In accommance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.8, which specifically identify orterial that adow for multi-jurisdictional milligation plans. The Town of Timmath has agreed to participate In the Larimez County Mutti-Jurisdictional Hazard Miligation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, Town of Timneth agrees to most the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.8 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to the Ladmer County to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Town of Timnath understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's Local Mitigation Planning Handbook dated March 2013 uscuding, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document.
- The conduct of a volmerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area.
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions
 complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proceedively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning
 process by all community staksholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any
 planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on
 drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the Mrisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I Jill Grossman-Beliate commit the Town of Timnath to the Latimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plenning effort,

Executed this 14th day of November

in Karsbele

Phone: (970) 224-3211 PAC: (970) 224-3217 www.timnathgov.com 4800 Goodman & Timnath, CO 20547





Upper Thompson Sanitation District

The Upper Thompson Sanitation District is fully committed to managing the natural resources with which the District is entrusted; to provide reliable, high quality, cost effective wastewater collection and treatment services; to promote a quality of life that all citizens in the Estes valley may benefit from. Our staff strives to deliver prompt and friendly customer service, while ensuring the preservation, protection, and enhancement of our environment for future generations.
 Mission Statement, Upper Thompson Sanitation District

Community Profile

The Upper Thompson Sanitation District was formed in 1971 to provide wastewater treatment service to the areas surrounding the Town of Estes Park and to improve the water quality of the Big Thompson River. The plant and collection lines were built with Federal, State and local funding and the plant was brought on-line in 1976, providing service to areas of the Estes Valley which were previously without adequate sewage treatment. The District policies and operations are overseen by a Board of Directors elected by the voters within the District.

The Upper Thompson Sanitation District Treatment Facility (or Plant) is a Tertiary (or three stage), Advanced Treatment Facility. This facility was built to handle a flow of 1.5 Million Gallons per Day (MGD), and a peak hydraulic flow of 3.75 MGD. This corresponds to an equivalent population of 15,000 people. Over 99% of the solids and pollutants in the wastewater are removed and disposed of. In the fall of 2000, Phase 1 (of a 3 Phase expansion) was completed, raising the plant capacity to 2.0 MGD by adding a new secondary clarifier.







Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.9 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.8 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.7 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.4 |
| Utility Disruption | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.4 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.3 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 2.3 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.9 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.5 |
| Tornado | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 1.2 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.1 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Flood – Flash and Riverine; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Fire – Wildland; Utility Disruption; Erosion / Deposition; Landslide / Rockslide | | | | | | |
| Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Earthquake; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Biological Hazards / | | | | | | |

Contagion; Tornado; Civil Disturbance

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Upper Thompson Sanitation District, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis





was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the district.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Town of Berthoud's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the district.



Social Vulnerability Map – Upper Thompson Sanitation District²³⁰

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

²³⁰ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





The Upper Thompson Sanitation District is characterized by a mix of medium-low to low levels of social vulnerability. A deeper-dive into the individual social vulnerability indicators in and around the district's boundaries will give local staff a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors have the largest negative effect on the community and its resiliency. It is important that the district continue to monitor social vulnerability levels over time as demographics and economics change in the area.

Flood – Flash and Riverine





Previous Occurrences

Estes Park sustained severe damages during the September 2013 Colorado flood event. Evacuations began on September 12, 2013, at approximately 3:00AM and 2,428 contacts were made to warn and evacuate neighborhoods through the LETA911 emergency notification system. The information below was provided by the Town of Estes Park and provides a snapshot of just home many residents were impacted by the flood.





²³¹ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.

| | 606 people signed in |
|----------------------------|--|
| Red Cross Shelter Support: | 167 people sheltered in the cents |
| | 316 people outsourced to local hotels for varying amounts of time |
| | 3571 meals were served |
| Salvation Army Support: | 7000 snacks/drinks were served |
| | 9000 gallons of water distributed |
| | Estimated \$35-40 million in public infrastructure damage in the Estes |
| | Valley |
| Utilities Outages and | 3.25 miles of Fish Creek Road are destroyed or damaged |
| Restoration | Caused outages for electric, water, gas, cable and phones |
| | Approximately 4,000 sewer taps were non-functional under "No Flush" |
| | orders within the Upper Thompson Sanitation District. |
| | Rapid assessments completed for approximately 3,000 structures in the |
| | Estes Valley this week. Approximately 12 red tags were issued for |
| Structural Damago | properties that were determined to be unsafe for occupancy due to |
| Accossments | structural damage or electrical safety. |
| (incorporated Estes Park) | 2,383 estimated residences affected by water, mud, sewer access, road |
| | access |
| | 183 estimated businesses affected by water, mud, sewer access, road |
| | access |







Upper Thompson Sanitation District Fall River 2013 Flood Extent²³²





²³² Based on high water marks collected by the Town of Estes Park.



Upper Thompson Sanitation District Fish Creek 2013 Flood Extent²³³

In addition to the September 2013 flood two additional floods were reported according to the NOAA's Storm Events Database. On August 2, 2007 a flash flood occurred resulting in \$20,000 in property damage. Another flash flood occurred on July 18, 2013 resulting in \$10,000 in property damage and \$5,000 in crop damage. There were no reported injuries or deaths from these two floods.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 3 critical facilities and 383 parcels/structures in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of these exposed critical facilities is over \$1.3 million dollars. The appraised value of these exposed structures is over \$123.9 million dollars.





²³³ Based on high water marks collected by the Town of Estes Park.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Upper Thompson Sanitation District that for a 100-year flood event, no critical facilities and approximately 56 buildings will experience flood damage. The estimated building loss is over \$1.4 million dollars, content loss over \$1 million dollars, and inventory loss \$14 thousand dollars.

Upper Thompson Sanitation District 1% Annual Flood Loss Estimation and Flood Depth Grid Map²³⁴



Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.





²³⁴ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses,

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the district. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries, deaths, or damages in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District due to hail. There have been 4 hail events reported in the district between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.





and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.





According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there is no historic data for thunderstorm wind events in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is a great potential for thunderstorm wind events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 9 lightning events in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District between 1996 and 2014. There have been 27 reported injuries, 4 deaths, \$5,000 worth of property damage, and no reported crop damage. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.





²³⁵ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no Windstorm events in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District between 1996 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the surrounding areas, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.



Historical High Wind Events in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District²³⁶

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:





²³⁶ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Upper Thompson Sanitation District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Upper Thompson Sanitation District. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Upper Thompson Sanitation District will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Upper Thompson Sanitation District experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of severe wind events in Larimer County, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.





Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Upper Thompson Sanitation District has experienced 264 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Western Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Upper Thompson Sanitation District is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Upper Thompson Sanitation District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Upper Thompson Sanitation District.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Upper Thompson Sanitation District will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the District at least once every year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Upper Thompson Sanitation District to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the district's hazard mitigation program.





<u>Local Personnel</u>

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the district's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | Х | |
| Floodplain | v | | |
| Administrator | ^ | | |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |
| Grant Writer | | X | |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the district's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Y |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Ν |
| Participates in the NFIP | N |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Upper Thompson Sanitation District has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the district will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|---------------------|--|
| Upper Thompson | "District staff will actively monitor and manage the plan, with Board of Directors |
| Sanitation District | review at least quarterly." |





"Status updates and changes to the plan will be posted on District social media outlets/website - and will be topics of public discussion."

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Upper Thompson Sanitation District based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Upper Thompson Sanitation District | "We will integrate mitigation actions into our Capital Improvement Plan." |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present the district's mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

Upper Thompson Sanitation District: District and Inter-Jurisdictional Communications Improvement (Upper Thompson SD – 1)

| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Earthquake, Land Subsidence, |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| | Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Wind & |
| | Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat |
| LOCATION: Estes Valley | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 5. |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 09/01/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: B, D, E. |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2016 – On | |
| Going | |

ISSUE: The September 2013 flooding exposed a serious weakness in the District staff's ability to communicate with each other and other organizations in times of major disaster. While email, land lines, and cell phones are normally operating, these resources were all temporarily unusable during the flood disaster. This required, for safety reasons, staff to physically report to the District office every two hours to report and communicate field conditions during the event. This was in itself unsafe as road conditions in the entire Estes Valley were unknown and constantly changing. This also had a negative impact on the staff's ability to assess, and react to, damages in the field. Improvements to District communications, as well as inter-jurisdictional communications, must be made to improve efficiency in the field during disaster events both large and small. RECOMMENDATION: Purchase of handheld radios for use by field, administrative, and treatment plant personnel, with possible future purchase of vehicle mounted radio units. Establish open lines of communication, utilizing this method, with other Estes Valley organizations and agencies.





ACTION: The District will apply for inclusion in the Consolidated Communications Network of Colorado (CCNC). The location of existing repeaters on this network, located on Prospect Mountain in Estes Park, are optimal for radio reception within District boundaries. Reception within these boundaries would be insufficient if the District were to utilize radio repeaters independently, with no real "line of sight" applications possible on the District's property.

If the application for participation is accepted, the District will purchase network compatible units and coordinate with governing agencies and committees to ensure all parameters and required training are met.

| LEAD AGENCY: Upper Thompson Sanitation | EXPECTED COST: Approximately \$15,000 |
|--|---|
| District | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Town of Estes Park | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Annual Upper |
| | Thompson Sanitation District Budget. Safety Grant |
| | funding (matching). |
| | The District |
| | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Starting application process for inclusion in the CCNC.

| Upper Thompson Sanitation District: FLCS Force Main Evaluation and Rehabilitation | | |
|---|---|--|
| (Upper Thompson SD – 2) | | |
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Land Subsidence, Extreme | |
| | Temperatures, Flood, Severe Storm, Public Health, and | |
| | Utility Disruption. | |
| LOCATION: CO HWY 36 and Fish Creek | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 5. | |
| Road extending northeast into Mall Road. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 07/21/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: B, C, D, E. | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2016 | | |

ISSUE: The Fish Creek Lift Station's existing 14 inch CIP force main was constructed in the early 1970s. This aging force main is the only lifeline for sanitary sewer flow received in the lift station to be properly conveyed through the system and ultimately reach the treatment plant. The topography of land surrounding the lift station, as well as the entire route of the force main, is such that an overflow of sanitary sewer resulting from a possible catastrophic system failure would certainly reach Colorado State receiving waters. This type of event would seriously threaten public and lake/stream health to not only the immediate area and residing aquatic life, but also to any public downstream users within the Big Thompson Watershed. Many types of natural disasters and events would greatly increase these risks, being a possible catalyst to an event.

Mitigation efforts would be a proactive measure to reduce the threat to public health and receiving waters.

RECOMMENDATION: Clean and inspect existing force main. Construct a parallel force main for redundancy and reduction in risks associated with a catastrophic failure of critical infrastructure. ACTION: The first step in this project would be inspection and evaluation of the existing 14 inch cast iron force main. This includes bypassing and hauling live flow from the lift station to isolate the existing force main, setup and implementation of pigging/cleaning of the force main, and finally inspection of the force main.





The existing force main would be left in place and a parallel force main would be constructed from the lift station, continuing northeast to the intersection of Colorado Highway 36 and Mall Road, then across HWY 36, connecting to existing District gravity manhole approximately 300 feet north of HWY 36/Mall Road intersection.

Would acquire all pertinent permits to complete the project.

| LEAD AGENCY: Upper Thompson Sanitation | EXPECTED COST: \$1,250,000 |
|--|--|
| District | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Project currently |
| | planned in Capital Improvement Plan for 2016 and |
| | 2017. Possible Grants, State and Federal. |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project currently in planning phase | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Project currently in planning phase.

| Upper Thompson Sanitation District: Sewer Main Cleaning and Inspection (Upper Thompson SD – 3) | | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Extreme Temperatures, Flood, | |
| | Severe Storm, Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: District Wide | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: On Going | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: B, C, D, E. | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: On Going | | |

ISSUE: The most common threat to the District's sanitary sewer system are sanitary sewer overflows resulting from a blockage in the pipe. Blockages can be caused by many things including tree root intrusion, grease build-up, grit/debris, and broken or collapsed pipe. Sanitary sewer overflows always have the potential to reach surface water, storm sewer systems, and State receiving waters, posing a threat to public health and stream health.

A large portion of the District's system is located in "off road" and "back yard" easements. Access to sewer lines and manholes is often blocked by trees, fences, structures, and other landscaping. The ability to gain entry to these system components is crucial to both preventive maintenance, as well as emergency response.

RECOMMENDATION: Routine cleaning and CCTV inspection of the District's sanitary sewer lines and manholes.

Maintain, and keep current, relations with mutual aid organizations and contractors. Continue repairing and rehabilitating system components.

ACTION: Known problem areas will be cleaned and inspected at least once a year. The rest of the District's system will continue to be routinely cleaned and inspected with the goal of completing these tasks on at least 10 percent of the District's system yearly. During this maintenance cycle, identified problem areas will be noted and incorporated into the District's capital improvement plan for repair or rehabilitation to reduce the risk of a sanitary sewer overflow or loss of proper utility function due to natural and man-made disasters.

Continue to evaluate, mitigate, and reinforce system components located within the floodplain, next to rivers, and in drainage areas.

Continue to assess and enforce District easements and access; keeping these easements clear of obstructions, ensuring staff and equipment can gain entry to manholes and sewer lines in the event of an emergency or for routine maintenance. Continue public outreach efforts to increase awareness and stress the importance of access of these critical locations.





Continue cooperative efforts with other agencies and organizations overseeing new development.Ensuring optimum placement of new sewer mains and manholes to reduce risk or damage caused by potential disasters.LEAD AGENCY: Upper Thompson Sanitation
DistrictEXPECTED COST: Tasks covered by annual District
Operations Budget.SUPPORT AGENCIES: Town of Estes Park,
Larimer County, Estes Park Sanitation
District, COWARN.POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: District's annual
budget.PROGRESS MILESTONES: On GoingFROGRESS MILESTONES: On Going




Letter of Intent to Participate



P.O. Box 568 • Estes Park, CO 80517 Ph: 970-586-4544 • Pax: 970-586-1049 www.utsd.org

July 24, 2015

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (IJMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazari Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteriathat allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans, the Upper Thompson Sanitation District is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that Upper Thompson Sanitation District has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, Upper Thompson Sanitation District agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Upper Thompson Sanitation District understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);

Environmental Protection Through Wastewater Collection and Treatment





Town of Wellington

"The citizens of Wellington choose to deal with the issue of growth proactively in order to maintain the quality of life in the community. Over the past fifteen years, the Town has witnessed a significant amount of residential growth. Wellington residents want to continue to investigate the development of innovative land uses that provide a sound tax base, preserve the quality of life, and balance residential and commercial development.

Citizens want to ensure that new development does not overburden existing infrastructure and services and does not detract from the community's existing character. The valued aspects of the Town's character include: friendly and accessible downtown, seeing familiar faces around town, a safe and relaxed environment, and diverse community programs and activities."

- Community Vision Statement, Town of Wellington Comprehensive Plan, 2014

Community Profile

Wellington, also referred to as "Colorado's Northern Gateway," is located along the northern Front Range, 11 miles north of Fort Collins and 34 miles south of Cheyenne on I-25. The town's location has long made it a crossroads of those travelling both north/south from Colorado to Wyoming and east/west from the farming and ranching communities east to Fort Collins and the Rocky Mountains.

Wellington was founded in 1905, spurred by agricultural development, the Union Pacific Railroad and the presence of the North Poudre Land & Reservoir Co. The town boomed in the early 20th century but its population did not reach 1,000 until 1980. From 2000 until 2010 the town grew rapidly from 2,672 residents to 6,289 residents. With new developments and a booming population in the early 21st century, anchor businesses downtown are beginning to thrive once again, and a community vision for a vibrant downtown commercial district along Cleveland Avenue has become a community priority







The following table summarizes key demographic and development related characteristics of the Town of Wellington.

| Town of Wellington Statistics | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|--|--|
| | Town of Wellington | Colorado | | |
| Population, 2010 | 6,289 | 5,029,196 | | |
| 2000-2010 Population Change, % | 58% | 14.5% | | |
| % Population under 5 years, 2010 | 10.6% | 6.8% | | |
| % Population under 19 years, 2010 | 33.7% | 20.3 | | |
| % Population 65 years and over, 2010 | 2.4% | 10.9% | | |
| Language other than English spoken at home, % age 5+, 2009-2013 | 3.6% | 15.9% | | |
| Homeownership Rate 2010 | 80.2% | 65.5% | | |
| Persons Per Household 2010 | 2.88 | 2.57 | | |
| Persons below poverty level, %, 2013 | 9.2% | 13.2% | | |
| Median Household Income, 2013 | \$72,621 | \$58,433 | | |





Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|--|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 3.1 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.8 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.7 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.7 |
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.6 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.4 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.4 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.0 |
| Earthquake | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.0 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.5 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Fire – Wildland; Utility Disruption; Tornado | | | | | | |

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Flood – Flash and Riverine; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport Biological Hazards / Contagion; Earthquake

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Erosion / Deposition; Landslide / Rockslide; Civil Disturbance

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Town of Wellington, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted





separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Town of Wellington.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Town of Wellington's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.



Social Vulnerability Map – Town of Wellington²³⁷

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

²³⁷ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





Wellington is characterized by medium-low levels of social vulnerability. This does not mean, however, that there aren't any socially vulnerable residents living in the community or that social vulnerability levels will remain the same over time. Close analysis of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the community will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors threaten the community the most and where social and economic resources should be allocated in order to reduce vulnerability. Over time, the town should continue to monitor their local social vulnerability as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries, deaths, and \$5,000 in damages in the Town of Wellington due to hail. There have been 15 hail event reported in the Town of Wellington between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the town, there is potential for hail events to occur at any given time.



Historical Hail Events in the Town of Wellington²³⁸

²³⁸ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no injuries, deaths, or damages in the Town of Wellington due to thunderstorm wind. There have been 3 thunderstorm wind events reported in the Town of Wellington between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the town, there is a great potential for thunderstorm wind events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there has been 1 lightning event in the Town of Wellington between 1996 and 2014. There have been 9 reported injuries, no deaths, and no damages. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the town, there is a great potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 4 Windstorm events in the Town of Wellington between 1996 and 2014. There have been no reported injuries, deaths, \$or damages. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the town, there is a great potential for high wind events to occur at any given time.



Historical High Wind Events in the Town of Wellington²³⁹

²³⁹ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Wellington can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes 6,289 people, or 100% of the town's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the town's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Town of Wellington including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of Wellington. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Town of Wellington will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and





frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Town of Wellington at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Town of Wellington experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of 4 severe wind events since 1996, there is a chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Town of Wellington has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Town of Wellington is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes 6,289 people, or 100% of the Town's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the town. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the Town's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Town of Wellington including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of Wellington.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Town of Wellington will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the town at least once every year.





Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported wildfire events in the Town of Wellington. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on Larimer County, there is potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time in the Town of Wellington.

Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. There are no wildfire hazard zones identified in the district.





The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the eastern region.





²⁴⁰ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.



Town of Wellington Wildfire Risk Index Map²⁴¹

There are a number of areas in the eastern region of the town that are within the lower level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is low in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





²⁴¹ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk.



Town of Wellington WUI Map²⁴²

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Town of Wellington depends. There are no areas of *most negative* and 2nd most negative wildfire threat in the district according to the WUI Risk Index.

Potential Losses

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Town of Wellington. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.





²⁴² Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.



Town of Wellington Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone²⁴³

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Town of Wellington that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.





²⁴³ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

Tornado

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA, no injuries, deaths, or damages have been recorded within the Town of Wellington due to tornadoes. There is record of 1 tornado reported within the town limits on May 31, 1989. Tornadoes will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of LaSalle.





Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Wellington can be considered at risk from severe wind and tornadoes. This includes 6,289 people, or 100% of the Town's population and all buildings and infrastructure within the Town.²⁴⁵ Most structures, including the town's critical facilities, should be able to withstand and

²⁴⁵ 2010 Census





²⁴⁴ Historical tornado events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1950 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

provide adequate protection from tornadoes. Those facilities with back-up generators should be fully equipped to handle tornado events should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Generally, tornadoes destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists tornado hazards, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Reported tornadoes over the past 61 years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of frequency for such events. The probability of the Town of Wellington experiencing a tornado associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify. Historic tornado frequencies suggest that there is a chance of this type of event occurring somewhere in within the town boundaries each year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Town of Wellington to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the town's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the town's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | Λ |
| Community Planner | | Х | |
| GIS Specialist | | | Х |
| Grant Writer | | | Х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the town's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); No (N) |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| A zoning ordinance | Y |





| | Yes (Y); No (N) |
|--|--------------------|
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Y |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Y |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | Ν |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Ν |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Ν |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance. In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and codes. The Town of Wellington has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

The Town of Wellington has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the town will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|-----------------------|--|
| Town of Wellington | "The Town Board will review the plan annually in a work session" "We will post mitigation plan on town website and update when mitigation actions are completed" |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Town of Wellington based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|-----------------------|---|
| Town of Wellington | "We will integrate mitigation actions into our capital improvements plan" |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides present the town's mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Town of Wellington: Tornado Warning System (Wellington – 1) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Tornado | | | |
| LOCATION: Town Wide | GOALS ADDRESSED: posted on website | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 1/1/2014 | /2014 OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: posted on website | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/17 | | | | |
| ISSUE: Town of Wellington has no Tornado Warning System | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Provide Tornado Warning System | | | | |
| ACTION: Tornado Sirens or Reverse 911 type phone notification | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Wellington EXPECTED COST: TBD | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Wellington Fire POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Grants, Annual | | | | |
| District, Larimer County Sheriff Budget | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | | | |

| Town of Wellington : North Old Town Drainage Improvements (Wellington – 2) | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flood | | | |
| LOCATION: Old Town Wellington, North of | GOALS ADDRESSED: posted on website | | | |
| Cleveland | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 1/1/2014 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: posted on website | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2016 | | | | |
| ISSUE: Lack of Adequate Drainage facilities in | Old Town results in local flooding of businesses on | | | |
| Cleveland Avenue (Hwy 1). | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Construction of New Stormwater Facilities | | | | |
| ACTION: Design and Construction of Stormwater pipe and inlets, directing storm flows to Boxelder | | | | |
| Creek. | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Wellington EXPECTED COST: \$1.8 Million | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: CDOT POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Storm Drainage Fund, | | | | |
| | Grants | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Feasibility Study and Preliminary Design completed. First of two projects | | | | |
| needed to solve issue currently under final design. | | | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



TOWN OF WELLINGTON 3735 CLEVELAND AVENUE 930 LENGTON, CO 80549 TOWN BALL 0700 568-5081 VAX 0970 508-9354

LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

December 6, 2014

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans, the Town of Wellington is submitting this letter of intent to contirm that Town has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, Town of Wellington agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.8 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County CEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

The Town of Wellington understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not rimited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document.
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area,
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeno ders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan:
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).





Wellington Fire Protection District

"Essential community partners serving as a cohesive team of highly skilled, professional responders exceeding expectations with courage, confidence, and uncompromising safety." — Mission Statement, Wellington Fire Protection District

Community Profile

The Wellington Fire Protection District (WFPD) serves over 10,000 residents living throughout an area of 288 square miles in Northern Colorado. The members respond to over 500 calls per year ranging from medical emergencies to hazardous material incidents. Although we the WFPD longer relies on horse-powered fire apparatus to respond to emergencies, the department values the department's history and all the members who have served the community over the last hundred years.



Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.





| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|--|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Fire – Wildland | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 3.0 |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.9 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 2.8 |
| Utility Disruption | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.8 |
| Tornado | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.6 |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.4 |
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.4 |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.2 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.7 |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 1.5 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.5 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Fire – Wildland; Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Utility Disruption; Tornado MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Flood – Flash and Riverine; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; | | | | | | |
| Erosion / Deposition | | | | | | |

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Earthquake; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Civil Disturbance; Landslide / Rockslide

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Wellington Fire Protection District, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to the Wellington Fire Protection District.





The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Wellington Fire Protection District's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.



Social Vulnerability Map – Wellington Fire Protection District²⁴⁶

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

Wellington Fire Protection District is characterized by a mix of medium-low to low levels of social vulnerability. This does not mean, however, that there aren't any socially vulnerable residents living in the area or that social vulnerability levels will remain the same over time. Close analysis of the individual social

²⁴⁶ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





vulnerability indicators within the district will give decision makers a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors threaten the community the most and where social and economic resources should be allocated in order to reduce vulnerability. Over time, the Wellington Fire Protection District should continue to monitor local social vulnerability as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change over time.

Fire – Wildland

Previous Occurrences

According to USGS there has been 1 reported wildfire events in the Wellington Fire Protection District. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the District, there is a great potential for wildfire events to occur at any given time.



Wellington Fire Protection District Historical Federal Wildfire Map²⁴⁷

²⁴⁷ Historical wildland fire occurrence data compiled by USGS from 1980 - 2013, from BIA, BLM, BOR, USGS, FWS, and NPS.





Inventory Exposed

The following Wildfire Hazard Zone map identifies the expected wildfire behavior. The highest wildfire hazard zones in the district are located in the western region, in areas where there are lower population densities.



The following Wildfire Risk map identifies areas with the greatest potential impacts from a wildfire, in other words, those areas most at risk. The highest wildfire risk areas in the district are located in the southwestern and northern region, in areas where there are lower population densities.





²⁴⁸ To be used to identify wildfire hazards within the Wildfire Mitigation Area. The hazards are determined based on vegetation cover type, habitat structure stage (cover type, tree size and crown cover percentage), southern facing aspects and 30% and greater slopes according to the Wildfire Hazard Area Mapping (WHAM) guidelines.





There are a number of areas in the eastern region of the district that are within the lower level on the WUI Risk Index Scale. This means that the potential impact on people and homes from a wildfire in those areas is low in relationship to the rest of Larimer County. This level of risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.





²⁴⁹ Wildfire Risk represents the possibility of loss or harm occurring from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining wildfire threat and fire effects. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: lowest risk to highest risk.



Wellington Fire Protection District WUI Map²⁵⁰

Fires can extensively impact the economy of an affected area, including the agricultural, recreation and tourism industries, water resources, and the critical facilities upon which the Wellington Fire Protection District depends. There are no areas of *most negative* and 2nd most negative wildfire threat in the district according to the WUI Risk Index.

Potential Losses





²⁵⁰ Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length. The COWRAP data set was produced statewide and ranks areas on a scale that includes: least negative to most negative impacts. This scale stretched from -1 (least) to -9 (most) statewide.

The exposure data provided in the previous section (Inventory Assets Exposed) provides the clearest picture of potential losses to wildfire in the Wellington Fire Protection District. The risk assessment uses worst case scenario loss estimates. For this reason it is important to plan for relative levels of loss rather than specific potential loss dollar amounts.



Wellington Fire Protection District Parcels in the Most Negative and Second Most Negative WUI Zone²⁵¹

Probability of Future Occurrences

The likelihood of wildfires attaining significant size and intensity is unpredictable and highly dependent on environmental conditions and firefighting response. Weather conditions, particularly drought events, increase the likelihood of wildfires occurring. That said, it is important to note that 98% of wildfires are human-caused. Ultimately, the occurrence of future wildfire events will strongly depend on patterns of human activity and events are more likely to occur in wildfire-prone areas experiencing new or additional development.





²⁵¹ Wildland Urban Interface Risk represents the potential impact on people and their homes from a wildfire. Risk is derived by combining housing density with predicted flame length.

Wildfires can occur at any time of day and during any month of the year. Moreover, the length of a wildfire season and/or peak months may vary appreciably from year to year. As evidenced by the wildfire risk assessment, areas within the Wellington Fire Protection District that are characterized by dense development and single family homes along the wildland-urban interface are most vulnerable to wildfire.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Wellington Fire Protection District has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Wellington Fire Protection District is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Wellington Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Wellington Fire Protection District including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Wellington Fire Protection District.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Wellington Fire Protection District will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the District at least once every year.





Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries or deaths in the Wellington Fire Protection District due to hail. There have been 44 hail events reported in district between 1955 and 2014. Of the 44 incidents, 3 reported losses totaling \$15,000. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for hail events to occur at any given time.



Historical Hail Events in the Wellington Fire Protection District²⁵²

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no injuries, deaths, or damages in the Wellington Fire Protection District due to thunderstorm wind. There have been 3 thunderstorm wind events reported in the Wellington Fire Protection District between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for thunderstorm wind events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there has been 1 lightning event in the Wellington Fire Protection District between 1996 and 2014. There have been 9 reported injuries, no deaths, and no

²⁵² Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





damages. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the district, there is a great potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been 10 Windstorm events in the Wellington Fire Protection District between 1996 and 2014. There have been no reported injuries, deaths, or damages within the district.



Historical High Wind Events in the Wellington Fire Protection District²⁵³

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Wellington Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes approximately 10,000 people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows

²⁵³ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Wellington Fire Protection District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Wellington Fire Protection District. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Wellington Fire Protection District will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Wellington Fire Protection District at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Wellington Fire Protection District experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify,





but based on historical record of 10 severe wind events since 1996, there is a chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Wellington Fire Protection District does not currently track incidences of utility disruption.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Wellington Fire Protection District are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes approximately 10,000 people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.

Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Wellington Fire Protection District.

Tornado

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA, 78 injuries, 1death, and over \$147 million dollars in damages have been recorded within and near the Wellington Fire Protection District service area due to tornadoes. There is record of 9 tornadoes reported within the district limits between 1954 and 2015. The most severe event occurred on May 22, 2008. This EF3 tornado traveled in a north westerly direction and reached speeds of over 165 miles per hour. This tornado event consisted of a formation of several combined tornadoes forming a wedge that was between a half and three quarters of a mile wide. The tornado caused damage to not only the Town of Windsor but also the towns of Milliken, Platteville, Gilchrest, and the City of Greeley. One person was killed at the Missile Silo Campground near Greeley. The tornado impacted area was designated a national disaster. The Rocky Mountain Insurance Information Association (RMIIA) reported that there was an estimated \$193.5 million in insured damages and approximately 24,000 auto and homeowners claims. Tornadoes will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Wellington Fire Protection District.







Wellington Fire Protection District Historic Tornadoes²⁵⁴

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in Wellington Fire Protection District can be considered at risk from severe wind and tornadoes. This includes over 10,000 people, or 100% of the District's population and all buildings and infrastructure within the District.²⁵⁵ Most structures, including the district's critical facilities, should be able to withstand and provide adequate protection from tornadoes. Those facilities with back-up generators should be fully equipped to handle tornado events should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Generally, tornadoes destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists tornado hazards, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

²⁵⁵ 2010 Census





²⁵⁴ Historical tornado events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1950 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

Probability of Future Occurrences

Reported tornadoes over the past 61 years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of frequency for such events. The probability of the Wellington Fire Protection District experiencing a tornado associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify. Historic tornado frequencies suggest that there is a chance of this type of event occurring somewhere in within the district boundaries each year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Wellington Fire Protection District to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the district's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the district's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | Х | | |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | Λ |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |
| Grant Writer | | | Х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the district's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | - |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Y |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | - |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | - |





| Participates in the NFIP | - |
|--------------------------|---|

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

Wellington Fire Protection District has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the district will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|--|---|
| | "The plans and our mitigation actions will be reviewed and updated with County, Town, and mutual aid agencies on an annual basis." |
| Wellington Fire Protection District | |
| | "We will work cooperatively with the County, Town and other local agencies to seek input and share in public communication efforts." |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by the Wellington Fire Protection District based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|---------------------|---|
| Wellington Fire | "Plans and actions will be integrated into fire district SOP's, Strategic Planning, |
| Protection District | Annual Budget Development, and coordinated with County and Town efforts." |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide presents Wellington FPD's new mitigation action that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Wellington Fire Protection District: Railroad Pre-Incident Planning (Wellington FPD – 1) | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| PRIORITY: 1 | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Hazmat (Ground Transport and | | |
| | Rail) | | |
| LOCATION: I-25 and BNSF rail within the | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 3 and 5 | | |
| Wellington Fire Protection District | | | |
| boundary, CO-WY border to approximately | | | |
| Larimer County Road 58. | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/11/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives C and E | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2020 | | | |
| ISSUE: Interagency communication, informati | on sharing, initial response and evacuation planning. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Interagency coordinated | d development of a pre-incident plan and regional | | |
| exercise | | | |
| ACTION: Development of a Pre-Incident Response and Evacuation Plan | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Wellington Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: \$8,000 (inclusive of estimated | | |
| District | personnel time and exercise supplies) | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Colorado State Patrol, | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Grant funding, private | | |
| Colorado Department of Transportation, | sector investment, interagency training funds | | |
| BNSF, Larimer County Emergency | | | |
| Management, Larimer County Sheriff's | | | |
| Office, Poudre Fire Authority. | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | | |
| 1) Initial interagency coordination | | | |
| meeting to discuss essential steps | 7520 7520 | | |
| 2) Project management by | | | |
| Wellington Fire Protection District | | | |
| 3) Conduct plan development | BINSE | | |
| A) Resource inventory | | | |
| 5) Formation of an exercise design | | | |
| team | | | |
| 6) Plan development | | | |
| 7) Exercise and test the plan | Contraction of the second s | | |
| 8) Plan maintenance | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Wellington Fire Protection District: Homeowner Fire Mitigation Program (Wellington FPD – 2)

PRIORITY: 2 LOCATION: I-25 and BNSF rail within the Wellington Fire Protection District HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Wildfire (grassfires) GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 3 and 5





| boundary, CO-WY border to approximately | | |
|--|---|--|
| Larimer County Road 58. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 11/11/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives C and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2018 | | |
| ISSUE: The Wellington Fire Protection District has a high risk of large-scale grassfires that can move | | |
| quickly and cause damage and destruction. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Inform homeowners and property owners of best practices in mitigating | | |
| properties against wildfire and grassfire hazards. | | |
| ACTION: Present at community meetings, provide written recommendations and actions to | | |
| homeowners and provided one-on-one assessments regarding wildfire/grassfire risk. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Wellington Fire Protection | EXPECTED COST: \$2,500 (inclusive of estimated | |
| District | personnel time and exercise supplies) | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer County | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Grant funding, private | |
| Emergency Management, Larimer County | sector investment, interagency training funds | |
| Sheriff's Office, Poudre Fire Authority. | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | and the second se | |
| 1) Presentations at Community | The second se | |
| Meetings | | |
| 2) Email Distribution List Information | | |
| 3) One-on-one Property Assessments | | |
| Written Newsletters and | | |

 Written Newsletters and informational bulletins






Letter of Intent to Participate





protecting lives and property

LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

December 15, 2014

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Emergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, GO 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Miligation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify oriteria that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plans, the WELUNGTON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT is submitting this latter of intent to confirm that WELLINGTON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the miligation planning, WELLINGTON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT agrees to meet the requirements for miligation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

WELLINGTON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT understands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FFMA's *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* dated March 2013 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hezero's unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulgerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been projectively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, date, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Mutti-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, 1, KENNETH PETTIT, commit WELLINGTON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 15TH day of December, 2014

the nneth Petilt, District Board President





Town of Windsor

During the development of the 2016 Larimer County HMP, the Town of Windsor was in the early stages of developing their 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update. Some of the key visions that have been previously established for Windsor by local residents include:

- Windsor's hometown feel fosters an energetic community spirit and pride that makes our town a special place in Northern Colorado.
- Windsor has a strong local economy with diverse business sectors that provide jobs and services for residents.
- Windsor promotes quality development.
- Windsor enjoys a friendly community with a vibrant downtown, housing opportunities, and choices for leisure, cultural activities, recreation, and mobility for all.
- Windsor is a good environmental steward.

Community Profile

Windsor was founded in 1882 and was incorporated on April 2, 1890. The Town's location in the fertile Cache la Poudre River Valley, the introduction of irrigation, and the development of the railroad through the area each contributed to the early development of the Town and Region. Windsor's early economy was centered largely on agriculture. As compared to the dramatic population increases of the 1970s, Windsor experienced only moderate growth between 1980 and 1990. During this time period, population growth in the Region was concentrated mainly in the larger cities of Fort Collins and Loveland, where large employers such as the Colorado State University and the Hewlett-Packard Corporation are located.



MMITTED TO EXCELLEN



The following table summarizes key demographic and development related characteristics of the Town of Windsor.

| Town of Windsor Statistics | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------|
| | Town of Windsor | Colorado |
| Population, 2010 | 18,644 | 5,029,196 |
| 2000-2010 Population Change, % | % | 14.5% |
| % Population under 5 years, 2010 | % | 6.8% |
| % Population under 19 years, 2010 | % | 20.3 |
| % Population 65 years and over, 2010 | % | 10.9% |
| Language other than English spoken at home, % age 5+, 2009-2013 | % | 15.9% |
| Homeownership Rate 2010 | % | 65.5% |
| Persons Per Household 2010 | | 2.57 |
| Persons below poverty level, %, 2013 | % | 13.2% |
| Median Household Income, 2013 | \$ | \$58,433 |

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale. The Town of Windsor is situated in both Larimer and Weld Counties. For the purpose of this plan, spatially analyzed hazard risks have been assessed for the areas of the town that lie specifically within Larimer County.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING |
|---|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Flood – Flash and | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 3.3 |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 3.3 |
| Wind Storm, Lightning) | | | | | | |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 3.2 |
| Tornado | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 2.9 |
| Utility Disruption | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.7 |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.1 |
| Earthquake | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.0 |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.8 |





| Erosion / Deposition | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.6 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Hazmat – Fixed and | 0.3 | 03 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1 / |
| Transport | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.4 |
| Biological Hazards / | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 13 |
| Contagion | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.5 |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| , | | | | | | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Flood – Flash and Riverine; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, | | | | | | |

Wind Storm, Lightning); Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Tornado; Utility Disruption

MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Civil Disturbance; Earthquake;

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Fire – Wildland; Erosion / Deposition; Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Landslide / Rockslide

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Town of Windsor, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to Windsor.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). The Town of Windsor's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the community.







Social Vulnerability Map – Town of Windsor²⁵⁶

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

Windsor is characterized by a mix of medium-low to low levels of social vulnerability. This does not mean, however, that there aren't any socially vulnerable residents living in the community or that social vulnerability levels will remain the same over time. Close analysis of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the community will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors threaten the community the most and where social and economic resources should be allocated in order to reduce vulnerability. Over time, the Town of Windsor should continue to monitor their local social vulnerability as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change.

²⁵⁶ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)







Flood – Flash and Riverine

Town of Windsor Special Flood Hazard Area²⁵⁷

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported injuries, property loss, or crop damage in the Town of Windsor caused by flooding. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, however, there is a great potential for flooding events to occur at any given time.





²⁵⁷ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.



Town of Windsor 2013 Flood Extent²⁵⁸

Maximum flood extent—a key data need for disaster response and mitigation—is rarely quantified due to storm-related cloud cover and the low temporal resolution of optical sensors. While change detection approaches can circumvent these issues through the identification of inundated land and soil from post-flood imagery, their accuracy can suffer in the narrow and complex channels of increasingly developed and heterogeneous floodplains. The data depicted above is from a study that explored the utility of the Operational Land Imager (OLI) and Independent Component Analysis (ICA) for addressing these challenges in the unprecedented 2013 Flood along the Colorado Front Range, USA. The approach was able to simultaneously distinguish flood-related water and soil moisture from pre-existing water bodies and other spectrally similar classes within the narrow and braided channels of the study site.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 3 critical facilities and 3,186 parcels/structures in the Town of Windsor that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood

²⁵⁸ Multi-Temporal Independent Component Analysis and Landsat 8 for Delineating Maximum Extent of the 2013 Colorado Front Range Flood





prone infrastructure). The appraised value of these exposed critical facilities is over \$2.8 million dollars. The appraised value of these exposed structures is over \$950.4 million dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Town of Windsor that for a 100-year flood event, no critical facilities or buildings will experience flood damage.



Town of Windsor 1% Annual Flood Loss Estimation and Flood Depth Grid Map²⁵⁹





²⁵⁹ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Town of Windsor provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the town. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries or deaths in Town of Windsor due to hail. There has been 1 hail events reported in Town of Windsor between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the town, there is potential for hail events to occur at any given time.







Historical Hail Events in the Town of Windsor²⁶⁰

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no injuries, deaths, or damages in the Town of Windsor due to thunderstorm wind. There have been no thunderstorm wind events reported in the Town of Windsor between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is potential for thunderstorm wind events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no lightning events in the Town of Windsor between 1996 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no Windstorm events in the Town of Windsor between 1996 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is potential for high wind events to occur at any given time





²⁶⁰ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf



Historical High Wind Events in the Town of Windsor²⁶¹

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Windsor can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes 18,644 people, or 100% of the Town's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the Town's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures

²⁶¹ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants
- Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Town of Windsor including all aboveground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of Windsor. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Town of Windsor will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Town of Windsor at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Town of Windsor experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of severe wind events in Larimer County, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, the Town of Windsor has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Town of Windsor is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.





Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Windsor can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes 18,644 people, or 100% of the Town's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the town. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the Town's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Town of Windsor including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of Windsor.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Town of Windsor will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the town at least once every year.

Tornado

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, 78 injuries, one death, approximately \$147,000 of property damage, and no crop damages have been recorded within and near the Town of Windsor due to tornadoes.

There have been six tornadoes in the Town of Windsor within Weld County and no reported tornadoes in the Town of Windsor within Larimer County between 1954 and 2015. The most severe event occurred on May 22, 2008. This EF3 tornado traveled in a north westerly direction and reached speeds of over 165 miles per hour. This tornado event consisted of a formation of several combined tornadoes forming a wedge that was between a half and three quarters of a mile wide. The tornado caused damage to not only the Town of Windsor but also the towns of Milliken, Platteville, Gilchrest, and the City of Greeley. One person was killed at the Missile Silo Campground near Greeley. The tornado impacted area was designated a national disaster. The Rocky Mountain Insurance Information Association (RMIIA) reported that there was an estimated \$193.5 million in insured damages and approximately 24,000 auto





and homeowners claims. Additional details concerning this damaging event can be found in the postevent reports posted on the Town's website.

There have been tornadoes reported very close to the northern, eastern and southern borders of the Town limits as well. Tornadoes will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Town of Windsor.



Two residents of Chimney Park walk away with some of their belongings after the tornado blew through Windsor on May 22, 2008. (Photo Credit: Joe Amon, The Denver Post)







Town of Windsor Historical Tornado Events²⁶²

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Town of Windsor can be considered at risk from severe wind and tornadoes. This includes 18,644 people, or 100% of the Town's population and all buildings and infrastructure within the town.²⁶³ Most structures, including the town's critical facilities, should be able to withstand and provide adequate protection from tornadoes. Those facilities with back-up generators should be fully equipped to handle tornado events should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Generally, tornadoes destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists tornado hazards, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

²⁶³ 2010 Census





²⁶² Historical tornado events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1950 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

Probability of Future Occurrences

Reported tornadoes over the past 61 years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of frequency for such events. The probability of the Town of Windsor experiencing a tornado associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify. Historic tornado frequencies suggest that there is a chance of this type of event occurring somewhere in within the town boundaries each year.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Town of Windsor does not currently track incidences of utility disruption.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in Town of Windsor are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes 18,644 people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.

Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Town of Windsor.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the Town of Windsor to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the town's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines the town's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | | | Х |
| Floodplain | | | v |
| Administrator | | | ^ |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |





| Grant Writer | Х | |
|--------------|---|--|

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines the town's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | - |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Y |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | - |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | - |
| Participates in the NFIP | Y |

Building codes are one tool that communities use to enhance public safety. For example, they can increase structural integrity, mitigate structure fires, and provide benefits in relation to natural hazard avoidance. In Colorado, land use regulations and building codes are typically implemented at the local level. Even without a statewide mandate, most counties and many municipalities have enacted regulations and codes. The Town of Windsor has adopted a local building code requirement, demonstrating their understanding of the benefits codes provide, including reduced exposure to hazards.

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

Windsor has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the town will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|-----------------|--|
| Town of Windsor | "The Larimer County (and Weld County Hazard Mitigation Plan) will be reviewed annually by Town Board and review by Engineering/Public Work/ Police Department Staff to ensure items are up to date." |





| "The public will have the opportunity to voice their opinions during Town Board |
|---|
| meetings." |
| |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by Windsor based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|-----------------|--|
| Town of Windsor | <i>"Our mitigation actions will be included in our yearly budget, capital improvement plan, and strategic plan."</i> |

Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guides presents the town's mitigation actions that were developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Windsor: NFIP Promotion and Administration (2009 UPDATE) (Windsor – 1) | | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flooding | |
| LOCATION: Windsor | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C & E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | |
| ISSUE: As participants in the NFIP the Community will continue to promote wise use of floodplains | | |
| through ordinance administration and period | ic update, promotion of flood insurance and staff | |
| training, including encouragement of Certified Floodplain Manager status. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: The benefits are to flood-prone building owners who choose to insure against | | |
| flood losses, and to taxpayers who no longer would be faced with subsidizing those potential losses. | | |
| ACTION: Continued administration of floodplain regulations and updates to town ordinances. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Floodplain Management EXPECTED COST: Can be accomplished within existing | | |
| officials budgets | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: PW Department | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: N/A | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Floodplain reviews prior to permitting any development in the floodplain. | | |

Floodplain information is posted on the Town of Johnstown website. Updates to town ordinances with regard to floodplain regulations.

| Windsor: John Law Ditch- Flood Mitigation Project (Windsor – 2) | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flooding | |
| LOCATION: Windsor | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Ongoing OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | | |





| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2016 | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| ISSUE: FEMA mitigation match for the installation of concrete box culverts under the Greeley No. 2 | | | | |
| Canal, Weld County Road 21 and State Highway 392 to reduce flood damage within the John Law | | | | |
| Floodplain. | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Complete project within given timeline to receive grant funding | | | | |
| ACTION: | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of WindsorEXPECTED COST: \$2,977,504.59 | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: FEMA and CDBG-DR | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Paceived EEMA grant and CDRG-DR funding. Project is scheduled to be | | | | |

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Received FEMA grant and CDBG-DR funding. Project is scheduled to be complete in 2016.

| Windsor: Emergency Power (Windsor – 3) | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Any hazard that may knock out | | | | |
| | power | | | | |
| LOCATION: Windsor | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2, 3 | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 2016 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 2016 | | | | | |
| ISSUE: In Colorado, there a numerous events that could knock out power to Town offices. In case of | | | | | |
| emergency, there are several Town employees who need to stay connected to serve our residents. | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: The Town plans on purchasing a backup generator | | | | | |
| ACTION: Purchase a backup generator | | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town of Windsor | EXPECTED COST: Can be accomplished within existing | | | | |
| | budgets | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Funds included in the 2016 budget. | | | | | |

| Windsor: LETA 911 (Windsor – 4) | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All hazards | | | | |
| LOCATION: Windsor | GOALS ADDRESSED: 2, 3, 4 | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, E | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: ongoing | | | | | |
| ISSUE: Residents need to be informed in case emergency situations arise. | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: The Town continuously partners with LETA 911 to provide emergency | | | | | |
| communications to our residents. We will provide LETA 911 each year and encourage residents to | | | | | |
| sign-up for this great service. | | | | | |
| ACTION: Continue to provide 911 services and related outreach. | | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Larimer County | EXPECTED COST: Can be accomplished within existing | | | | |
| | budgets | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Town of Windsor and | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Already funded | | | | |
| other jurisdictions | | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: Town of Windsor staff was recently trained to use LETA 911. | | | | | |





| Windsor: Flood Prevention on CR 13 (Windsor – 5) | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flooding | | | | |
| LOCATION: Windsor | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 2 | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Yearly | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: E | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: ongoing | | | | | |
| ISSUE: CR 13 is vulnerable to flooding each year | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: The Town invests \$50,000 annually to prevent flooding by removing excess | | | | | |
| gravel | | | | | |
| ACTION: Removing excess gravel. | | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town | EXPECTED COST: Can be accomplished within existing | | | | |
| | budgets | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Already funded | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | | | | |

| Windsor: Floodplain (Windsor – 6) | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Flooding | | | | |
| LOCATION: Windsor | GOALS ADDRESSED:1, 4 | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: Yearly | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, C, E | | | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: ongoing | | | | | |
| ISSUE: NFIP participation | | | | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Windsor not participating in the CRS program, however we are a member of | | | | | |
| NFIP. Windsor adopted the model ordinance in Jan of 2014 as required by the State of Colorado. The | | | | | |
| Town enforces the floodplain regulations in accordance with FEMA's requirements. | | | | | |
| ACTION: Continued participation in NFIP | | | | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Town | EXPECTED COST: | | | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Both Weld and Larimer | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Already funded | | | | |
| County | | | | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | | | | |





Letter of Intent to Participate



LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

January 12, 2015

Lori R. Hodges Larimar County Emergency Management 200 West Ock Street Fort Collins, CO 80523

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Lemmer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multijurisdictional mitigation plane, the <u>Town of Windsor</u> is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that <u>Town</u> <u>of Windsor</u> has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the mitigation planning, <u>Town of Windsor</u> agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CER §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as is necessary and in a timoly manner to Larimer County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

<u>Town of Windsor</u> understands that it must engage in the following planzing process, as more fully described in FEMA's *Local Miligation Planning Handbook* dated March 2019 including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning process by all community stakeholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the Jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a tult understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, <u>John Vazquez, Mayor</u> commit <u>Town of Windsor</u> to the Lazimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 12th day of January

301 Walnut Street · Windsor, Colorado · 80550 · phone 970-674-2400 · fax 970-674-2458 www.windsorgov.com





Windsor Severance Fire Rescue

"Providing professional service and compassionate care from our family to yours." – Mission, Windsor Severance Fire Rescue

Community Profile

Windsor Severance Fire Rescue (WSFR) provides fire and rescue services to the towns of Windsor and Severance as part of the 110 square mile area it protects. The fire district employs 80 firefighters utilizing full-time, part-time and volunteer staffing. WSFR has three fire stations that are staffed 24 hours a day. Station 1 is located in downtown Windsor at 100 7th Street and serves as the department's headquarters. Station 2 is located at 209 1st St. in Severance. A new Station 2 is projected to open in early 2014 and will be located at the intersection of Timber Ridge Parkway and Scotch Pine Drive. Station 3 is located at 7790 REA Parkway in west Windsor.

WSFR is an all-hazards organization. It handles fires, emergency medical services, hazardous materials response, specialized rescue, and wildland firefighting. Fire prevention is heavily promoted through business inspections, school presentations, carbon monoxide and fire detector programs and proactive relationships with town and county officials. Mutual aid and automatic aid agreements with surrounding fire agencies ensures a high level of resources are available for all types of events.







Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The following Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Summary table is based on jurisdiction-specific responses to the risk factor exercise and differs from the risk factor results that were determined at the county scale.

| NATURAL HAZARD | PROBABILITY | IMPACT | SPATIAL EXTENT | WARNING TIME | DURATION | RF RATING | | |
|--|-------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--|--|
| Hazmat – Fixed and Transport | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.9 | | |
| Flood – Flash and Riverine | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 3.3 | | |
| Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 3.3 | | |
| Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation) | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 3.3 | | |
| Utility Disruption | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 3.3 | | |
| Biological Hazards / Contagion | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.9 | | |
| Tornado | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.5 | | |
| Fire – Wildland | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.2 | | |
| Civil Disturbance | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.0 | | |
| Earthquake | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.9 | | |
| Erosion / Deposition | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.3 | | |
| Landslide / Rockslide | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.3 | | |
| HIGH RISK (2.5 or higher): Hazmat – Fixed and Transport; Flood – Flash and Riverine; Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning); Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation); Utility Disruption; Biological Hazards / Contagion; Tornado | | | | | | | | |
| MODERATE RISK HAZARD (2.0 - 2.4): Fire – Wildland; Civil Disturbance | | | | | | | | |

Low Risk (1.9 and lower): Earthquake; Erosion / Deposition; Landslide / Rockslide

Vulnerability Assessment

This section provides a refined vulnerability assessment, specific for the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue, for those hazards that were identified as being rated HIGH in the preceding section. This analysis was





conducted separately from that of the county-wide vulnerability assessment to specifically focus on the population, structures, infrastructure, and other assets unique to Windsor.

The results of the social vulnerability assessment are displayed on the map below. On the map, social vulnerability is represented at the census tract level by 5 classes of vulnerability: Low (bottom 20% of the county), Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High (top 20% of the county). Windsor Severance Fire Rescue's social vulnerability map shows social vulnerability within the service area.



Social Vulnerability Map – Windsor Severance Fire Rescue²⁶⁴

Social vulnerability is represented as the social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and adapt to hazard events. The pre-existing social conditions that contribute to disaster losses can be identified using social vulnerability indicators. Using methods identified in the Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) developed by Cutter et. al. (2003) this layer shows the social vulnerability index scores for the State of Colorado at the census tract level. Social vulnerability is represented at the Census tract level by five classes of vulnerability: Low, Medium-Low, Medium-High, and High.

²⁶⁴ Source: Colorado Division of Water Resources Dam Safety Branch, FEMA, Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)





The Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area is characterized by a mix of medium-low to low levels of social vulnerability. This does not mean, however, that there aren't any socially vulnerable residents living in the area or that social vulnerability levels will remain the same over time. Close analysis of the individual social vulnerability indicators within the area will give local emergency managers, planners, and stakeholders a clearer picture of which social vulnerability factors threaten the community the most and where social and economic resources should be allocated in order to reduce vulnerability. Over time, the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue should continue to monitor their local social vulnerability as demographic, economic, and housing related conditions change.

Hazmat – Fixed and Transport

Previous Occurrences

Based on data supplied by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's (PHMSA) Incident Reports Database there have been 9 reported HAZMAT incidents within the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area between 1972 and 2015. Many more unreported events have occurred within the service area during that same time period.

Inventory Exposed

We can't accurately predict when or where a HAZMAT incident may occur. Therefore, for the purpose of this plan, all existing and future buildings, facilities, and populations in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area are considered to be equally exposed and couple potentially be impacted. This includes 18,644 people, or 100% of the service area's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area.

When hazardous materials are being transported they are particularly vulnerability to transportation related accidents, misuse, or terrorist threats. Most hazardous materials are transported in large quantities in order to reduce costs and security is difficult to maintain around moving vehicles that cross jurisdictional boundaries. When transported close to populated areas or critical infrastructure, HAZMAT releases can have serious consequences. The inventory that is most often exposed to HAZMAT risks are railways, roadways, and fixed facilities that contain hazardous materials, and all assets that lie within a mile of the potential release areas.

I-25 runs through the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area and is a designated nuclear and hazardous materials transportation route. All structures, natural resources, and people located within one mile of these transportation routes (and railways) are exposed to the impacts of a potential HAZMAT event. Structures, people, and natural resources located outside of a one mile buffer of these routes are also at risk of exposure.

Assets and people that are located within one mile of an industrial or commercial fixed site are also at risk of exposure to the impacts of a HAZMAT release.

Potential Losses

HAZMAT related events occur within the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area almost every year. The intensity and magnitude of these incidents depend on weather conditions, the location of the event, the time of day, and the process by which the materials are released. *Was is raining when the event happened? Were the hazardous materials being transported by rail when they were released or were they at a fixed facility? Did the spill happen during rush hour traffic or in the middle of the night?* All of these





considerations matter when determining the risk and potential damages associated with a HAZMAT incident.

HAZMAT events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. Moreover, HAZMAT incidents can cause serious environmental contamination to non-renewable resources such as air, ground, and water sources.

Probability of Future Occurrences

As with most hazards that have limited spatial predictability or warning time, the probability of future occurrences of HAZMAT events is difficult to predict. However, as development continues to encroach into existing industrial areas and becomes more dense along high-risk designated hazardous materials transportation routes, the risk of future occurrences becomes greater. Even if the frequency of HAZMAT spills remains the same over time, population growth will increase the probability of a disaster event.







Flood – Flash and Riverine

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no reported injuries, property loss, or crop damage in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area caused by flooding. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is a great potential for flooding events to occur at any given time.





²⁶⁵ This layer is compiled utilizing the most recent Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) as defined by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) in combination with some recent flood studies performed by the City of Fort Collins. These areas are also referred to as the 1% Annual Chance Floodplain.



Windsor Severance Fire Rescue 2013 Flood Extent²⁶⁶

Maximum flood extent—a key data need for disaster response and mitigation—is rarely quantified due to storm-related cloud cover and the low temporal resolution of optical sensors. While change detection approaches can circumvent these issues through the identification of inundated land and soil from post-flood imagery, their accuracy can suffer in the narrow and complex channels of increasingly developed and heterogeneous floodplains. The data depicted above is from a study that explored the utility of the Operational Land Imager (OLI) and Independent Component Analysis (ICA) for addressing these challenges in the unprecedented 2013 Flood along the Colorado Front Range, USA. The approach was able to simultaneously distinguish flood-related water and soil moisture from pre-existing water bodies and other spectrally similar classes within the narrow and braided channels of the study site.

Inventory Exposed

Critical facilities are essential to the health and welfare of the whole population and are especially important both during and after hazard events. Critical structures or areas that overlap or touch the SFHA are considered "flood prone."





²⁶⁶ Multi-Temporal Independent Component Analysis and Landsat 8 for Delineating Maximum Extent of the 2013 Colorado Front Range Flood

The critical facility and structure exposure analysis estimates that there are 3 critical facilities and 3,186 parcels/structures in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area that are flood prone (not including the total miles of flood prone infrastructure). The appraised value of these exposed critical facilities is over \$2.8 million dollars. The appraised value of these exposed structures is over \$950.4 million dollars.

Potential Losses

Hazus estimates for the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area that for a 100-year flood event, no critical facilities or buildings will experience flood damage.



Windsor Severance Fire Rescue 1% Annual Flood Loss Estimation and Flood Depth Grid Map²⁶⁷





²⁶⁷ FEMA's loss estimation modeling software, Hazus, was utilized to produce this data set. A 100 year flood scenario was defined and losses were calculated for each point (structure) that intersected the depth grid based on the Hazus depth damage curves for specific structure attributes (such as foundation type, building type, and first flood height). Information derived from Hazus-MH 2.2 flood scenario. Total Losses equals a sum of building losses, content losses, and inventory losses. 1% Annual Chance Flood flooding depth grid, produced from the best available topographic and floodplain data.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Frequency of previously reported flood events in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area provide an acceptable framework for determining the probability of future flood occurrence in the area. The probability that the district will experience a flood event can be difficult to predict or quantify.

Severe flooding has the potential to inflict significant damage to people and property in the service area. Mitigating flood damage requires that communities remain diligent and notify local officials of potential flood (and flash flood) prone areas near infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and buildings.

Spring / Summer Storm (Hail, Thunderstorm, Wind Storm, Lightning)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there are no reported injuries or deaths in Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area due to hail. There has been 1 hail events reported in Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the town, there is potential for hail events to occur at any given time.







Historical Hail Events in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue²⁶⁸

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no injuries, deaths, or damages in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area due to thunderstorm wind. There have been no thunderstorm wind events reported in the service area between 1955 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is potential for thunderstorm wind events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no lightning events in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area between 1996 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is potential for lightning events to occur at any given time.

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database there have been no Windstorm events in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area between 1996 and 2014. Based on the historic data showing hazardous impacts on the county, there is potential for high wind events to occur at any given time

²⁶⁸ Source: Historical hail events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf







Historical High Wind Events in Windsor Severance Fire Rescue²⁶⁹

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area can be considered at risk from spring and summer storms. This includes 18,644 people, or 100% of the service area's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the service area's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Inventory assets exposed to severe wind is dependent on the age of the building, type, construction material used, and condition of the structure. Possible losses to critical infrastructure include:

- Electric power disruption
- Communication disruption
- Water and fuel shortages
- Road closures
- Damaged infrastructure components, such as sewer lift stations and treatment plants

²⁶⁹ Source: NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1955 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf





Damage to homes, structures, and shelters

Potential Losses

Spring and summer storms affect the entire planning area of the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Severe storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area. It is likely that lightning and hail will also be experienced in the area due to such storms.

Generally, straight-line wind events destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists for wind, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Spring and summer storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past spring and summer events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District will experience a spring or summer storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District at least once every year.

Reported straight-line wind events over the past nineteen years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of event. The probability of the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District experiencing a severe wind event associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify, but based on historical record of severe wind events in Larimer County, there is a high chance of this type of event occurring each year.

Winter Storm (Blizzard Conditions, Heavy Snow Accumulation)

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District has experienced 74 Winter Storms since 1996. On March 17, 2003 there was report of a winter storm causing \$15,500,000 in property damage in areas of Larimer County below 6,000 feet and eastern Larimer County. There were no deaths, injuries or damage to crops reported for any of these storms. The Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District is at high risk of experiencing Winter Storms during the winter months.





Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District can be considered at risk from winter storms. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the district. Damages primarily occur as a result of high winds, lightning strikes, hail, snow-loading, and flooding. Most structures, including the District's critical facilities, should be able to provide adequate protection from hail but the structures could suffer broken windows and dented exteriors. Those facilities with back-up generators are better equipped to handle a severe weather situation should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Winter storms affect the entire planning area of the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District including all above-ground structures and infrastructure. Although losses to structures are typically minimal and covered by insurance, there can be impacts with lost time, maintenance costs, and contents within structures. A timely forecast may not be able to mitigate the property loss, but could reduce the casualties and associated injury.

It appears possible to forecast these extreme events with some skill, but further research needs to be done to test the existing hypothesis about the interaction between the convective storm and its environment that produces the extensive swath of high winds. Winter storms will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Severe winter storms can be predicted with a reasonable level of certainty. Through the identification of various indicators of weather systems, and by tracking these indicators, warning time for snow storms can be as much as a week in advance. Understanding the historical frequency, duration, and spatial extent of severe winter weather assists in determining the likelihood and potential severity of future occurrences. The characteristics of past severe winter events provide benchmarks for projecting similar conditions into the future. The probability that the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area will experience a severe winter storm event can be difficult to quantify. However, based on historical records and frequencies there is nearly a 100% chance of this type of event will occur somewhere in the service area at least once every year.

Utility Disruption

Previous Occurrences

The Windsor Severance Fire Rescue does not currently track incidences of utility disruption.

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area are considered at risk from the impacts of utility disruption events. This includes 18,644 people, or 100% of the County's population, and all buildings and infrastructure within the County.

Potential Losses

Utility disruption events have the potential to threaten lives and disrupt business activity. However, monetary losses and casualty estimates are largely unknown.





Probability of Future Occurrences

In general, utility outages result from failures in the distribution system as opposed to shortages of supply. Distribution systems are most susceptible to failure during extreme hot and cold temperatures as well as during violent weather conditions. Regional utility failures can threaten human life, particularly when outages affect hospitals, nursing homes, or other healthcare facilities. As both population and climate variability increase across the State of Colorado, and put more pressure on aging distribution systems, it is likely that utility disturbance events will become more frequent in and around the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area.

Biological Hazards / Contagion

Biological hazards, including epidemics and pandemics, have the potential to cause serious illness and death, especially among those who have compromised immune systems due to age or underlying medical conditions. During the 2015 planning process, pandemic flu was identified as the key public health hazard in the county.

Previous Occurrences

There is no available data for historic occurrences of biological hazards specifically within the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area.

Inventory Exposed

Due to the regional nature of public health hazards, jurisdictions with higher numbers of socially vulnerable residents are expected to experience magnified impacts of public health hazards. This includes places with high numbers of elderly residents, young children, low income families, and homeless individuals/outdoor laborers. Future mitigation efforts related to biological hazards should focus on reaching those residents who are elderly, young children, and live in poverty or are homeless.

Potential Losses

Because there is no defined geographic boundary for public health hazards, all of the people and infrastructure within the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area are exposed to public health hazards. Those with elevated risk and potential loss are the homeless, infirm, elderly, young and low income families. Placing a dollar amount on the cost of a human life are beyond the scope of the Plan, annualized economic losses for the Fire Rescue due to public health hazards can be best quantified in terms of number of days of work lost due to sick staff.

Probability of Future Occurrences

Based on the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment annual reportable disease summary of 2,308 Reportable Diseases within Larimer County, there is great potential for biological hazards to occur at any given time in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue service area.

Tornado

Previous Occurrences

According to NOAA's Storm Events Database, 78 injuries, one death, approximately \$147,000 of property damage, and no crop damages have been recorded within and near the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District due to tornadoes.





There have been six tornadoes in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District within Weld County and no reported tornadoes in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District within Larimer County between 1954 and 2015. This EF3 tornado traveled in a north westerly direction and reached speeds of over 165 miles per hour. This tornado event consisted of a formation of several combined tornadoes forming a wedge that was between a half and three quarters of a mile wide. The tornado caused damage to not only the Town of Windsor but also the towns of Milliken, Platteville, Gilchrest, and the City of Greeley. One person was killed at the Missile Silo Campground near Greeley. The tornado impacted area was designated a national disaster. The Rocky Mountain Insurance Information Association (RMIIA) reported that there was an estimated \$193.5 million in insured damages and approximately 24,000 auto and homeowners claims. Additional details concerning this damaging event can be found in the post-event reports posted on the Town of Windsor's website.

There have been tornadoes reported very close to the northern, eastern and southern borders of the District limits as well. Tornadoes will remain a highly likely occurrence for the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District.



Two residents of Chimney Park walk away with some of their belongings after the tornado blew through Windsor on May 22, 2008. (Photo Credit: Joe Amon, The Denver Post)






Historic Tornadoes - Windsor Severance Fire Rescue Service Area²⁷⁰

Inventory Exposed

All assets located in the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District can be considered at risk from severe wind and tornadoes. This includes all people, or 100% of the District's population and all buildings and infrastructure within the District.²⁷¹ Most structures, including the district's critical facilities, should be able to withstand and provide adequate protection from tornadoes. Those facilities with back-up generators should be fully equipped to handle tornado events should the power go out.

Potential Losses

Generally, tornadoes destroy private, commercial, and public property. Additional costs stem from debris removal, maintenance, repair, and response. Indirect costs include loss of industrial and commercial productivity as a result of damage to infrastructure, facilities, or interruption of services. Because no specific, countywide loss estimation exists tornado hazards, potential losses are related to historical property damage and injuries/deaths.

²⁷¹ 2010 Census





²⁷⁰ Historical tornado events. NOAA's National Weather Service Storm Prediction Center, 1950 – 2014. Attribute details can be found at http://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/SPC_severe_database_description.pdf

Probability of Future Occurrences

Reported tornadoes over the past 61 years provide an acceptable framework for determining the future occurrence in terms of frequency for such events. The probability of the Windsor Severance Fire Rescue District experiencing a tornado associated with damages or injuries can be difficult to quantify. Historic tornado frequencies suggest that there is a chance of this type of event occurring somewhere in within the district boundaries each year.

Capabilities Assessment

The capability assessment examines the ability of the WSFR to implement and manage the comprehensive mitigation strategy laid out in this Plan. The strengths, weaknesses, and resources of the community are identified here as a means for evaluating and maintaining effective and appropriate management of the organization's hazard mitigation program.

Local Personnel

The ability of a community to implement a comprehensive mitigation strategy depends, in part, on available resources, including people and staff. The following table outlines WSFR's capabilities as they relate to key personnel.

| | Full Time | Part Time | None or Not-Identified |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Emergency Manager | Х | | |
| Floodplain | x | | |
| Administrator | | | |
| Community Planner | Х | | |
| GIS Specialist | Х | | |
| Grant Writer | | | Х |

Land Use Planning and Codes

Local land use plans and building codes are tremendous tools for evaluating local policies related to hazard mitigation and risk reduction. Additionally, comprehensive master plans, capital improvement plans, stormwater plans and zoning ordinances all present opportunities for enhanced local capabilities. The following table outlines WSFR's current capabilities as they relate to land use planning and codes.

| | Yes (Y); |
|--|----------|
| | No (N) |
| A zoning ordinance | Y |
| A hazard-specific ordinance | Ν |
| Local building codes | Y |
| A Comprehensive Plan / Master Plan | Y |
| A Capital Improvements Plan | Y |
| A Stormwater Plan | Y |
| A Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) | - |
| An Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) | Y |
| A Long-Term Recovery Plan | Y |





| Participates in the NFIP | - |
|--------------------------|---|
| | |

Plan Maintenance and Implementation

Windsor Severance Fire Rescue has developed a Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy outlining their method and schedule for keeping the plan current. The Implementation Strategy below also includes a discussion of how the organization will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

| Jurisdiction | Plan Maintenance and Implementation Strategy |
|----------------|---|
| | "Our mitigation actions will be reviewed by staff on an annual basis" |
| Windsor | |
| Severance Fire | |
| Rescue | "Any major changes will be relayed to the community via social media, |
| | Everbridge, and our district's website." |

Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning

Through discussions at planning meetings and the use of an online survey, individual outreach, and phone calls, each participating jurisdiction brainstormed with the planning team to identify processes for integrating hazard mitigation into their local planning mechanisms and policies. The following table lists the specific integration strategy identified by WSFR based on the mitigation actions listed in this plan.

| Jurisdiction | Strategy |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | <i>"We will implement a hazardous materials inspection and permitting process for businesses in our jurisdiction"</i> |





Mitigation Action Guides

The following Mitigation Action Guide presents WSFR's mitigation action that was developed for the 2016 Plan.

| Windsor Severance Fire Rescue: Mitigation Code Changes | | |
|---|---|--|
| PRIORITY: High | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Wildfire | |
| LOCATION: Windsor Severance Service | GOALS ADDRESSED: Goals 1, 2, 4, and 5 | |
| Area | | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 6/1/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: Objectives B, C, and E | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 12/31/2016 | | |
| ISSUE: Recent large-scale disasters have cause | ed Windsor Severance Fire to re-evaluate all Wildfire | |
| codes for possible mitigation actions | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Provide recommendations for code changes to the Windsor Severance Board for | | |
| reducing losses and mitigating risk to structural and wildfire | | |
| ACTION: Update fire codes with recommendations approved by the Board to decrease future risk and | | |
| disaster losses. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Windsor Severance Fire | EXPECTED COST: \$0 | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Larimer Community | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: Staff time | |
| Development Division, Office of Emergency | | |
| Management | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| Develop a review team to go over all codes and provide suggested changes | | |
| Compile all recommended changes and present to the Fire Board for consideration | | |
| Make changes as appropriate and finalize recommended actions | | |

- Participate in the code revision process, including public meetings

| Windsor Severance Fire Rescue: Community Emergency Preparedness (Windsor Severance FR – 1) | | |
|--|--|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: Drought, Earthquake, Land | |
| | Subsidence, Extreme Temperatures, Flood, Severe | |
| | Storm, Wind & Tornado, Fire, Public Health, Hazmat | |
| LOCATION: Windsor, Fort Collins | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1, 4 | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 2016 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: A, E | |
| | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: Ongoing | | |
| ISSUE: There is a need for increased public awareness regarding emergency preparedness for hazards | | |
| common to our area. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: Information on websites, social media, community events, more collaboration | | |
| with government entities. | | |
| ACTION: Establish and implement plan for continuous community education. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Windsor Severance Fire | EXPECTED COST: Can be accomplished within existing | |
| Rescue | budgets. | |
| | | |





SUPPORT AGENCIES: Town of Windsor, City of Fort Collins, RE-4 School District, Library District

PROGRESS MILESTONES: Implementation of a plan that includes supporting agencies.

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES:



| Windsor Severance Fire Rescue: Mitigation Assessment (Windsor Severance FR – 2) | | |
|--|---|--|
| PRIORITY: Medium | HAZARDS ADDRESSED: All | |
| LOCATION: Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | GOALS ADDRESSED: 1. Protect people, property and | |
| | natural resources | |
| RECOMMENDATION DATE: 10/30/2015 | OBJECTIVES ADDRESSED: C. Incorporate risk reduction | |
| | principles into policy documents and initiatives; other | |
| | institutional plans | |
| | | |
| TARGET COMPLETION DATE: 01/01/2018 | | |
| ISSUE: With the new HIRA information, Wind | sor Severance Fire is susceptible to multiple natural | |
| hazards, including tornado, fire, and flood. | | |
| RECOMMENDATION: A determination of mitigation actions to protect the area is needed. | | |
| ACTION: Conduct a mitigation assessment to protect Windsor Severance Fire Rescue assets is needed. | | |
| LEAD AGENCY: Windsor Severance Fire | EXPECTED COST: Unknown | |
| Rescue | | |
| SUPPORT AGENCIES: Town of Windsor | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES: General operating | |
| | funds and/or potential grants. | |
| | | |
| PROGRESS MILESTONES: | | |
| - Conduct an asset and infrastructure inventory to determine critical infrastructure in the | | |
| district | | |
| Assess each area for hazard vulnerability and risk | | |

- Determine key mitigation actions for each area in the future





Letter of Intent to Participate



Windsor Severance Fire Rescue

100 7th Street, Windsor, Colorado, 80550 970-686-2026 www.wsfr.us

LETTER OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE

January 8, 2015

Lori R. Hodges Larimer County Envergency Management 200 West Oak Street Fort Collins, CO 80526

Re: "Statement of Intent to Participate" as a participating jurisdiction in the Larimar County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

Dear Ms. Hodges,

In accordance with the Federal Emergency Managament Agency's (FEMA) Local Hazerd Mitigation Plan (HMP) requirements, under 44 CFR §201.6, which specifically identify criteria that allow for multi-jurisdictional mitigation plane, Windsor Severance Fire Rescue is submitting this letter of intent to confirm that Windsor Severance Fire Rescue has agreed to participate in the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning offort.

Further, as a condition to participating in the miligation planning, Windsor Severance Fire Rescue agrees to meet the requirements for mitigation plans identified in 44 CFR §201.6 and to provide such cooperation as a necessary and in a timely manner to Larimer County OEM to complete the plan in conformance with FEMA requirements.

Windsor Severance Fire Rescue uncerstands that it must engage in the following planning process, as more fully described in FEMA's Local Miligation Planning Handbook dated March 2013 Including, but not limited to:

- Identification of hazards unique to the jurisdiction and not addressed in the master planning document;
- The conduct of a vulnerability analysis and an identification of risks, where they differ from the general planning area;
- The formulation of mitigation goals responsive to public input and development of mitigation actions complementary to those goals. A range of actions must be identified specific for each jurisdiction;
- Demonstration that there has been proactively offered an opportunity for participation in the planning
 process by all community statisholders (examples of participation include relevant involvement in any
 planning process, attending meetings, contributing research, data, or other information, commenting on
 drafts of the plan, etc.);
- Documentation of an effective process to maintain and implement the plan;
- Formal adoption of the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the jurisdiction's governing body (each jurisdiction must officially adopt the plan).

Therefore, with a full understanding of the obligations incurred by an agreement between the Lead Jurisdiction and the Participating Jurisdiction, I Jim Abbott, commit Windsor Severance Fire Rescue to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning effort.

Executed this 6th day of January, 2015





Appendix C – Local Jurisdiction Mitigation Outreach





As a participating member of the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team, you can help ensure a successful planning process by helping to inform your communities about this process and the ultimate goal of a more resilient Larimer County. Please leverage any opportunities that you may have to inform your jurisdictional staff and the public about this important project (<u>www.LarimerHMP2016.com</u>).

When opportunities do arise to hold internal meetings or to provide outreach to groups of citizens, it is important to document these interactions so that they can be mentioned in the plan document. During the course of the planning process, please help to document these interactions with the public using the brief form below.

| Jurisdiction/Organization: | LARIMER COUNTY |
|--|---|
| Meeting / Event : | PUBLIC OPEN HOWE FOR MITIGATION PLAN |
| Date: | 7/27/2015 |
| Location: | FORT COLLIUS POLICE SVES BLOG 2221 S. TIMBERLIUE RD, FORT COLLIUS CO |
| Brief Description of outreach performed: | |
| | OPEN HOUSE TO OUTLINE THE PLANNING PROCESS, |
| | TALK ABOUT RISK ASSESSMENT & IMPORTANCE |
| | OF MITIGATION PLANNING |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |





As a participating member of the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team, you can help ensure a successful planning process by helping to inform your communities about this process and the ultimate goal of a more resilient Larimer County. Please leverage any opportunities that you may have to inform your jurisdictional staff and the public about this important project (<u>www.LarimerHMP2016.com</u>).

When opportunities do arise to hold internal meetings or to provide outreach to groups of citizens, it is important to document these interactions so that they can be mentioned in the plan document. During the course of the planning process, please help to document these interactions with the public using the brief form below.

| Jurisdiction/Organization: | LARIMER COUNTY |
|---|--|
| Meeting / Event : | HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING MITG |
| Date: | 10/16/2015 |
| Location: | 200 W. OAK ST, FORT CULLINS CO |
| Brief Description of outreach performed: | COUNITY STAFF MTS TO DISCUSS THE PLAN & POSSIBLE MITIGATION ACTIONS |
| | |





As a participating member of the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team, you can help ensure a successful planning process by helping to inform your communities about this process and the ultimate goal of a more resilient Larimer County. Please leverage any opportunities that you may have to inform your jurisdictional staff and the public about this important project (www.LarimerHMP2016.com).

When opportunities do arise to hold internal meetings or to provide outreach to groups of citizens, it is important to document these interactions so that they can be mentioned in the plan document. During the course of the planning process, please help to document these interactions with the public using the brief form below.

| Jurisdiction/Organization: | |
|--|--|
| | Loveland * |
| Meeting / Event : | Loveland MAG development |
| Date: | September 28, 2015 |
| Location: | |
| | Loveland Library Erion Room |
| Brief Description of outreach performed: | Refresher on HMP project and comparisons with the Mitigation Strategy Master Plan project. |
| | Began developing a list of potential Mitigation Actions. |
| | *Participating jurisdictions: |
| | City of Loveland |
| | Thompson Valley EMS |
| | Loveland Fire Rescue Authority |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |



As a participating member of the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team, you can help ensure a successful planning process by helping to inform your communities about this process and the ultimate goal of a more resilient Larimer County. Please leverage any opportunities that you may have to inform your jurisdictional staff and the public about this important project (<u>www.LarimerHMP2016.com</u>).

When opportunities do arise to hold internal meetings or to provide outreach to groups of citizens, it is important to document these interactions so that they can be mentioned in the plan document. During the course of the planning process, please help to document these interactions with the public using the brief form below.

| Jurisdiction/Organization: | LARIMER COUNTY |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | BERTHOUD FIRE / TOWN OF BEAThoud |
| Meeting / Event : | |
| | HAZARD MITIGATION MIAN |
| Date: | 1 1 2 1 2 |
| | Thuasday Octobser 15, 2015 |
| Location: | |
| | 328 MASSACHUSE HES AVE. DEATHOUDE (O |
| Brief Description of outreach | 80513 |
| performed: | DISCUSSED 11AZARD M. FIGATION |
| | Al. I d al hartigat a chigar Guide |
| | MAN & MITIGLUION ACTION COULD |
| | SPEC.F. CAlly |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |





Vitable County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

As a participating member of the Wett County Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee (HMPC), you serve as a vital link between the county and its businesses and residents. Individual jurisdictional and organizational representatives can help ensure a successful planning process by helping to inform your communities about this process and the ultimate goal of a more resilient Weld County. Please leverage any opportunities that you may have to inform the public about this important project (www.WeldHMP2016.com).

When opportunities do arise to outreach to groups of citizens, it is important to document these public interactions so that they can be mentioned in the plan document. During the course of the planning process, please help to document these interactions with the public using the brief form below.

| Jurisdiction/Organization: | CITY OF FORT Collins/POUDRE FIRET |
|--|--|
| Meeting / Event : | |
| Date: | |
| Location: | VARIOUS Presentiations to Discuss Plen |
| Brief Description of outreach performed: | Public Recting - Jul-172015 |
| Forebook. | Better Business Bureau - July 2516, 2015 75 catterieled |
| FC/DEM INTO | FAMILY SAFETY & Emergency Prepared NPSS |
| | EX70 - SEPT 2015 450 ATTENded- |
| | HAD A booth TO Explain tgAther INPUT- (PFA, Loveland, LAVIMEr COUNTY) |
| | Poudre Fize/DEM Website |
| | has into on planning process |
| | City MitigAtion Action Planning |
| | OCT 12, 2015 22 PARTICIPANTS |
| | CITI Executive Leadership Texm Meeting - 1 |





Font Fort Collins HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING Oct. 12, 2015 GREG YEAGER FCPS greager Cfegov.com Mort Kempton Fat Collins mkempton@fesor-com JIII Oropeza COFC joropezale fagor.com Chris Doneson Fast Collins Conegon Regor, Man mjackson e faqov.com dyreen e Afagou.com Mark Jackson Coty FC- POT Dianne Green COFC Matt Zoccali COFC mzoccali etcyov.com Carol A Welto Cof FC CWebbe Fegior.com Capter Copter Cgoodwin efegar.com CHRIS LOCHRA CITY Clochra@Fregor.com ClaireGoodwin Carrie Williams City Del BERNUS AS- Cory Konsing Cawilliams (a) figur, con decembre rol Le fi gos, com Dianne C. Tjalkens CoFC dtjalkens@feger.com Clint Andreus (OFC candreus @ regor.row Day Coldiron, COFC dcoldiron@regor.row Light & Power twalker & Feger. com Travis Walker Civid TERRI KUNYAN truny prod figur ion





WAME DE PT Heidi Hansen Fort Collins Utilities Stormwater Marshe Himes-Robinson FI. Collins Utilities Stormwater





As a participating member of the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Large Planning Team, you can help ensure a successful planning process by helping to inform your communities about this process and the ultimate goal of a more resilient Larimer County. Please leverage any opportunities that you may have to inform your jurisdictional staff and the public about this important project (<u>www.LarimerHMP2016.com</u>).

When opportunities do arise to hold internal meetings or to provide outreach to groups of citizens, it is important to document these interactions so that they can be mentioned in the plan document. During the course of the planning process, please help to document these interactions with the public using the brief form below.

| Jurisdiction/Organization: | Livermore Fire Protection District and Larimer County Office of Emergency Management |
|---|--|
| Meeting / Event : | HMP Planning Meeting - Webinar |
| Date: | 11/1/2015 |
| Location: | Larimer County - Webinar |
| Brief Description of outreach performed: | This one-hour webinar was designed to provide comprehensive planning information to jurisdictions unable to attend the final planning meeting on October 20, 2015. Livermore Fire Protection District was the only jurisdiction that participated. The webinar included information regarding: Project Website Review FEMA Hazard Mitigation Planning Resources Hazard and Risk Assessment and Risk Mapping Data Planning Goals and Objectives Community Profile Information Plan Review Requirements Development of Mitigation Actions |





Page <u>f</u> of <u>f</u>

NOTICE: The City of Fort Colline will use the contact information you provide on this sign in sheet to deliver any additional information related to the topic of this meeting to you. This sign in sheet and the contact information you provide (except ornal addresses) is considered a public record.

| Project: H | fazard Miligation (| Open House 12/2 | ting Date: /2015 | | |
|----------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| Facilitator; N | like Gavin – PFA, Iaraha Hilmee-Fok at Maily – City of I | Lorl Hodges - Lorimer County, 200 W oinson - City of Fort Collins, Larim Loveland Build | d/Room: / Oak SI. er County | | |
| Name | | Address | Zip Code | E-Mail | Phone |
| Linnin He | neren | 4726 Shaveno Dr. | OSSOG | change abor Defequences | 810-010 |
| Umi Clay | Well | 5101 WHANS PEAK DR. APTIN | BESOB E | Usmi clay web Obarmerkan | K CANN 1970. 820-904 |
| (Loni Hedge | | 2012 Aroused St. H. Continu | 32208 | hodgests @ co. Connisco. un | 303-656-8214 |
| Marshatabi | (veron- | 4207 Rockites (t. Ft. Collin | 4 805-24 | millime stabing on of figure. | 970-224-6026 |
| Pa+ Miray | | 5275 Crubymic et Luid | 81509 | Pat, mich Oc. i Jul tour lang | h/12 e-ch#-o/b |
| STATE. | 1 | Silli CANTAWAY DA | Ses06 | Row Derridowin S. m | 324143578 |
| Will Note- | | 1224 Twin Cak Cot | 80525 | Wwelch Cristweth in | - 9 NO- 215-409 |
| | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | | |





ort Collins

2016 LARIMER MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL

HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE

Appendix D – Additional Fort Collins CRS Documentation













15

Fort Collins Utilities



POLICY NUMBER AND TITLE: UOPS 2.0 SUBSTANTIAL DAMAGE POLICY

ORIGINATOR'S NAME AND TITLE: Marshe Hilmes-Robinson, Floodplain Administrator

LOCATION OF DOCUMENT: S/STAFF/Policies and Procedures/POLICIES-APPROVED/UOPS-UTILITIES OPERATIONS POLICIES/UOPS 2.0 Substantial Damage Policy

INITIAL ADOPTION DATE: February 3, 2012

REVISION HISTORY (Last revision listed represents the version correctly in effect):

| Name | Date | Reason for Change | Version Suffix |
|------|------|-------------------|----------------|
| | | | .01 |
| | | | .02 |
| | | | .03 |
| | | | .04 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 1 | i | | |

REVIEW SCHEDULE: Annual

ATTACHMENTS:

A 40 A

- 1. Sample Property Owner Notification Letter
- Substantial Damage Review Requirements for Applications to Repair Damaged Structures in the 100-year Floodplain
- 3. Owner's Affidavit
- 4. Contractor's Affidavit
- 5. Damage Evaluation Form
- 6. Sample Substantial Damage Determination Notification

REFERENCES:

 City of Fort Collins Municipal Code, Chapter 10, "Flood Prevention and Protection".

 "Substantial Improvement/Substantial Damage Desk Reference," FEMA P-758, May 2010.

PURPOSE: To establish a uniform policy for calculating Substantial Damage as related to the City's floodplain management ordinance in Chapter 10 of City Code.

Page 1

WARNING! Print copies may reflect an out-of-date version. This document is uncontrolled when printed.





Flood Response Projects

During and after a flood, Utilities will implement specific flood response projects as indicated in <u>Table 9</u>.

TABLE 9 - FLOOD RESPONSE PROJECTS

| | Flood Response Projects | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Projects | Message Topics | Audience | Stakeholder Support | Action | | | | |
| Website | Know Your Flood Hazard Protect People from Hazard Protect Property from Hazard Insure Your Property Build Responsibly Floodplain Regulations Flood warning Basement Flooding Drive Safe | General Residents and owners in 100-year floodplain Flooded homes and businesses Building design professionals | Utilities FEMA Red Cross | During and after a flood: Post information on City website and provide links to additional FEMA and Red Cross resources. | | | | |
| Brochure Displays | Know Your Flood Hazard Protect People from Hazard Protect Property from Hazard Insure Your Property Build Responsibly Floodplain Regulations | General Flooded homes and businesses Building design professionals | Utilities Red Cross FEMA | After a flood: Set up displays at locations around town with brochures for the public. Provide brochures. | | | | |
| Social Media | Know Your Flood Hazard Protect People from Hazard Protect Property from Hazard Insure Your Property Build Responsibly Floodplain Regulations Flood warning Basement Flooding Drive Safe | General Residents and owners in 100-year floodplain Flooded homes and businesses Building design professionals | • Utilities | During and after a flood: Send social media messages via Facebook/Twitter. | | | | |

Chapter 6: Flood Response Public Information





City of Fort Collins Flood Mitigation

Floodplain Management Program Goal

The goal of the City of Fort Collins floodplain management program is to take a proactive, comprehensive approach to dealing with potential loss of life and property damage due to flooding. Components of this program are:

- Drainage Basin Master Planning that evaluates the flood risk and examines alternatives to mitigate the risk.
- Floodplain regulations and development criteria that attempt to balance risk with regulation
- Cost effective capital projects to reduce the flood hazard.
- Educational outreach efforts to promote awareness of the flood hazard and water quality issues.
- Drainage system maintenance so that facilities can function in a flood.
- Flood warning system maintenance and technical assistance to the Office of Emergency Management for flood response.

Hazard Mitigation Planning Process

The Drainage Basin Master Planning Effort

The Drainage Basin Master Planning Effort

The City of Fort Collins has 12 drainage basins: the Cache la Poudre, Dry Creek, Cooper Slough/Boxelder, West Vine, Old Town, Canal Importation, Spring Creek, Foothills, Mail Creek, Fox Meadows, McClellands and Fossil Creek. All have flooded in the past for various reasons and have different features that must be taken into account when considering safety. The Drainage Basin Master Plan, approved by City Council in June 2004, describes the flooding history of each basin, identifies potential problem areas and recommends improvements. There are continuous updates occurring for each of the plans.

In addition, the Master Plan:

- Recommends cost-effective projects to remove properties from floodplains, reduce risk and reduce street flooding
- Offers guidance for new development in the basins
- Provides ways to enhance the riparian habitat along stream corridors and improve water quality
- Offers guidance to stabilize streams where necessary

The City updated the Master Plan and floodplain maps after the 1997 flood, including criteria for a "100year storm." During the update process, officials determined that approximately 2,745 structures and numerous roads would be damaged in the event of such a storm. The total estimated cost of damage would be \$139.6 million. Numerous improvements were recommended in the plan and construction of all improvements is expected to occur by 2036. The Master Plan called for more than 2,300 structures to be removed from the 100-year floodplain and flood damages are estimated to be reduced by approximately \$289 million. In 2012, the master plans were updated to include a stream rehabilitation program and also identified necessary regional Best Management Practices (BMPs).





The Fort Collins Utilities Stormwater Master Planning Department was in charge of the overall drainage basin master planning. Consultants were used to develop the floodplain maps and to assist in evaluating the problems and potential solutions. In addition to the City master planning staff, representatives from numerous other City departments (Emergency Management, Engineering, Parks, Natural Resources, Advanced Planning, Current Planning, Transportation) and outside agencies (Irrigation Ditch companies, Larimer County Engineering Department, Poudre School District, and Colorado State University) were brought together several times throughout the process to review information and provide input. All property owners and renters who were identified as being in the floodplain were sent information about the flooding hazard and then invited to an open house for their basin. In addition, numerous presentations were made to the various City boards and commissions as well as local organizations and special interest groups. Some of the these groups included the Chamber of Commerce, Home Builders Association, Affordable Housing, Kiwanas, several Home Owners Associations, etc. The City's website also had information about the drainage basin planning process.

Hazard Assessment by Drainage Basin

General Information

Figure 1 is a city-wide map of stormwater basins in Fort Collins. Individual maps of the floodplain for each of the 12 basins are shown as part of the basin description. Four of these drainage basins have Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated floodplains and seven basins have City-designated floodplains (Table 1). One of those basins, Fox Meadows, does not have any mapped floodplains.

There are approximately 3,700 acres in the mapped 100-year floodplain. However, over 1,600 of those acres are preserved as open space in the form of parks or natural areas.

The effective FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map is dated May 2, 2012. FEMA is in the process of remapping the Cache la Poudre River as part of RiskMAP. Each of the City-designated floodplains was developed as part of the Drainage Basin Master Planning process. The floodplain maps can be viewed on the Fort Collins Utilities' website at fcgov.com/floodplain-maps. These maps are continuously updated.

| FEMA-designated Floodplains | City-designated Floodplains |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Cache la Poudre River (Poudre River) | Old Town |
| Spring Creek | West Vine Basin |
| Dry Creek | Canal Importation Basin |
| Boxelder Creek and | Fossil Creek |
| eooper blough | Foothills Channel |
| | Mail Creek |
| | McClellands Creek |

Table 1 - FEMA and City-designated floodplains

In addition to mapping floodplains, the City also has mapped Erosion Buffer Zones on Fossil Creek and Boxelder Creek. These Buffer Zones designate areas of channel instability and potential future lateral migration of the channel.





Fort Collins has a total of 1,015 structures located in the mapped 100-year floodplain. These structures are divided between the basins as shown in Table 5. More than half of the total at-risk structures are located in the Old Town Floodplain, which is subject to street flooding since there are no remaining natural drainageways to convey the water. During the past 15 years, Old Town has been the location of several large capital improvement projects to install large storm sewers that capture storm runoff and convey it to the Poudre River. However, there are many structures, both residential and nonresidential, still at risk. Other basins with high numbers of structures at risk include the Poudre River, Spring Creek and West Vine.

Of the structures in the 100-year floodplain:

- 83 percent are one-to-four family residential structures
- 2 percent are multi-family
- 15 percent are non-residential structures

There also are several critical facilities at risk in the 100-year and 500-year floodplain.





| Floodplain Name | Physical structures greater than 500 sq. ft. |
|-----------------------------|---|
| FEMA Ba | isins |
| Boxelder / Cooper Slough | 40 |
| Dry Creek | 25 |
| Poudre River | 63 |
| Spring Creek | 81 |
| FEMA Basin TOTAL | 209 |
| City Bas | sins |
| Canal Importation | 156* |
| Foothills | 5 |
| Fossil Creek | 20 |
| Mail Creek | 0 |
| McClelland's Creek | 0 |
| Old Town | 538 |
| West Vine | 87 |
| City Basin TOTAL | 981 |
| | |
| TOTAL (all basins) | 1015 |

Table 2 - Structures in Floodplains

*Estimated value. Waiting for final mapping for this basin.







Figure 1 – City Stormwater Basins





Dry Creek Basin

Dry Creek, a tributary to the Poudre River, extends from near the Wyoming border to where it joins the river near Mulberry and Timberline. The Dry Creek Basin is approximately 23 miles long and six miles wide, encompassing approximately 62 square-miles. The upper and middle portions of the basin are primarily used as rangeland, irrigated hay meadows and pastures. The majority of the lower basin is developed for commercial, industrial and residential uses. The natural channel has disappeared in some areas of the lower basin because of development.

Dry Creek is a FEMA-designated floodplain and is subject to the City's floodplain regulations. The new mapping also includes areas beyond the FEMA floodplain which are considered to be in a City-designated floodplain.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - While there is no history of flooding in the upper and middle portions of the basin, a large storm could threaten the lower basin. In the lower basin, there are 614 structures, nine roads, Larimer and Weld Canal and one railroad that would be damaged during a 100-year storm event, with an estimated \$24.4 million in damage. If nothing is done to mitigate this damage, it is estimated that \$21.6 million of damage would occur over the next 50 years.

Minor flooding has occurred in the lower portion of the basin due to inadequate or non-existent drainage facilities. Areas south of the Larimer and Weld Canal would be flooded if the canal were overtopped during a large storm. Areas of potential flooding include, but are not limited to:

- Airpark business area, including the runway and several hangars;
- Several mobile home parks and neighborhoods;
- Vine Drive, College Avenue, Lemay Avenue, and Mulberry Street; and
- Redwood and Conifer Streets intersection.

Summary of Road Overtopping Depths and Velocities for the 100-year Event Dry Creek Basin

| Location | Over-topping Elevation (ft) | Flow Depth (ft) | Velocity (ft/sec) | Flow Depth times Velocity |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Lemay Ave north of Vine Drive (Dry Creek Lower flowpath) | 4947.8 | 1.2 | 4.8 | 5.8 |
| Vine Drive and Dry Creek (Dry Creek Lower flowpath) | 4941.0 | 3.3 | 2.1 | 6.9 |
| Lincoln and Dry Creek near Timberline (Dry Creek Lower flowpath) | 4919.0 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.4 |
| Mulberry and Dry Creek near Timberline (Dry Creek Lower flowpath): | 4918.7 | 1.0 | 4.4 | 4.4 |

Canal Spills - There are several locations along the canals in the Dry Creek basin that have the potential to overtop and spill or where there is excess flow during storm events. These include:

- Larimer and Weld Canal at the Pond 6 Overflow,
- Larimer and Weld Canal at Black Hollow,
- Larimer and Weld Canal at Waterfield,
- The Lake Lindenmeier Overflow, and
- Lake Canal (various locations).





• Critical Facilities – In general, flooding and overtopping of roadways in the North College area have been removed with the Dry Creek Flood Control Project. All of the critical facilities previously listed have also been removed. There is still some danger of overtopping and flooding of critical facilities in storm events that exceed the 100-year design storm







Boxelder Creek and Cooper Slough Basins





The Boxelder Creek and Cooper Slough Basins encompass approximately 265 square miles beginning at the Colorado/Wyoming border, extending southward into east Fort Collins and ending at the Cache la Poudre River. The basins are primarily characterized by farmland with isolated areas of mixed-use residential development and limited commercial development.

These basins are interconnected. Floodwaters from Boxelder Creek Basin can spill into Cooper Slough Basin upstream of Vine Drive. Most of the water from Cooper Slough drains into Boxelder Creek at Prospect Road, near the downstream end of the basins.

Storm runoff from the upper 186 square miles of the basin is controlled by a series of flood control reservoirs. However, the lower 80 square miles of the basin can generate a substantial amount of runoff contributing to flooding along Boxelder Creek and the Cooper Slough on both sides of I-25. A portion of this runoff crosses I-25 through the Larimer and Weld Canal and also contributes to flooding problems on the west side of the interstate.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - The master plan update estimated that 134 structures would be damaged during a 100year storm with the most significant structural damage at the State Highway 14 and I-25 intersection. There are also 18 roads within the basin that would be overtopped during a 100-year storm. The master plan update estimated there would be \$23 million in damages during a 100-year storm. If nothing is done to mitigate this damage, it is estimated that \$62 million of damage would occur over the next 50-years.

In addition to flooding hazards, erosion has occurred because of natural processes, agricultural practices and urban development. Excessive erosion leads to poor water quality; damage to adjacent property, roads and utilities; and reduced biological diversity to support riparian habitat.





Summary of Hydraulic Data at

Stream Crossings

| | | | 100-Year Channel | 100-Year | | Roadway | Overtoppin | g Depth (ft) | |
|---|--|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------|---------|------------|--------------|----------|
| Location | Structure Size & Type | Structure Capacity | Velocity (fps)ª | WSE (ft, NGVD) [♭] | 2-Year | 5-Year | 10-Year | 50-Year | 100-Year |
| Boxelder Creek | | | | | | | | | |
| Boxelder Sanitation District Access Road | 3 - 7' High Pipe Arches | No Overtopping Occurs | 6.9 | 4872.5 | | | | | |
| Prospect Road | 1 - 3' High * 14' Wide Box Culvert | 5-Year | 8.2 | 4902.2 | | | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.1 |
| I-25, South of Mulberry St. | 2 - 10' Wide * 6.5' High Box Culverts | 10-Year | 5.4 | 4917.7 | | | | | |
| Mulberry St. (SH 14) | 3 - 21' Wide * 7.5' High Box Culverts | No Overtopping Occurs | 12.5 | 4931.2 | | | | | |
| Vine Drive (CR 48) | 1 - 6' Diameter CMP | 10-Year | 2.8 | 4969.2 | | | | 1.0 | 1.2 |
| Mountain Vista Dr. (CR 50) | 1 - 7' Diameter CMP | 2-Year | 9.6 | 4989.5 | | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| County Road 52 | 1 - 7' Diameter RCP | 5-Year | 7.6 | 5021.3 | | | 0.3 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| County Road 54 | 2 - 14' Wide * 8' High Box Culverts | 10-Year | 8.2 | 5051.2 | | | | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Boxelder Creek Overfl | ow | | • | | | | | | |
| Mulberry St. | No Culvert at this location. | N/A | 4.6 | 4934.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.2 |
| C & S Railroad | No Culvert at this location. | N/A | 4.7 | 4946.5 | | | | 1.0 | 1.5 |
| Vine Drive (CR 48) | No Culvert at this location. | N/A | 5.6 | 4967.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| Mountain Vista Dr. (CR 50) | 1 - 11' Wide * 6' High Box Culvert & | 50-Year | 8.9 | 4996.7 | | | | | 0.7 |
| County Road 52 | No Culvert at this location. | N/A | 7.6 | 5021.3 | | | 0.3 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| Boxelder Split Flow Pa | th | | • | | | | | | |
| I-25 Northbound Lane at CR 42 | No Culvert at this location. | N/A | 0.7 | 4902.8 | | | | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| I-25 Frontage Rd. South of Prospect Rd. | No Culvert at this location. | N/A | 3.9 | 4902.8 | | | | 1.9 | 2.8 |
| Prospect Road | No Culvert at this location. | N/A | 6.2 | 4908.2 | | | | 1.6 | 2.1 |



| | | Standard Concesitor | 100-Year Channel | 100-Year | Roadway Overtopping Depth (ft) | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|----------|--|
| Location | Structure Size & Type | Structure Capacity | Velocity (fps)ª | wse (ft, NGVD)⁵ | 2-Year | 5-Year | 10-Year | 50-Year | 100-Year | |
| I-25 Frontage Rd. North of Prospect Rd. | No Culvert at this location. | N/A | 2.3 | 4909.6 | | | | 1.0 | 1.6 | |
| Cooper Slough | | | | | | | | | | |
| Emergency Access Road in Waterglen | 2 - 10' Wide * 3' High Box Culverts | 10-Year | 0.8 | 4973.3 | | | | 0.3 | 1.3 | |
| Vine Drive | 2 - 3.5' Diameter RCP's | 50-Year | 1.3 | 4957.0 | | | | 0.3 | 1.0 | |
| C & S Railroad | 1 - 2' Diameter CMP | 10-Year | 0.2 | 4943.0 | | | | 0.5 | 1.0 | |
| Mulberry St. | 2 - 4' Diameter CMP's | 2-Year | 0.1 | 4928.0 | | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.6 | |

^a Downstream of Structure

^b Upstream of Structure



Summary of Detention Pond

Operating Parameters

| | | | | 100- | Year Event | Operating Para | meters | |
|--|------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 7.1.4.1 Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate Location | Normal Outlet Discharge (cfs) | Overtopping Discharge (cfs) | Total Release (cfs) | Emergency Spillway/ Flow Depth (ft) | Approximate Width of Overtopping (ft.) | Ponded Water Surface Elevation (ft, NGVD) |
| South Gray Reservoir | 402 | North of CR 50, and West of Boxelder Creek | N/A | 278.2 | 278.2 | 1.2 | | Gage Height =20.7 ft |
| North Gray Reservoir | 401 | North of CR 50, and West of Boxelder Creek | N/A | 65.2 | 65.2 | 1.6 | | Gage Height = 15.7 ft |
| Waterglen Pond (A) | 470 | East of Elgin Place in Waterglen, West of Cooper Slough | 2 | N/A | 2 | N/A | N/A | 4961.0 |
| Waterglen Pond (B) | 471 | East of Cullen Court in Waterglen, West of Cooper Slough | 2.4 | 3.6 | 6 | 0.1 | 56.0 | 4957.2 |
| Waterglen Pond (C) | 472 | South of Gardenwall Court in Waterglen, East of Cooper Slough | 4.3 | 13.4 | 17.7 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 4964.7 |
| Waterglen Pond (D) | 473 | South of Bannoch Street in Waterglen, East of Cooper Slough | 15.1 | N/A | 15.1 | N/A | N/A | 4959.4 |
| Waterglen Pond (E) | 474 | North of Vine Drive, East of Cooper Slough | 43.5 | 46 | 89.5 | 0.2 | 210.0 | 4955.2 |
| Inadvertent Detention behind Vine Dr. & CSRR | 416 | N.E. Corner of Vine Dr. and C&S Railroad | N/A | 144.3 | 144.3 | 0.3 | 730.0 | 4964.3 |
| Story Book Patio Homes On-Site Detention Pond | 424 | N.E. Corner of Mountain Vista Dr. & CR 11 | 8.6 | 17.6 | 26.2 | 0.4 | 23.0 | 5010.8 |
| Anheuser Busch Regional Detention Pond | 425 | North of Waterglen, West of I-25, and South of Mountain Vista Dr. | 455.1 | 455.1 | 455.1 | 3.0 | 45.0 | 4978.6 |
| C&S Railroad, West of Waterglen | 426 | West of C&S Railroad, just West of Waterglen | 20.4 | 895.1 | 915.5 | 2.6 | 890.0 | 4986.6 |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 50 & CR 9 | 427 | N.W. Corner of CR 50 & CR 9 | 10.9 | 156.4 | 167.3 | 0.5 | 420.0 | 4988.7 |
| Story Book Patio Homes Detention/Retention Pond | 428 | Adjacent to the No. 8 Ditch, and North of Mountain Vista Dr. | 203.4 | 203.4 | 203.4 | 0.8 | 86.0 | 4997.8 |



| | | | | 100- | Year Event | Operating Para | meters | |
|--|------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 7.1.4.1 Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate Location | Normal Outlet Discharge (cfs) | Overtopping Discharge (cfs) | Total Release (cfs) | Emergency Spillway/ Flow Depth (ft) | Approximate Width of Overtopping (ft.) | Ponded Water Surface Elevation (ft, NGVD) |
| Anheuser Busch On-Site Detention Pond | 430 | North of Mountain Vista Dr., West of I-25 | 34.1 | 34.1 | 34.1 | 0.3 | 30.0 | 4993.8 |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 50 & CSRR | 431 | N.W. Corner of CR 50 & C&S Railroad | 8.1 | 1660.1 | 1668.2 | 1.5 | 750.0 | 4991.5 |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 50 & CR 9 | 432 | West side of CR 9, North of CR 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 52 & I-25 | 435 | North of CR 52, West of I-25 | 58.8 | 365.4 | 424.2 | 0.8 | 320.0 | 5026.8 |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 52, b/w CR 9 and C&SRR | 436 | North of CR 52, between CR 9 and C&S Railroad | 13.3 | 1316.4 | 1329.7 | 1.2 | 700.0 | 5024.1 |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 9 & CR 52 | 437 | S.W. Corner of CR 9 and CR 52 | 10.2 | 347.9 | 358.1 | 0.8 | 340.0 | 5025.8 |
| Inadvertent Detention Area North of CR 52 on Turf farm | 438 | North of CR 52, East of the No. 8 Ditch | N/A | 75.7 | 75.7 | 0.2 | 330.0 | 5030.2 |
| Richard's Lake P.U.D. | 441 | N.W. Corner of CR 11 and CR 52 | N/A | N/A | 5.3 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 11 & CR 54 | 446 | West side of CR 11, South of CR 54 | 19.8 | 467.7 | 487.5 | 0.8 | 550.0 | 5066 |



Summary of Detention Pond

Overtopping Data

| Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate Location | Potential Flooding Scenario | Potential Flooding Scenario if the Normal Outlet is Blocked |
|--|------------|--|---|--|
| South Gray Reservoir | 402 | North of CR 50, and West of Boxelder Creek | Spills directly into Boxelder Creek | Spills directly into Boxelder Creek |
| North Gray Reservoir | 401 | North of CR 50, and West of Boxelder Creek | Spills directly into Boxelder Creek | Spills directly into Boxelder Creek |
| Waterglen Pond (A) | 470 | East of Elgin Place in Waterglen, West of Cooper Slough | Discharges to Cooper Slough through pipe outlet | Discharges to Cooper Slough through emergency spillway |
| Waterglen Pond (B) | 471 | East of Cullen Court in Waterglen, | Discharges to Cooper Slough through pipe outlet, | Discharges to Cooper Slough |
| | | West of Cooper Slough | and emergency spillway | through emergency spillway |
| Waterglen Pond (C) | 472 | South of Gardenwall Court in Waterglen, | Discharges to Cooper Slough through pipe outlet, | Discharges to Cooper Slough |
| | | East of Cooper Slough | and emergency spillway | through emergency spillway |
| Waterglen Pond (D) | 473 | South of Bannoch Street in Waterglen, | Discharges to Cooper Slough through pipe outlet | Discharges to Cooper Slough |
| | | East of Cooper Slough | | through emergency spillway |
| Waterglen Pond (E) | 474 | North of Vine Drive, East of Cooper Slough | Discharges to Cooper Slough through pipe outlet, | Discharges to Cooper Slough |
| | | | and emergency spillway | through emergency spillway |
| Inadvertent Detention behind Vine Dr. | 416 | N.E. Corner of Vine Dr. and C&S Railroad | Overtops Vine Drive and flows to the south across field, may be some flow to the west along Vine Dr. | Overtops Vine Drive and flows to the south across |
| & CSRR | | | | field, may be some flow to the west along Vine Dr. |
| Story Book Patio Homes On-Site Detention Pond | 424 | N.E. Corner of Mountain Vista Dr. & CR 11 | Overtops emergency spillway and flows into an open graded ditch which leads into the No. 8 Ditch | Increased flow depth through emergency |
| | | | | spillway and flows into an open graded |
| | | | | ditch which leads into the No. 8 Ditch |
| Anheuser Busch Regional Detention Pond | 425 | North of Waterglen, West of I-25, | Flows into the Larimer & Weld Canal | Flows would move to the east |
| | | and South of Mountain Vista Dr. | through a concrete spill structure | into an adjacent open field |
| C&S Railroad , | 426 | West of C&S Railroad, just West of Waterglen | Overtops the C&S Railroad to the south west, | Overtops the C&S Railroad to the south west, |
| West of Waterglen | | | and ultimately flows into the L&W Canal | and ultimately flows into the L&W Canal |



| L | ARIMER CO | | | |
|--|------------|--|---|--|
| Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate Location | Potential Flooding Scenario | Potential Flooding Scenario if the Normal Outlet is Blocked |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 50 & CR 9 | 427 | N.W. Corner of CR 50 & CR 9 | Overtops CR 50 and flows to the south through an open field | Overtops CR 50 and flows to the south through an open field |
| Story Book Patio Homes Detention/ Retention Pond | 428 | Adjacent to the No. 8 Ditch, and North of Mountain Vista Dr. | Overtops emergency spillway and flows into the No. 8 Ditch | Overtops emergency spillway and flows into the No. 8 ditch |
| Anheuser Busch On-Site Detention Pond | 430 | North of Mountain Vista Dr., West of I-25 | Overtops emergency spillway and flows into downstream channel | Increased flow depth through emergency spillway and flows into downstream channel |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 50 & CSRR | 431 | N.W. Corner of CR 50 & C&S Railroad | Overtops CR 50 and flows to the south through an open field - one structure threatened | Overtops CR 50 and flows to the south through an open field - one structure threatened |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 50 & CR 9 | 432 | West side of CR 9, North of CR 50 | None - all flows contained within pond | Overtops CR 9 and flows to the east into an open field |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 52 & I-25 | 435 | North of CR 52, West of I-25 | Overtops CR 52 and flows to the south into Anheuser Busch Brewery | Overtops CR 52 and flows to the south into Anheuser Busch Brewery |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 52, b/w CR 9 and C&SRR | 436 | North of CR 52, between CR 9 and C&S Railroad | Overtops CR 52 and flows to the south through Anheuser Busch | Overtops CR 52 and flows to the south through Anheuser Busch |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 9 & CR 52 | 437 | S.W. Corner of CR 9 and CR 52 | Overtops CR 9 and flows to the east into an open field | Overtops CR 9 and flows to the east into an open field |
| Inadvertent Detention Area North of CR 52 on Turf Farm | 438 | North of CR 52, East of the No. 8 Ditch | Flows southeast towards the intersection of CR 52 and CR 9 | Flows southeast towards the intersection of CR 52 and CR 9 |
| Richard's Lake P.U.D. | 441 | N.W. Corner of CR 11 and CR 52 | N/A - Combined four ponds into one pond release | N/A - Combined four ponds into one pond release |
| Inadvertent Detention behind CR 11 & CR 54 | 446 | West side of CR 11, South of CR 54 | Overtops CR 11 and flows to the east through an open field | Overtops CR 11 and flows to the east through an open field |


Critical Facilities - No critical facilities would be directly impacted by the 100-year flood flows but access would be compromised for an electrical substation located north of the Larimer and Weld Canal and east of I-25.







Poudre River Basin

The Cache la Poudre River, a major tributary to the South Platte River, is located in Larimer and Weld Counties, with a small portion of the drainage basin extending into southern Wyoming. Passing through Fort Collins, the Poudre River corridor provides for stormwater drainage from various contributing City drainage basins.

Floodplain restrictions have limited the amount of building in the floodplain, resulting in lower development density. This lower density, combined with sensitivities to the natural environment, has resulted in a high concentration of parks and open space along the river corridor. Portions of the river corridor also contain old industrial sites, reflecting a time when the river was seen as a convenient means of carrying off waste products.

Many of the city's natural areas are located within the Poudre River corridor. The riparian ecosystem provides important habitat for a variety of wildlife and also contains diverse vegetation that is both biologically and aesthetically valuable. The biological diversity, along with the sheer length of mostly undeveloped land, create a critical habitat of regional significance.

The Poudre River has the longest amount of warning time of any of the drainage basins in Fort Collins. This is because most flooding will be a result of snowmelt in the upper basin. The travel time from the mouth of Poudre Canyon to the city is approximately 2 hours.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - Approximately 3,160 acres of floodplain between Taft Hill Road and I-25 would be inundated by a 100-year flood, damaging approximately 188 structures. Estimates indicate that damages to property, utilities and infrastructure caused by the 100-year flood would total \$9.5 million, with expected annual damages of \$460,000. Additional damages would be expected due to significant erosion.

Riverbank conditions vary widely both in terms of their ecological condition and structural stability. Some sections have stable banks and a well-developed floodplain with developing riparian zones. Other sections have been stabilized but are not aesthetically pleasing and provide little wildlife benefit. Still other sections have steep, eroding banks with concrete embankments and little vegetation.

| Summary of Bridge Data Within the Study Reach. | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---------|---|---|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Inventory of Bridges | | | | | | | | |
| Location | Station ¹ (ft) | Type of | 100-year Water Surface Elevation (ft.msl) | Highest Roadway Crown Elevation on Bridge (ft.msl) | Low Chord Elevation (ft.msl) | Minimum Overbank Elevation (ff. msl) | 100-Year Velocity Thru Bridge (fns) | Frequency of Flows Required to Inundate Bridge Low Chord (vrs) |
| I-25 | 189498 | R.C. | 4850.88 | 4853.2 | 4949.2 | 4853.2 | 6.77 | 11 |
| BNRR | 193727 | W.T. | 4863.00 | 4863.2 | 4860.8 | 4960.0 | 3.40 | 45 |
| Haul Road | 196897 | W.&S. | 4865.61 | 4868.4 | 4862.0 | 4860.0 | 4.93 | 3 |
| Haul Road | 200990 | W.&S. | 4873.60 | 4877.9 | 4873.2 | 4870.0 | 6.58 | 45 |
| Prospect Road | 208917 | R.C. | 4898.07 | 4909.2 | 4901.2 | 4901.0 | 8.09 | >100 |
| Lemay Avenue | 221702 | R.C. | 4932.25 | 4941.8 | 4938.9 | 4938.0 | 8.52 | >100 |
| Mulberry Street | 222452 | R.C. | 4934.34 | 4939.6 | 4935.6 | 4939.6 | 7.06 | >100 |
| Lincoln Avenue | 227437 | R.C. | 4947.06 | 4957.8 | 4956.5 | 4957.8 | 13.69 | >100 |
| Linden Street | 228687 | R.C. | 4953.65 | 4962.4 | 4954.6 | 4956.0 | 6.84 | >100 |
| C&S RR | 230017 | W.&S. | 4958.28 | 4968.9 | 4964.4 | 4964.0 | 8.15 | >100 |
| College Avenue | 230912 | R.C. | 4965.15 | 4970.2 | 4965.7 | 4963.4 | 5.25 | >100 |
| UP RR | 231022 | W.T. | 4965.54 | 4971.8 | 4969.5 | 4966.0 | 3.61 | >100 |
| Shields Street | 237537 | R.C. | 4986.41 | 4993.5 | 4990.6 | 4988.0 | 10.45 | >100 |
| Haul Road | 241267 | W.&S. | 5002.30 | 5003.0 | 4999.3 | 5000.0 | 7.89 | 52 |
| Taft Hill Road | 244547 | S.G. | 5019.77 | 5021.9 | 5018.0 | 5018.0 | 5.21 | 22 |





¹Upstream face of bridge

²R.C. = Reinforced Concrete; W.T. = Wood Trestle; W.&S. = Wood and Steel; S.G. = Steel Girder

| Summary of Road Overtopping Conditions. | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------|--|
| | | Total River | | | Road Overtop | oping Conditio | ns | |
| Location | Station | Discharge at | Frequency | Peak | | | | |
| | | Overtopping | | Discharge | Velocity | Depth | Duration | |
| | | (cfs) | | (cfs) | (fps) | (ft) | (hrs) | |
| I-25 | 189,498 | 9,990 | 25-yr ⁸ | 4,564 | 5.2 | 0.92 | 18 | |
| Harmony Road | 182,253 ¹ | 9,990 | 25-yr ⁸ | 4,564 | 3.8 | 2.9 | 18 | |
| BNRR | 193,727 | 9,990 | 25-yr | 2,950 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 14 | |
| Prospect Road | 208,917 | 11,986 | 50-yr | 3,680 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 10 | |
| E. Mulberry Street | 214,500 | 7,820 ⁷ | 25-yr | 3,477 | 4.1 | 0.85 | 12 | |
| (Hwy 14) | | | | | | | | |
| Airpark Drive | 450 ² | 7,820 ⁷ | 25-yr | 2,903 | 2.1 | ~1.5 | 12 | |
| Link Lane | 2,050 ² | 7,820 ⁷ | 25-yr | 2,903 | 1.1 | ~2 | 12 | |
| Lincoln Avenue | 0 ² | 7,820 ⁷ | 25-yr | N/A ⁵ | <1 | ~2 | 12 | |
| (airpark area) | | | | | | | | |
| Lincoln Avenue | 8,425 ⁶ | 13,700 | 100-yr | 4 | <1 | <1 | 11 | |
| (Buckingham area) | | | | | | | | |
| North College Ave. | 230,912 | 10,200 | 50-yr | 4,083 | 2.4 ⁴ | 1.8 | 9 | |
| Taft Hill Road | 244,547 | 8,521 | 25-yr | 7,032 ³ | 3.7 | 1.8 | 11 | |
| ¹ Flow path I25MAIN.DA | λT | | | | | | | |
| ² Flow path RLMAYDS.D | AT | | | | | | | |
| ³ Includes flow over roa | dway north a | ind south of river | | | | | | |
| ⁴ Estimated using weir le | ength and de | pth of flow. | | | | | | |
| ⁵ Flow is parallel to Lince | oln Avenue. | | | | | | | |
| ⁶ Flow path LINC92.DAT | | | | | | | | |
| ⁷ Assumes breach of Ler | may Avenue | embankment. | | | | | | |
| ⁸ Although the hydraulio | c analysis ind | icates split flow f | rom the mainst | em for the 5- | and 10-year | events, with t | he | |
| available storage upstr | eam of Harm | ony Road, it is u | nlikely that flow | s below the 2 | 5-year event | will overtop | | |
| Harmony or Interstate | 25. | | | | | | | |
| ~ = Approximate | | | | | | | | |

<u>Critical Facilities</u> – There are several critical facilities in the 100-year Poudre River floodplain:

- Team Petroleum 105 E. Lincoln Ave.
- City of Fort Collins Mulberry Wastewater Reclamation Facility, 500 block of East Mulberry Street,
- Boxelder Sanitation District Wastewater Facility, 3201 East Mulberry Street,
- Orthopedic Center of the Rockies/Gateway medical/Health South Rehabilitation Center, 2500 East Prospect Rd (100 & 500-yr floodplains)

In addition, the following two facilities are located in the 500-year floodplain:

- IonTech/Vecco, 2330 East Prospect Rd
- City of Fort Collins Drake Wastewater Reclamation Facility, 3036 East Drake Rd.











West Vine Basin

The West Vine Basin, located in northwest Fort Collins, extends east from Horsetooth Reservoir to the Cache la Poudre River and south from West Vine Drive to Mulberry Street and Laporte Avenue. The total area is approximately 2,350 acres. The eastern half of the basin is part of the Fort Collins Urban Growth Area. The western half of the basin, west of Overland Trail, includes open space and the Colorado State University Foothills Campus. Less than 15 percent of the basin is within city limits; the rest is in Larimer County.

In general, the basin drains from west to east along five flow paths that are not well defined. Throughout the years, development has occurred over the historical flow paths. Most of the basin's drainage facilities are inadequate during any storm event, and as a result, drainage problems have occurred regularly.

The main channel of the West Vine drainage, downstream of Laporte Avenue, is usually dry. Several locations lack a well-defined channel because of development and because stormwater is intercepted by irrigation canals. Only the reach upstream of Laporte Avenue and Poudre High School has perennial flow in a well-defined channel. This reach is known as Soldier Canyon Creek, and typically there is a small amount of base flow in the bottom of the channel.

Five irrigation canals cross the basin, generally from north to south. The three main canals—the Pleasant Valley and Lake Canal (PV&L), the New Mercer Ditch (NMD) and the Larimer County Canal No. 2 (LC2)—impact the drainage in the basin. The canals intercept runoff traveling through the basin and transport it out. They also regularly spill runoff into the basin when their capacity is exceeded.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - Three main areas in the West Vine Basin have a history of flooding problems. They include the Irish Green Subdivision, the subdivision at the northwest corner of Taft Hill Road and Laporte Avenue, and the Second Filing of the Hanna Subdivision. Residents have indicated there has been stormwater up to their homes' foundation levels or higher on a regular basis. Other reports indicate that the open field west of the Hanna Subdivision has experienced ponding during long or intense storms.

Other flooded areas include the Bonnaview and Rosteks Subdivisions and the railroad embankment near Shields Street and West Vine Drive. Flooding in the Bonnaview Subdivision resulted from spilling from the PV&L. The abandoned railroad embankment near Shields and Vine was overtopped downstream of the existing culvert.

During a 100-year storm, there are 33 structures and 14 roads that would be damaged, in addition to an estimated 18 spills off the PV&L, NMD and LC2. This would result in an estimated \$1.7 million in damages. If nothing is done to mitigate this damage, it is estimated that \$10.4 million of damage would occur over the next 50 years.

| | | | Selected Plan | | |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------|------------|
| Location | Overtopping Elevation (ft) | Flow Depth (ft) | Travel Time ** (min) | Velocity | Flow Depth |
| | (14) | (11) | (mm) | (11/300) | (10) |
| LaPorte Ave. and Impala Drive (Poudre High School) | 5067 | 1.7 | 106 | 3.9 | 0.5 |
| | | | | | |
| New Mercer Ditch and: | | | | | |
| Taft Hill Boad and LaBorta (Southorn Flow Dath) | FOFE | 2.0 | 106 | 2.4 | spill |
| Tait Hill Road and LaPorte (Southern Flow Path) | 5050 | 2.8 | 100 | 5.4 | structure |
| Charry St. (Captral Flow Path) | 5060 | 1.2 | 01 | 1.0 | spill |
| Cherry St. (Central Flow Path) | 5000 | 1.2 | 01 | 1.0 | structure |
| | | | | | |

Summary of Road Overtopping Depths





| | | | Selected Plan | | |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Location | Overtopping Elevation (ft) | Flow Depth (ft) | Travel Time ** (min) | Velocity (ft/sec) | Flow Depth (ft) |
| Taft Hill Road and: | | | | | |
| Vine Drive (Northern Flow Path) | 5055 | 0.5 | 63 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
| Larimer County Canal No. 2 (Central Flow Path) | 5050 | 0.4 | 75 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| LaPorte (Southern Flow Path) | 5053.5 | 0.6 | 109 | 3.4 | 0.0 |
| Larimer County Canal No. 2 and: | | | | | |
| Northern Flow Path | 5048 | 1.7 | 36 | 4.2 | 0.5 |
| Central Flow Path | 5046 | 1.6 | 57 | 3.5 | spill structure |
| Southern Flow Path | 5046 | 1.6 | 110 | 2.0 | spill structure |
| Southeastern Flow Path | 5044 | 0.4 | 173 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| | | | | | |
| Vine Drive and Hanna St. (all flow paths converge) | 5010.5 | 1.2 | 94 | 2.6 | 0.0 |
| | | | | | |
| Abandoned RR Embankment | 5006.5 | 0.7 | * | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| | | | | | |
| Shields Street and: | | | | | |
| Main Flow Path | 4995 | 1.4 | * | 5.2 | 0.0 |
| Eastern Flow Path | 5006.5 | 0.8 | * | 3.8 | 0.0 |

*beyond hydrological modeling limits

**travel time to peak discharge

Critical Facilities - Seven critical facilities were identified within the West Vine Basin:

Locations within the West Vine floodplain are as follows:

(1) Poudre School District Admin Center, 2407 Laporte Ave (100-year floodplain)

Locations within the West Vine Basin but not directly in the floodplain are as follows:

- (1) Irish Elementary School, 515 Irish Dr.,
- (2) Lincoln Junior High School, 1600 W. Lancer Dr
- (3) Poudre High School, 201 Impala Dr
- (4) Putnam Elementary School, Maple
- (5) Gasamat, 1054 W. Vine Dr











Canal Importation Basin

The Canal Importation Drainage Basin spans nearly five square miles in west-central Fort Collins. Three major irrigation canals traverse the basin from north to south and impact drainage in the basin. The canals can intercept runoff traveling through the basin and transport it out of the basin, and they also spill runoff into the basin when their capacity is exceeded.

The basin, which suffered significant property damage in the flood of 1997, is almost completely urbanized with primarily mixed density residential and isolated commercial land uses. Runoff from the basin empties into the Old Town and Spring Creek Basins.

Much development in the basin occurred before the City adopted drainage criteria. The basin's original master plan, prepared in 1980, identified several drainage improvement projects. Many of these projects have been completed or are in the process of being constructed, including the Sheldon Lake and City Park Nine Detention Ponds, Canal Importation Channel, Fairbrooke Detention Pond, Rodeo Detention Pond, Willow Lane Channel, Plum Street Regional Detention Pond and a spill structure and outlet pipe at Prospect Road. Other improvements include construction of the Fairbrooke Channel, enlargement of the Avery Park Detention Pond, widening of Clearview Channel and construction of Hughes Stadium Detention Pond.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - Flooding potential in the basin continues to be widespread, due to significant loss of natural drainage channels and uncontrolled spilling of storm runoff from the canals. A 100-year storm event would result in more than 700 structures being flooded with total damages estimated at \$25.6 million. If nothing is done to mitigate this damage, it is estimated that \$125 million of direct flood damage would occur over the next 50 years.

During a 100-year storm, there is significant street and neighborhood flooding, severely impeding traffic and placing citizens and emergency responders at risk.

- Taft Hill Road would be overtopped at five locations;
- Shields Street, Prospect Road and Overland Trail would be overtopped at several locations;
- Significant street flooding would occur along West Elizabeth, West Mulberry, Mountain and Oak Streets;
- Many other collector and local streets would be flooded or overtopped; and
- Entire neighborhoods could be flooded.





Summary of 10-Year and 100-Year Flow Depths Along Major Streets for Developed Conditions with Existing Facilities

| Street | Peach | Street Flow Depth (ft) ^a | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|--|--|
| Sileet | Neach | 10-Year | 100-Year | | |
| Mountain Avenue | Shields Street to Roosevelt Avenue | 0.9 - 1.4 | 1.5 - 2.0 | | |
| Wouldan Avenue | West of Roosevelt Avenue | 0.7 - 1.7 | 1.1 - 2.1 | | |
| Mulberry Street | Taft Hill to Briarwood Road | 0.9 - 1.0 | 1.4 - 1.6 | | |
| Elizabeth Street | Shields Street to City Park Avenue | 0.9 - 4.1 | 1.9 - 5.2 | | |
| Liizabetii Street | City Park Avenue to NMD | 0.7 - 1.3 | 1.2 - 2.2 | | |

^a Relative to the gutter flowline

Summary of 10-Year and 100-Year Flow Depths Crossing Major Streets for Developed Conditions with Existing Facilities

| Location | Street Overtoppi | ng Depth (ft)ª |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Location | 10-Year | 100-Year |
| Shields Street, at Mountain Avenue | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| Taft Hill Road, at Mulberry Street | 0.5 | 0.8 |
| Skyline Drive, at Plum Street | 0.6 | 1.2 |
| Taft Hill Road, between Orchard Place and Plum Street | 2.3 | 3.7 |
| Ponderosa Drive, between Orchard Place and Plum Street | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| Shields Street, at Elizabeth Street | 0.7 | 1.6 |
| City Park Avenue, at Elizabeth Street | 1.3 | 2.2 |
| Castlerock Drive, between Clearview Avenue and Oakwood Drive | 0.7 | 1.1 |
| Taft Hill Road, between Clearview Avenue and Springfield Drive | | 2.4 |
| Ponderosa Drive, South of Clearview Avenue | 1.2 | 3.0 |
| Taft Hill Road, between Prospect Road and Suffolk Street | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| Hampshire Road, between Cedarwood Drive and Suffolk Street | | 0.9 |
| Langshire Drive, North of White Rock Court | | 0.7 |
| Taft Hill Road, at Manchester Drive | 0.1 | 0.8 |

^a Relative to the crown of the street

Critical Facilities – There are several critical facilities in the Canal Importation 100-year floodplain:

- Children's House Montessori School, 113 N. Shields Street;
- CSU Moby Arena, 1951 W. Plum Street
- two gas stations located at 501 S. Taft Hill Road and 1015 S. Shields Street

In addition to the facilities which would be directly impacted by flood flows, emergency access would be compromised for two public schools, Moore Elementary at 1905 Orchard Place, and Blevins Junior High School at 2101 S. Taft Hill Road. In the event that flooding occurs across the northern half of the basin, access to Moore Elementary School would be severely compromised due to: (a) overtopping of Taft Hill





Road both at Mulberry Street and south of Orchard Place; (b) overtopping of Skyline Drive at Plum Street; and (c) flooding of Mulberry Street east of Taft Hill Road. Access to Blevins Junior High School would not be as severely limited, but would be compromised due to overtopping of Taft Hill Road both south of Prospect Road and at Manchester Drive.







Old Town Basin

The Old Town Drainage Basin is located in north-central Fort Collins. The basin has a drainage area of approximately 2,120 acres, including approximately 400 acres of the Colorado State University campus. The entire basin is urbanized, with some development occurring in the late 1800s.

In general, the basin drains from west to east. The Old Town Basin receives some runoff water from the Canal Importation Basin directly west of Old Town. Most of the water from Old Town drains to the Poudre River, just to the east.

Three major capital projects were completed in Old Town since the 1997 flood: the Howes Street Outfall, the Locust Street Outfall and the Oak Street Outfall. These projects significantly reduced flooding problems in the basin, and they removed more than 700 properties from the mapped floodplain. However, in general the projects did not reduce flooding west of Mason Street. Many properties remain in the floodplain.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - Basin flooding results primarily from encroachment and urbanization of natural drainage corridors, none of which are visible today. Instead, the streets become stream channels. When the streets and the undersized storm sewer system cannot contain the flow, water spills out of the street and floods homes and businesses. Flooding in the Old Town Basin occurs regularly.

The remapping of the floodplain identified several areas of flood hazard within the basin. During a 100-year storm, approximately 624 structures would be damaged and nearly 50 street intersections would be flooded. This would result in an estimated \$35 million in damages. If nothing is done to mitigate this damage, it is estimated that \$97.5 million of damage would occur over the next 50 years.





| | 100-Year | Flow Depth | (fps) | | Flow Veloc | city (fps) | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Cross Street | WSEL | 2-Year | 10-Year | 100-Year | 2-Year | 10-Year | 100-Year |
| | (ft, NGVD) | 2 1001 | 10 1001 | 100 1001 | 2 1001 | 10 1001 | 100 1001 |
| Flow Path: Myrtle | Street | | | | | | |
| Mason St | 4994.5 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 5.3 |
| College Ave | 4992.3 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.8 |
| Remington St | 4990.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 7.8 |
| Mathews St | 4988.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 6.5 |
| Peterson St | 4985.8 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 6.2 |
| Flow Path: Mulber | rry Street | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Wayne St | 5023.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 7.4 |
| Gordon St | 5021.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 7.4 |
| Washington Ave | 5015.2 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 6.0 | 7.0 | 8.6 |
| Grant Ave | 5009.4 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 6.3 |
| Loomis Ave | 5006.6 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 5.4 |
| Whitcomb St | 5003.6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 4.9 |
| Canyon Ave | 5002.4 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Sherwood St | 4999.0 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 5.6 |
| Meldrum St | 4997.1 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 4.4 |
| Howes St | 4994.2 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 3.1 | 3.2 |
| Mason St | 4993.3 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 3.2 | 5.1 |
| College Ave | 4992.3 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Flow Path: Magno | lia Street | | | | | | |
| Gordon St | 5018.2 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 6.3 |
| Washington Ave | 5015.9 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 7.5 |
| Grant Ave | 5009.9 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 5.8 | 7.3 | 9.9 |
| Loomis Ave | 5006.3 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 9.2 |
| Whitcomb St | 5002.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 3.5 | 4.7 | 7.2 |
| Canvon Ave | 5000.3 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.2 |
| Meldrum St | 4997.3 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 4.9 | 8.2 |
| Howes St | 4995.9 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 0.1 | 3.7 | 7.0 |
| Mason St | 4993.3 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 3.3 | 5.1 |
| College Ave | 4992.3 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Flow Path: Olive S | treet | , a | .,, . | , | , | , | , a |
| Loomis Ave | 5003 3 | 11 | 14 | 21 | 3 3 | 43 | 6.2 |
| Whitcomh St | 5001.1 | 14 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 35 | 2.8 | 6.5 |
| Canvon Ave | 5000.3 | n/a | n/a | 2.5 n/a | n/a | 2.0 n/a | 0.5 n/a |
| Howes St | 4997.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 1 3 | 5.6 |
| Mason St | 4997.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 5.0 |
| | 4333.3 | 0.1 n/a | 0.0 n/a | 1.5 n/a | 1.5 n/a | 5.1 n/2 | 5.1 n/a |
| Flow Path: Oak Str | 14452.5 | 11/ d | 11/ a | 11/ a | 11/ a | 11/ a | 11/ a |
| Grant Ave | 5007.6 | 1 2 | 17 | 28 | 13 | 11 | 65 |
| | 5007.0 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 7.J | 3.1 | 9.5 8 9 |
| Whitcomh St | 5004.0 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 2.1 1.0 | 2.3 2.1 |). 4 | 4.0 |
| Flow Pathe Mount | ain Avenue | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.0 | ۲.۲ | ۷.۱ | +.0 |
| Nachington Aug | | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1 5 | 4.1 | ΕQ | 0 E |
| Crapt Ave | 5011.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 4.1 0.0 | J.0 C E | 0.0 |
| Grant Ave | 5009.4 | U.8 | 1.1 1.1 | 1.8 1.7 | 0.U | ס.ט ד 1 | ŏ./ |
| LOOMIS AVE | | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1./ | 1./ | J.1 | פ.ס |
| FIOW Path: Laporte | Flow Path: Laporte Avenue | | | | | | |

Summary of Hydraulic Data at Cross Streets





| | 100-Year | Flow Depth (fps) | | | Flow Velocity (fps) | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------|---------|----------|---------------------|---------|----------|
| Cross Street | WSEL (ft <i>,</i> NGVD) | 2-Year | 10-Year | 100-Year | 2-Year | 10-Year | 100-Year |
| Whitcomb St | 5003.2 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 5.6 | 6.9 | 7.2 |
| Sherwood St | 4992.7 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 6.6 |
| Meldrum St | 4987.7 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 6.1 |
| Howes St | 4984.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Flow Path: Maple S | Street | | | | | | |
| Sherwood St | 4990.8 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 5.1 |
| Meldrum St | 4988.8 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 5.7 |
| Howes St | 4984.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2.2 |

Summary of Hydraulic Data for Flow Along Streets

| Description | Average Flow Dept | h (ft) | Average Flow Velocity (fps) | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|--|
| Description | 10-Year | 100-Year | 10-Year | 100-Year | |
| Flow Path: Myrtle Street | | | | | |
| College to Remington | 1.2 | 2.0 | 5.7 | 7.4 | |
| Remington to Mathews | 1.2 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 6.5 | |
| Mathews to Peterson | 1.0 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 5.7 | |
| Flow Path: Mulberry Street | | | | | |
| Shields to Wayne | 1.4 | 2.0 | 5.6 | 8.2 | |
| Flow Path: Magnolia Street | | | | | |
| Wayne to Gordon | 1.6 | 2.4 | 4.7 | 6.1 | |
| Gordon to Washington | 1.4 | 2.1 | 4.6 | 6.4 | |
| Washington to Grant | 1.3 | 2.0 | 6.8 | 8.9 | |
| Grant to Loomis | 1.2 | 1.9 | 5.3 | 7.4 | |
| Loomis to Whitcomb | 1.6 | 2.3 | 5.5 | 7.8 | |
| Whitcomb to Canyon | 2.1 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 5.4 | |
| Canyon to Meldrum | 1.6 | 2.7 | 4.1 | 7.9 | |
| Meldrum to Howes | 1.6 | 2.9 | 4.3 | 7.5 | |
| Howes to Mason | 1.4 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 8.2 | |
| Flow Path: Mason Street | | L | | 1 | |
| Olive to Oak | 0.7 | 1.4 | 3.2 | 6. 4 | |
| Flow Path: Olive Street | | | | | |
| Loomis to Whitcomb | 1.3 | 2.2 | 4.1 | 6.4 | |
| Whitcomb to Sherwood | 1.8 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 5.8 | |
| Mason to College | 1.1 | 1.7 | 3.7 | 6.6 | |
| Flow Path: Loomis Street | | | | | |
| Oak to Olive | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 4.9 | |
| Flow Path: Oak Street | | | • | | |
| Grant to Loomis | 1.3 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 7.0 | |
| Flow Path: Grant Street | | | | | |
| Mountain to Oak | 1.4 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 4.2 | |
| Flow Path: Mountain Avenue | | | | | |
| Shields to Mack | 1.1 | 1.8 | 5.2 | 8.1 | |





| Description | Average Flow Dept | h (ft) | Average Flow Velocity (fps) | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|--|
| Description | 10-Year | 100-Year | 10-Year | 100-Year | |
| Mack to Washington | 1.1 | 1.8 | 5.3 | 8.1 | |
| Washington to Grant | 1.0 | 1.7 | 4.2 | 6.3 | |
| Flow Path: Laporte Avenue | | | | | |
| Meldrum to Howes | 1.2 | 1.7 | 5.1 | 7.2 | |
| East of Howes | 0.9 | 1.4 | 5.6 | 7.8 | |





<u>Critical Facilities</u> – there are several critical facilities in the Old Town 100-year floodplain:

- Theresa Jekel Family Child Care, 100 N Grant;
- Larimer County Mental Health Center, 525 W. Oak St (also addressed 214 S. Whitcomb);
- Qwest Relay/Switching Center, NE corner of Mason and Magnolia; and
- Four gas stations, 429 S. Mason, 816 E. Mulberry, 1032 W. Mountain, and 803 Riverside

As well as two critical facilities in the Old Town 500-year floodplain:

- Centennial High School; 300 E. Laurel;
- Children's House, 113 N. Shields;

In addition to the critical facilities directly in the 100-year floodplain, two more would be islands completely surrounded by floodwaters without street access; these facilities are:

- Dunn Elementary School, 501 S. Washington; and
- The Fort Collins Police Department, 300 Laporte Avenue.

Emergency response throughout much of the basin, particularly in the portion of the basin east of Shields Street, west of Peterson Street, south of Cherry Street and north of Laurel Street, may be compromised due to widespread street flooding throughout that area. Fortunately, Poudre Fire Authority (PFA) Fire Stations #1 and #2 are located east and west of the primary flooding area defined for this study, respectively. However, PFA Fire Station #2 at 415 South Bryan Avenue is located in the 100-year floodplain along Mulberry Street defined as part of the Canal Importation Basin Master Drainage Plan.

In addition to the critical facilities that would be directly impacted or surrounded by major flood flows within the Old Town Basin, as defined herein, the following 19 critical facilities were identified within the Old Town Basin:

- Beebe Christian School, 821 W. Lake;
- Children's Workshop Early Learning Center, 635 S. Grant;
- First United Methodist Pre-School, 100 S. Stover;
- Fullana Elementary School, 200 N. Grant;
- Harris Elementary School, 501 E. Elizabeth;
- Open Arms Christian Preschool, 305 E. Elizabeth;
- PFA Fire Station #1, 505 Peterson;
- Plymouth Children's Center, 916 W. Prospect;
- St. Joseph's Catholic School, 127 N. Howes;
- United Day Care Center, 424 Pine;
- Young People's Learning Center (two), 209 E. Plum and 405 Mathews; and
- Seven gas stations.











Spring Creek

Spring Creek is a major watercourse that flows from Spring Canyon Dam at Horsetooth Reservoir to its confluence with the Poudre River. The Spring Creek Drainage Basin encompasses nearly nine square miles in central Fort Collins. The basin is dominated by residential development, but it also includes open space, parks and isolated areas of commercial and industrial development.

The city's worst natural disaster occurred on July 28, 1997, when Spring Creek flooded following 14.5 inches of rainfall in 31 hours. Five residents lost their lives, a building exploded, a train derailed and 400 people were rescued from the floodwaters. Across the city, more than \$200 million in damages were attributed to the storm. The impact of the storm would have been far worse if the City had not invested more than \$5 million in stormwater improvements in the basin in the early 1990s. These included improvements to channels and bridges, reinforcement of the Burlington Northern railroad embankment, and acquisition and relocation of structures in high hazard areas (30 mobile homes, nine houses, one business and one retirement home).

Spring Creek is a FEMA-designated floodplain and is subject to the City's floodplain regulations. The new mapping also includes areas beyond the FEMA floodplain which are considered to be in a City-designated floodplain.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - The master plan update identified 178 structures, eight roads and the Burlington Northern railroad that would be damaged during a 100-year storm with an estimated \$8.78 million in damages. If nothing is done to mitigate this damage, it is estimated that \$12.25 million of damage would occur over the next 50 years.





Summary of Hydraulic Data at Stream

Crossings

| | . | | Structure | 100-Year Channel | 100-Year | Roadway Overtopping Depth (ft) | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------|--|-----------|---------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------|
| Location | Structure Type | Structure Size | Capacity | Velocity (fps)ª | WSEL (ft, NGVD) ^b | 2-Year | 10-Year | 100- Year |
| Along Spring Creek | | | | | | | | |
| Prospect Road | Three span bridge | Total width = 95' | 100-YR | 7.2 | 4907.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Timberline Road | Two span bridge | Total width = 84' | 100-YR | 9.3 | 4910.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| C&SRR | Single RCB | 9'4"H x 13'10"W | < 100-YR | 10.2 | 4919.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Riverside Avenue | Single span bridge | Total width = 37' | 10-YR | 9.6 | 4923.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 |
| Welch Street | Single span bridge | Total width = 30' | < 100-YR | 15.7 | 4936.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lemay Avenue | Three span bridge | Total width = 92' | 100-YR | 12.0 | 4944.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Stover Street | Single span bridge | Total width = 52' | < 100-YR | 7.8 | 4962.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Stuart Street | Two span bridge | Total width = 55' | < 100-YR | 6.0 | 4967.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Remington Street | Single span bridge | Total width = 30' | 10-YR | 8.7 | 4978.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| College Avenue | Single span bridge | Total width = 32' | 100-YR | 11.0 | 4981.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| BNRR | Three RCP's; one arch CMP | RCP Dia. = 7'; Arch CMP = 9.0'H x 9.2'W | < 100-YR | 8.2 | 4995.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Centre Avenue | Two RCB's | North RCB = 11.6'H x 20.2'W, South RCB = 9.0'H x 18.4'W | < 100-YR | 0.8 | 4995.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Shields Street | Four span bridge | Total width = 54' | 100-YR | 6.0 | 5014.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Drake Road | Two span bridge | Total width = 48' | 100-YR | 9.5 | 5052.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Taft Hill Road | Single RCB | 6.0'H x 10.7'W | 100-YR | 8.7 | 5084.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 7.1.4.2 Other Area | S | | | | | | | |
| Timberline Ro | oad at the C&SRR | n/a | n/a | n/a | 4916.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Shields Stree | et at Shire Court | n/a | n/a | n/a | Varies | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| Dixon Creel | k at Drake Road | 18" RCP | 2-yr | 9.9 | 5136.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Dixon Creek | at Overland Trail | 18" ADS/CMP | 2-yr | 9.4 | 5149.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 1.0 |

^a Downstream of Structure

^b Upstream of Structure



| | | | | | 100-Year Ev | vent Operating F | Parameters | |
|---|------------|---|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate location | Normal Outlet Discharge (cfs) | Overtoppin g Discharge (cfs) | Total Release (cfs) | Emergency Spillway/Flo w Depth (ft) | Active Storage Volume (ac-ft) | Ponded Water Surface Elevation (ft, NGVD) |
| Veterinary Teaching Hospital (VTH) Pond | 50 | NW corner of Drake Road and Bay Road | 512 | 0 | 512 | 0.0 | 21.0 | 5023.6 |
| Woodwest Pond | 51 | South of Drake Road/ NMD Intersection | 269 | 268 | 537 | 0.4 | 16.0 | 5042.0 |
| Rossborough Park Pond | 103 | NE corner of Dunbar Ave. and Casa Grande Blvd. | 51 | 0 | 51 | 0.0 | 23.6 | 5089.3 |
| Silver Oaks P.U.D. Pond | 108 | NW corner of Bronson St. and Taft Hill Road | 11 | 77 | 88 | 0.2 | 6.6 | 5122.7 |
| Conceptual Sub-basin 9 Pond | 109 | NW corner of Taft Hill Road and Horsetooth Road | 1.7 | 0 | 1.7 | N/A | 1.3 | N/A (future pond) |
| Springfield East Ponds | 112 | Between Dalton Dr. and Horsetooth Road | 6 | 15 | 21 | 0.2 | 3.0 | N/A (combination of two existing ponds) |
| Avocet Road Pond | 282 | Along Avocet Road east of Meadowlark Ave. | 37 | 36 | 73 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 5033.4 |
| Conceptual Centre for Advanced Technology (CAT) Ponds | 287 | SW corner of Worthington Circle and Centre Ave. | 11 | 35 | 46 | N/A | 11.5 | N/A (combination of seven future ponds) |
| Conceptual north CAT Pond | 288 | NW corner of LCC No. 2 and Centre Ave. | 2.7 | 0 | 2.7 | N/A | 4.6 | N/A (future pond) |
| Conceptual east CAT Pond | 289 | NE corner of LCC No. 2 and Centre Ave. | 4.5 | 0 | 4.5 | N/A | 6.6 | N/A (future pond) |
| Burlington Northern Railroad (BNRR) Pond | 303 | BNRR embankment SW of Prospect Road and College Ave. | 1975 | 0 | 1975 | N/A | 340.9 | 4995.0 |
| Taft Hill Road Pond | 304 | SW corner of Drake Road and Taft Hill Road | 843 | 0 | 843 | N/A | 83.3 | 5084.6 |
| Conceptual Sub-basin 100 Pond | 318 | South of Spring Creek near Swallow Road | 11.4 | 0 | 11.4 | N/A | 8.5 | N/A (future pond) |
| Raintree Townhomes P.U.D. Ponds | 333 | NW corner of Drake Road and Shields St. | 6.4 | 0 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 5.0 | N/A (combination of two existing ponds) |
| Preserve P.U.D. Ponds | 334 | Immediately west of Raintree Townhomes P.U.D. Pond | 6.1 | 0 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 4.9 | N/A (combination of three existing ponds) |
| Kensington South Pond | 336 | SE corner of Dunbar Ave. and Drake Road | 65 | 87 | 152 | 0.5 | 4.4 | 5052.8 |

Summary of Detention Pond Operating Parameters



| | LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | 100-Year E | vent Operating I | Parameters | | | |
| Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate location | Normal Outlet Discharge (cfs) | Overtoppin g Discharge (cfs) | Total Release (cfs) | Emergency Spillway/Flo w Depth (ft) | Active Storage Volume (ac-ft) | Ponded Water Surface Elevation (ft, NGVD) | | |
| Dixon Reservoir | 340 | West of Drake Road and Overland Trail | 110 | 0 | 110 | 0.0 | 72.0 | 5200.3 | | |
| Springfield Pond | 349 | SW corner of Platte Dr. and Horsetooth Road | 6 | 50 | 56 | 0.9 | 8.2 | 5142.1 | | |
| Quail Hollow First Filing Pond | 357 | SE of Drake Road and Overland Trail | 19 | 247 | 266 | 1.4 | 8.7 | 5115.4 | | |
| Quail Hollow Third Filing Pond | 358 | South of Drake Road and Overland Trail | 1 | 125 | 126 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 5125.7 | | |
| Fox Creek P.U.D. West Pond | 360 | Between McKeag Drive and PV&L Canal | 7 | 22 | 29 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 5109.9 | | |
| Fox Creek P.U.D. East Pond | 361 | NE of Moore Lane and PV&L Canal | 0.5 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 5109.3 | | |

Summary of Detention Pond Operating Parameters (Continued)

| | | | 100-Year Event Operating Parameters | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate location | Normal Outlet Discharge (cfs) | Overtoppin g Discharge (cfs) | Total Release (cfs) | Emergency Spillway/Flo w Depth (ft) | Active Storage Volume (ac-ft) | Ponded Water Surface Elevation (ft, NGVD) | |
| Conceptual Sub-basin 62 Pond | 362 | NE of Research Blvd. and Drake Road | 1.5 | 0 | 1.5 | N/A | 1.4 | N/A (future pond) | |
| CAT 18 th and 19 th Filing Ponds | 363 | NW corner of Worthington Circle and Drake Road | 4.8 | 0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.4 | N/A (combination of seven existing ponds) | |
| CAT Sub-basin 64 Pond | 364 | NW corner of Research Blvd. and Drake Road | 7.5 | 0 | 7.5 | N/A | 3.5 | N/A (future pond) | |
| Kingston Woods P.U.D. Pond | 370 | NW of Horsetooth Road and Shields St. | 3 | 25 | 28 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 5091.6 | |
| Chaparral P.U.D. Pond | 371 | SW corner of Shields St. and Casa Grande Blvd. | 21 | 85 | 106 | 0.6 | 4.4 | 5079.1 | |
| Wagon Wheel P.U.D. Pond | 372 | SW corner of Shields St. and Swallow Road | 19 | 59 | 78 | 0.1 | 13.8 | 5073.5 | |
| Rocky Mountain High School Ponds | 373 | NW corner of Shields St. and Swallow Road | 7 | 93 | 100 | N/A | 5.3 | N/A (combination of two existing ponds) | |



| | | | | | 100-Year E | vent Operating I | Parameters | |
|------------------------------------|------------|--|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate location | Normal Outlet Discharge (cfs) | Overtoppin g Discharge (cfs) | Total Release (cfs) | Emergency Spillway/Flo w Depth (ft) | Active Storage Volume (ac-ft) | Ponded Water Surface Elevation (ft, NGVD) |
| Silverplume P.U.D. Ponds | 374 | West of Rocky Mountain High School | 4.2 | 0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 1.7 | N/A (combination of four existing ponds) |
| Drake Road/Shields St. Ponds | 380 | Intersection of Drake Road and Shields St. | 18.6 | 0 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | N/A (combination of two existing ponds) |
| Southeast Timberline Lake Pond | 603 | NE of Timberline Road and Spring Creek | 31 | 69 | 100 | 0.7 | 22.1 | 4904.5 |
| Southwest Timberline Lake Pond | 604 | West of Timberline Road and SE Timberline Lake Pond | 115 | 0 | 115 | 0.0 | 37.6 | 4907.5 |
| Northwest Timberline Lake Pond | 605 | West of Timberline Road and north of SW Timberline Lake Pond | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A | 11.9 | |
| C&SRR Pond | 610 | C&SRR/Spring Creek | 2632 | 0 | 2632 | N/A | 73.5 | 4919.4 |
| Parkwood East Apartments Pond | 613 | NE corner of Parwood East Apartment Complex and Riverside Ave. | 38 | 0 | 38 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 4943.5 |
| Stonehenge Ponds | 616 | SW corner of Stuart St. and Brookwood Dr. | 2 | 95 | 97 | 1.1 | 3.8 | N/A (combination of five existing ponds) |
| Poudre Valley Hospital Ponds | 618 | East side of PVH campus | 9.1 | 0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 3.9 | N/A (combination of two existing ponds) |
| Rolland Moore Park Pond | 630 | North of Drake on west side of Shields | 2112 | 193 | 2305 | 0.5 | 30.1 | 5023.8 |
| Remington/Lake St. Pond | 637 | Intersection of Remington St. and Lake St. | 3.3 | 0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 4990.6 |
| Parkwood Lake Pond | 640 | NE corner of Drake Road and Lemay Ave. | 4.8 | 0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 121.9 | 4971.7 |
| Mission Hills Ponds | 641 | SW corner of Lemay Ave. and Columbia Road | 4 | 105 | 109 | 0.1 | 7.5 | N/A (combination of two existing ponds) |
| Scotch Pines Filing No. 7 Ponds | 642 | SW corner of Drake Road and Lemay Ave. | 5.8 | 0 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 1.9 | N/A (combination of two existing ponds) |
| Cottonwood P.U.D. Pond | 646 | NW of Drake Road and Lemay Ave. | 29 | 31 | 60 | 0.1 | 4.9 | 4982.1 |
| Spring Canyon Park Pond | 838 | Northwest of the dog park off of Horsetooth Road | 10.5 | 712.5 | 723 | 1.9 | 49.2 | 5118.4 |



| Summarv | of Detention | Pond | Overtopping | Data |
|----------------|--------------|--------|---------------|------|
| Summary | or Detention | I UIIG | o ver topping | Dutu |

| Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate Location | Potential Flooding Scenario | Potential Flooding Scenario if the Normal Outlet is Blocked |
|---|------------|--|---|---|
| Woodwest Pond | 51 | South of Drake Road/NMD intersection | Major (268 cfs) overtopping into NMD to the east | Additional (up to 269 cfs) flows spilling into NMD; max. possible discharge = 537 cfs; possible overtopping of left (east) bank of NMD toward houses along Meadowlark Avenue |
| Silver Oaks P.U.D. Pond | 108 | NW corner of Bronson St. and Taft Hill Road | Significant (77 cfs) overtopping of Taft Hill Road | Additional (up to 11 cfs) flows overtopping Taft Hill Road; max. possible discharge = 88 cfs |
| Springfield East Ponds | 112 | Between Dalton Dr. and Horsetooth Road | Minor (16 cfs) overtopping of pond berm south of Horsetooth Road | Additional (up to 6 cfs) flows overtopping berm south of Horsetooth Road; max. possible discharge = 22 cfs |
| Avocet Road Pond | 282 | Along Avocet Road east of Meadowlark Ave. | Minor (36 cfs) overland flows to LCC No. 2 between houses | Additional (up to 37 cfs) overland flows to LCC No. 2; max. possible discharge = 73 cfs; possible overtopping of left (east) bank of LCC No. 2 toward Redwing Office Park and potential ponding along Avocet Road |
| Burlington Northern Railroad (BNRR) Pond | 303 | BNRR embankment SW of Prospect Road and College Ave. | Potential for overtopping in storms larger than 100- year design storm. Minimal (if any) overtopping during 100-year storm. | Significant (up to 1975 cfs) overtopping may occur if outlets become plugged. |
| Kensington South Pond | 336 | SE corner of Dunbar Ave. and Drake Road | Significant (87 cfs) overtopping of Drake Road | Additional (up to 65 cfs) flows overtopping Drake Road; max. possible discharge = 152 cfs |
| Springfield Pond | 349 | SW corner of Platte Dr. and Horsetooth Road | Significant (50 cfs) overtopping of Horsetooth Road | Additional (up to 6 cfs) flows overtopping Horsetooth Road; max. possible discharge = 56 cfs |
| Quail Hollow First Filing Pond | 357 | SE of Drake Road and Overland Trail | Major (247 cfs) flows through emergency spillway to Dixon Creek | Additional (up to 19 cfs) flows using emergency spillway; max. possible discharge = 266 cfs |
| Quail Hollow Third Filing Pond | 358 | South of Drake Road and Overland Trail | Major (125 cfs) flows through emergency spillway | Additional (up to 1 cfs) flows using emergency spillway; max. possible discharge = 126 cfs |
| Fox Creek P.U.D. West Pond | 360 | Between McKeag Drive and PV&L Canal | Minor (22 cfs) flows through emergency spillway to Dixon Creek | Additional (up to 7 cfs) flows using emergency spillway; max. possible discharge = 29 cfs |
| Fox Creek P.U.D. East Pond | 361 | NE of Moore Lane and PV&L Canal | Minor (1.8 cfs) flows through emergency spillway into PV&L Canal | Additional (up to 0.5 cfs) flows using emergency spillway into PV&L Canal; max. possible discharge = 2.3 cfs |



| Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate Location | Potential Flooding Scenario | Potential Flooding Scenario if the Normal Outlet is Blocked |
|-------------------------------|------------|--|--|--|
| Kingston Woods P.U.D. Pond | 370 | NW of Horsetooth Road and Shields St. | Minor (25 cfs) flows overtopping berm to the north (between Kingston Woods and Casa Grande P.U.D.'s) | Additional (up to 3 cfs) flows overtopping berm; max. possible discharge = 28 cfs |

Summary of Detention Pond Overtopping Data (Continued)

| Detention Pond | SWMM ID | Approximate Location | Potential Flooding Scenario | Potential Flooding Scenario if the Normal Outlet is Blocked |
|--|------------|---|--|---|
| Chaparral P.U.D. Pond | 371 | SW corner of Shields St. and Casa Grande Blvd. | Significant (85 cfs) overtopping of Shields Street | Additional (up to 21 cfs) flows overtopping Shields Street; max. possible discharge = 106 cfs |
| Wagon Wheel P.U.D. Pond | 372 | SW corner of Shields St. and Swallow Road | Significant (59 cfs) overtopping of Shields Street | Additional (up to 19 cfs) flows overtopping Shields Street; max. possible discharge = 78 cfs |
| Rocky Mountain High School Ponds | 373 | NW corner of Shields St. and Swallow Road | Significant (93 cfs) overland flows along Rocky Mountain Way | Additional (up to 7 cfs) overland flows along Rocky Mountain Way; max. possible discharge = 100 cfs |
| Southeast Timberline Lake Pond | 603 | NE of Timberline Road and Spring Creek | Significant (69 cfs) overtopping of berm to the east toward Spring Creek | Additional (up to 31 cfs) overtopping of berm to the east toward Spring Creek; max. possible discharge = 100 cfs |
| Stonehenge Ponds | 616 | SW corner of Stuart St. and Brookwood Dr. | Significant (95 cfs) overtopping of Stuart Street | Additional (up to 2 cfs) overtopping of Stuart Street, max. possible discharge = 97 cfs |
| Remington/Lake St. Pond | 637 | Intersection of Remington St. and Lake St. | Up to 3.2' of ponding at Lake and Remington Street intersection | Additional ponding at Lake and Remington Street intersection |
| Mission Hills Ponds | 641 | SW corner of Lemay Ave. and Columbia Road | Major (105 cfs) overtopping of Lemay Ave. | Additional (up to 4 cfs) overtopping of Lemay Ave.; max. possible discharge = 109 cfs |
| Cottonwood P.U.D. Pond | 646 | NW of Drake Road and Lemay Ave. | Minor (31 cfs) overtopping of berm to east toward Woodward Governor site | Additional (up to 29 cfs) overtopping of berm to the east toward Woodward Governor site; max. possible discharge = 60 cfs |
| Spring Canyon Park Pond | 303 | Northwest of dog park off of Horsetooth Rd. | Overtopping is designed to occur from Spring Creek into pond then back into Spring Creek. No overtopping of streets will occur during normal operation. | Additional (up to 10.5 cfs) overtopping back into Spring Creek; max possible discharge = 723 cfs |



Critical Facilities – There are two critical facilities are located in the Spring Creek 100-year floodplain:

- Spring Creek Country Day School, 1900 Remington St;
- Mountain Center Pre-School Day Camp, 419 E Stuart St;
- Orthopaedic Center of the Rockies, 2500 E Prospect Rd.

Emergency response in the eastern portion of the basin may be compromised due to direct flood impacts to Fire Station No. 3, and reduced access due to the overtopping of Remington Street, Stuart Street, Stover Street, Welch Avenue, Riverside Avenue, and Timberline Road. In addition to the critical facilities that would be directly impacted by flood flows along Spring Creek, the following facilities were identified within the Spring Creek basin:

- Poudre Fire Authority Station No. 3, 2000 Mathews St;
- Poudre River Power Authority Timberline Substation, 2000 E Horsetooth Rd; and
- Poudre Fire Authority Station No. 4, 1945 W Drake Rd;
- Platte River Power Authority Dixon Creek Substation, Drake Rd and Overland Trail;
- City of Fort Collins Drake Substation, Drake/McClelland, NW corner;
- Mountain Sage Charter School, 2310 E. Prospect Rd;
- Poudre Online Academy/Barton School, 703 E. Prospect Rd;
- Sunshine School, 906 E. Stuart St;
- Spring Creek Health Care Center, 1000 E. Stuart St











Foothills Basin

The Foothills Basin is centrally located in Fort Collins. It covers about 3,200 acres generally between Taft Hill and Ziegler Roads and between Horsetooth and Drake Roads. The basin is mostly developed, with commercial development along College Avenue and mixed-use residential in the remainder.

The basin drains from west to east through open channels or the storm sewer system to the Fossil Creek Reservoir Inlet Ditch. Three irrigation canals intercept stormwater to transport it out of the basin, but runoff spills into the basin when canal capacity is exceeded.

Drainage between Taft Hill Road and the Foothills Fashion Mall is characterized by street and storm sewer flow with some grass-lined channels and detention ponds. The main channel begins downstream of Stanford Road. This channel is generally well-defined with a low base flow. The City of Fort Collins constructed a regional channel east of Timberline Road to carry stormwater runoff from the entire Foothills Basin.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - Since the Foothills Basin was developed according to the original 1981 master plan and the Storm Drainage Design Criteria, many of the recommended improvements were completed. Because of this, most of the basin is capable of handling a 100-year storm event. However, some localized flooding problems exist:

- Warren Farms detention pond located at the northwest corner of Horsetooth Road and the Burlington Northern Railroad;
- Nelson Farm detention pond located northwest of the corner of Lochwood Drive and Horsetooth Road;
- Southmoor Village ponds located near Boltz Drive and Lemay Avenue; and
- Oxford Apartment pond located near Oxford Lane and Lemay Avenue.

The master plan update estimates there are 21 structures, four roads and one railroad crossing that would be damaged during a 100-year storm, with an estimated \$1.5 million in damages. If nothing is done to mitigate this damage, it is estimated that \$0.91 million of damage would occur over the next 50 years.

| SWMM Element ID # | D/S Road | Road Classification (*allowable overtopping depth) | Overtopping Elevation | 100-year Velocity (ft/s) ** | 100-year WSEL (Crown overtopping depth – feet) | 50-year WSEL (Crown overtopping depth – feet) |
|-------------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Pond 157 | Timberline Rd. | Major Arterial (zero inches) | 4939.5 | 0.0 ft/s | 4934.96 (0 feet) | 4935.1 (0 feet) |
| Pond 57 | Eastbrook e Dr. | Local (18 inches over flowline) | 4940.0 | 3.0 ft/s | 4941.22 (1 foot) | 4940.5 (0.5 feet) |
| Pond 56 | UPRR | n/a (zero inches) | 4953.1 | 2.2 ft/s | 4952.07 (0 feet) | 4949.3 (0 feet) |
| CE 55 | Lochwood Dr. | Collector (18 inches over flowline) | 4954.0 | 3.0 ft/s | 4955.63 (1.6 feet) | 4955.56 (1.6 feet)*** |
| Pond 42 | Lemay Ave. | Arterial (6 inches over crown) | 4979.5 | 2.4 ft/s | 4980.3 (0.8 feet) | 4979.8 (0.3 feet) |
| Pond 41 | Camelot | Local (18 inches over flowline) | 4981.0 | 7.4 ft/s | 4983.31 (2.3 feet) | 4980.5 (0 feet) |

Summary of Roadway Overtopping – Foothills Basin





| SWMM Element ID # | D/S Road | Road Classification (*allowable overtopping depth) | Overtopping Elevation | 100-year Velocity (ft/s) ** | 100-year WSEL (Crown overtopping depth – feet) | 50-year WSEL (Crown overtopping depth – feet) |
|-------------------------|----------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Pond 15 | Meadow- lark Ave. | Collector (18 inches over flowline) | 5045.6 | 1.9 ft/s | 5046.3 (0.8 feet) | 5043.7 (0 feet) |
| Pond 44 | Lemay Ave. | Arterial (6 inches over crown) | 4979.7 | 0.5 ft/s | 4981.7 (2 feet) | 4981.3 (1.6 feet)**** |

*Local & Collector – 18 inches over flowline equates to 1 foot over crown assuming 24-foot width for ½ street and 2% cross-slope.

** Note – Velocities based on Q=AV where A is approximate overtopping area, or results of HEC-RAS.

*** Note – 10-year depth of flow over Lochwood =0.9 feet based on 10-year water surface elevation of

4954.9 from HEC-RAS model Lochwood.prj (cross section #3) in Hydraulics Technical Appendix.

**** Note - 10-year depth of flow over Lemay=0.0 feet based on 10-year water surface elevation of 4979.7 from pond 44 rating curve in Hydrology Technical Appendix.











Fox Meadows Basin

The Fox Meadows Basin encompasses approximately 2.4 square miles in southeast Fort Collins. The basin is bound by Horsetooth Road on the north, Lemay Avenue on the west, Harmony Road on the south and the Cache La Poudre River on the east. The basin is primarily developed with residential development, some commercial areas and the Collindale Golf Course. The basin does not include a major drainageway for conveying flows through the basin, so no regulatory floodplain has been mapped. Storm runoff flows through a network of storm sewers, local drainage channels and detention ponds.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - The basin has limited flooding problems because it was developed with the guidance of the Storm Drainage Design Criteria and the original drainage master plan. However, the updated master plan, which includes a higher rainfall standard adopted by City Council in 1999, identified a few potential problems. These include overtopping of existing detention facilities, ponding behind railroad embankments, roadway overtopping and inadequate ditch capacity. The master plan estimates 14 structures would be damaged in a 100-year storm, with \$610,000 worth of damage. If nothing is done to mitigate this damage, an estimated \$670,000 worth of damage could occur over the next 50 years.











Inventory of Detention Ponds – Fox Meadows Basin

| | Outlet | Volume | Overtopping | Discharge at | | | Overtopping | | | 100-yr | Roadway / Embankment |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Location | Size | Before Overtopping | Elevation (feet) | Overtopping Elevation | 2-Year Overtopping | 5-Year Overtopping | 10-Year Overtopping | 50-Year Overtopping | 100-yr Overtopping | WSEL (feet) | |
| | | (acre-ft) | | (cfs) | Depth (feet) | Depth (feet) | Depth (feet) | Depth (feet) | Depth (feet) | | |
| HP Site Pond | 18" Dia. | 11.9 | 4892.0 **** | 22 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4894.0 | Embankment |
| Woodland Park Regional Detention Pond | 12" Dia. Plate | 5.5 | 4881.00 | 11 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 4882.1 | Embankment |
| Inadvertent Detention at Undeveloped Lots | (2) 18" Dia. | 23.1 | 4927.00 | 29 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4927.0 | Ziegler Road |
| LSI Pond | 36" Dia. | 7.0 | 4930.00 | 66 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4927.3 | LSI Entrance Road |
| English Ranch Pond #7 | 18"x18" Plate | 6.6 | 4926.80 | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 4926.9 | Embankment |
| English Ranch Pond #6 | 24" Dia. | 6.0 | 4927.10 | 33 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4924.3 | Paddington Road |
| English Ranch Pond #5 | 6.5"x7.5" Plate | 4.5 | 4918.50 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 4918.9 | Ziegler Road |
| English Ranch Pond #4 | 6"x7" Plate | 3.5 | 4918.00 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 4919.1 | Ashmount Drive |
| English Ranch Pond #3 | 6" Plate | 4.5 | 4919.00 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 4920.3 | Embankment |
| English Ranch Pond #2 | 6" Plate | 1.8 | 4922.20 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 4923.1 | Kingsley Drive |
| Sunstone Village Pond #5 | 24" Dia. | 6.5 | 4940.10 | 46 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 4940.5 | Embankment |
| Sunstone Village Regional Detention Pond | 30" Dia. | 17.0 | 4934.00 | 27 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 4935.1 | Embankment |
| Fox Meadows Pond | 21" Dia. | 5.8 | 4931.00 | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 4931.3 | Embankment |
| SunstoneVillage Pond #4 | 15" Dia. | 5.9 | 4949.26 | 11 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 4949.7 | Embankment |
| Fox Meadows Apartments Pond | 12" Dia. Plate | 2.0 | 4941.10 | 8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 4941.2 | Embankment |
| Sunstone Village Pond #3 | 24" Dia. | 6.5 | 4958.0 *** | 34 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4956.8 | Embankment |
| Timberline Sump | 36" Dia. | 95.5 | 4957.50 | 111 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4952.4 | Timberline Road |
| Collindale Business Park | 24" Dia. | 21.6 | 4948.00 | 35 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4946.8 | Timberline Road |
| Golden Meadows Detention Pond | 36" Dia. | 65.8 * | 4962.60 | 117 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4961.9 | Union Pacific Railroad |
| Collindale Golf Course Inadvertent Detention | 18" Dia. | 43.6 | 4956.5 ** | 19 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4954.6 | Union Pacific Railroad |

* Note: Total pond storage exceeds the actual pond and collects behind the UP Railroad Embankment.

** Note: Above El. 4956.50, overtopping will occur to the North, to the Foothills Basin, before overtopping the UP Railroad to the East.

*** Note: Maximum pond stage exceeds the actual design capacity of the pond. Excess storage occurs in undeveloped area to the south of the pond.

**** Note: The Overtopping Elevation corresponds with the invert elevation of the FCRID Bypass Spillway. The discharge at the full capacity of the Bypass Spillway is 1039-cfs at El. 95.8.



Pond locations are shown on the Flood Potential Maps in Appendix A, and discussed in detail in the Hydrology Report



Mail Creek Basin

The McClellands Basin encompasses approximately 3.4 square miles in southeast Fort Collins. The storm runoff from the basin originates northeast of College Avenue and Harmony Road and drains southeast through the Oakridge, Willow Springs, Stetson Creek and Harvest Park developments. A single major drainageway, McClellands Creek, conveys flow from the upper end of the basin to the downstream discharge point along the Fossil Creek Reservoir Inlet Ditch. The majority of the basin is either developed, or is being developed, with residential and commercial land areas.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - The basin has limited flooding problems because it was developed with the guidance of the Storm Drainage Design Criteria and the original master drainage plan. The updated master plan, which includes the higher rainfall standard adopted by City Council in 1999, identifies no structures damaged during a 100-year storm. However, several drainage problems have been identified in the basin, including pond overtopping, stream instability, water quality and street flooding.











| SWMM Element ID | D/S Road | Road classification (*allowable depth) | Over- topping | Overtopping elevation | 100-year WSEL (overtopping depth – inches) | 50-year WSEL (overtopping depth-inches) |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Pond 189 | Westbury Drive | Local (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 5085.0 | 5085.22 (2.6 inches) | NA |
| Pond 279 | Seneca Street | Collector (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 5107.0 | 5107.05 (0.6 inches) | NA |
| Pond 321 | N/a – d/s swale | N/a | Yes | 5055.0 | 5055.13 (1.6 inches) | NA |
| Pond 412 | Wabash Street | Collector (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 5075.0 | 5075.07 (0.8 inches) | NA |
| Pond 104 | N/a – d/s swale | N/a | No | 5059.5 | 5058.99 (0 inches) | NA |
| Pond 230 | Seneca Street | Collector (18 inches over flowline) | No | 5116.5 | 5115.88 (0 inches) | NA |
| CE 16 | Crest Road | Local (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 5042.25 | 5042.88 (7.6 inches) | 5042.46 (2.5 inches) |
| CE 17 | Hinsdale Drive | Collector (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 5054.36 | 5054.82 (5.5 inches) | NA |
| CE 35 | Hummingbird Drive | Local (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 101.76 (relative elevation) | 102.6 (10 inches) | 102.43 (8 inches) |
| CE 35 | Warbler | Local (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 103.95 (relative elevation) | 104.81 (10.3 inches) | 104.62 (8 inches) |
| CE 38 | Manhattan Avenue | Collector (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 105.96 (relative elevation) | 106.59 (7.5 inches) | 106.46 (6 inches) |
| CE 49 | Royal Drive | Local (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 5119.5 | 5120.59 (13.1 inches) | 5120.41 (10.9 inches) |
| CE 49 | Crescent Drive | Local (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 5115.43 | 5116.38 (11.4 inches) | 5116.24 (9.7 inches) |
| CE 200 | Taft Hill Road | Arterial (6 inches over crown) | Yes | 5150.75 | 5151.56 (9.7 inches) | 5151.45 (8.4 inches) |
| CE 200 | Goodell Lane | Local (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 5137.81 | 5139.09 (15.4 inches) | 5138.90 (13.1 inches) |
| CE 200 | Lynda Lane | Local (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 5131.56 | 5132.29 (8.8 inches) | 5132.17 (7.3 inches) |
| CE 200 | Capitol Drive | Local (18 inches over flowline) | Yes | 5124.27 | 5125.61 (16.1 inches) | 5125.42 (13.8 inches) |
| CE 366 | Moss Creek | Local (18 inches over flowline) | No | 109.49 (relative elevation) | 102.06 (0 inches) | NA |
| CE 366 | Benthaven Street | Local (18 inches over flowline) | No | 105.17 (relative elevation) | 103.00 (0 inches) | NA |
| CE 369 | Dennison Avenue | Local (18 inches over flowline) | No | 105.79 (relative elevation) | 104.6 (0 inches) | NA |

*Local & Collector – 18 inches over flowline equates to 12 inches over crown assuming 24 foot ½ street width and 2% crossslope.





McClellands Basin

The McClellands Basin encompasses approximately 3.4 square miles in southeast Fort Collins. The storm runoff from the basin originates northeast of College Avenue and Harmony Road and drains southeast through the Oakridge, Willow Springs, Stetson Creek and Harvest Park developments. A single major drainageway, McClellands Creek, conveys flow from the upper end of the basin to the downstream discharge point along the Fossil Creek Reservoir Inlet Ditch. The majority of the basin is either developed, or is being developed, with residential and commercial land areas.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - The basin has limited flooding problems because it was developed with the guidance of the Storm Drainage Design Criteria and the original master drainage plan. The updated master plan, which includes the higher rainfall standard adopted by City Council in 1999, identifies no structures damaged during a 100-year storm. However, several drainage problems have been identified in the basin, including pond overtopping, stream instability, water quality and street flooding.










| | | | | | | | Existing Conditions | | | Developed Conditions | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| Location | SWMM | Type of Structure | Approximate | Capacity | Top of | 100-Year | 100-Year | 100-Year | 100-Year | 100-Year | 100-Year | Approximate | |
| | Design | | Capacity | Relative to | Road Elev. | Discharge | WSEL | Overtopping | Discharge | WSEL | Overtopping | Travel Time | |
| | Point | | (cfs) | Frequency* | (ft) | (cfs) | (ft) | Depth (ft) | (cfs) | (ft) | Depth (ft) | (hrs) | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wheaton Drive | 42 | (2) 42" RCP** | 64 | <25-yr | 4972.2 | 115 | 4972.5 | 0.3 | 115 | 4972.5 | 0.3 | 0.9 | |
| Keenland Drive @ Wheaton Drive | 4 | 34"x53" HERCP | 105 | <50-yr | 4959.2 | 166 | 4959.5 | 0.3 | 166 | 4959.5 | 0.3 | 1.0 | |
| Boardwalk Dr. West of Lemay Ave. | 326 | 42" RCP | 76 | <25-yr | 4968.5 | 179 | 4968.8 | 0.3 | 179 | 4968.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 | |
| Boardwalk at Whalers Way | 486 | 21" RCP | 20 | <25-yr | 5003.3 | 40 | 5003.7 | 0.4 | 54 | 5003.8 | 0.5 | 2.0 | |
| McMurray Avenue | 43 | (2) 42" RCP | 202 | <100-yr | 4959.2 | 223 | 4959.2 | 0.0 | 223 | 4959.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | |
| Lemay Avenue & Harmony Road | 31 | 36" RCP | 49 | <100-yr | 4987.3 | 71 | 4987.5 | 0.2 | 86 | 4987.5 | 0.2 | 2.0 | |

Inventory of Overtopping Culverts and Roadways (Developed Conditions) – McClellands Basin

*Capacity relative to developed conditions SWMM discharges

**Without additional inlet access to the 2-42" RCPs, actual capacity under Wheaton is limited to the combined capacity of the 12" and 42" RCPs.

Inventory of Major Non-Overtopping Culverts and Roadways (Developed Conditions) – McClellands Basin

| | | | | | | E | kisting Condi | tions | Developed Conditions | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Location | SWMM Design Point | Type of Structure | Approximate Capacity (cfs) | Capacity Relative to Frequency* | Top of Road Elev. (ft) | 100-Year Discharge (cfs) | 100-Year WSEL (ft) | 100-Year Overtopping Depth (ft) | 100-Year Discharge (cfs) | 100-Year WSEL (ft) | 100-Year Overtopping Depth (ft) | Approximate Travel Time (hrs) |
| County Road 36 | 414 | (2) 20'x5' RCB | 1900 | >100 | 4893.0 | 1489 | 4888.8 | 0 | 1943 | 4890.3 | 0 | 1.1 |
| County Road 9 | 102 | 30'x5.5' RCB | 159 | <2-yr | 4907.0 | 891 | 4905.1 | 0 | 1130 | 4906.9 | 0 | 1.0 |
| Oakridge Drive | 41 | (3) 42" RCP | 170 | >100-yr | 4978.0 | 102 | 4977.4 | 0.0 | 102 | 4977.4 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| Timberline Road | 358 | (2) 4'x8' RCBC | 576 | >100-yr | 4939.0 | 380 | 4937.1 | 0.0 | 381 | 4937.1 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
| UPRR | 2 | 72" RCP** | 310 | >100-yr | 4960.4 | 274 | 4954.3 | 0.0 | 276 | 4954.3 | 0.0 | 2.6 |
| Lemay N. of Boardwalk Drive | 341 | (3) 36" RCP | 197 | >100-yr | 4963.0 | 165 | 4963.0 | 0.0 | 165 | 4963.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| White Willow Drive | 140 | (3) 60" RCP | 750 | >100-yr | 4945.0 | 293 | 4939.2 | 0.0 | 295 | 4939.3 | 0.0 | 2.6 |
| Battle Creek Drive | 116 | (3) 60" RCP | 900 | >100-yr | 4955.0 | 283 | 4945.2 | 0.0 | 285 | 4945.2 | 0.0 | 2.6 |

*Capacity relative to developed conditions SWMM discharges

**Actual outlet capacity controlled by smaller orifice plate.



Fossil Creek Basin

The Fossil Creek drainage basin extends along the south end of Fort Collins, from the foothills across Interstate 25 past County Road 5. It encompasses 32 square miles in the City of Fort Collins and Larimer County. Historically, the basin consisted of agricultural land, but the basin has experienced significant development in the past decade.

The original Fossil Creek Master Plan (1982) mapped the 100-year floodplain and restricted any new development from this floodplain. Construction that occurred throughout the 1990s took place outside the floodplain. Early in 2002, Fort Collins Utilities mapped a new floodplain for this basin as part of a comprehensive update of the City's Stormwater Master Plan. The new floodplain map reflects the higher rainfall standard adopted by City Council in 1999.

<u>Basin Problems</u> - The Fossil Creek floodplain is now wider in many locations. Flooding problems are primarily due to undersized culverts that back water up into homes or overtop roadways. The majority of flooding of structures would occur along Fossil Creek between the Union Pacific Railroad and Lemay Avenue. Water would back up behind the railroad embankment south of Trilby Road. The 10-foot-diameter culvert through the railroad embankment would not be able to handle the amount of water generated by a flood, and water would back up all the way to the Southridge Greens Golf Course.

Since the rainfall standard was increased, there are now 117 homes, 13 roads and three railroads that would be damaged during a 100-year storm, with an estimated \$10.6 million in damage. If nothing is done to mitigate this damage, it is estimated that \$5.97 million of damage would occur over the next 50 years, primarily from flooding of homes.

In addition to flooding hazards, erosion has occurred because of natural processes, agricultural practices and urban development. The channel of Fossil Creek and its tributaries are very unstable, with steep banks—in some places up to 25 feet high. Excessive erosion also leads to poor water quality, damage to adjacent property, damage to roads and utilities and reduced biological diversity to support riparian habitat.





Inventory of Overtopped Roadways -

Fossil Creek Basin

| Location | Type of Structure | Approximate | 2-Year Depth | 5-Year Depth | 10-Year Depth | 50-Year Depth | 100-Year Depth | 500-Year Depth | 100-Year | 100-Year |
|------------------------|--|------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------|
| | | Capacity* | Over Road | Over Road | Over Road | Over Road | Over Road | Over Road | WSEL | Velocity |
| | | | (feet) | (feet) | (feet) | (feet) | (feet) | (feet) | (feet) | (fps) |
| FOSSIL CREEK | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timberline Road | (8) 5'x10'RCB & (1) 6'x12'RCB | 7-Year | 0 | 0 | 0.6 | 0.8 | <1.0 | 1.2 | 4876.8 | 0.3 |
| Union Pacific Railroad | 10' CMP & (2) 118" Steel | Exceeds 500-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4902.9 | 20.9 |
| Trilby Road | 6.5' CMP | 4-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | <1.0 | 3.7 | unknown | 4895.9 | 0.2 |
| Lemay Avenue | 3-Sided RCB | 95-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 3.5 | 4906.1 | 8.9 |
| Fossil Creek Parkway | Bridge | 150-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.7 | 4916.8 | 4.7 |
| College Avenue | Triple RCB | 150-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.4 | 4949.5 | 14.3 |
| C & S Railroad | 3-Sided RCB | Exceeds 500-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4963.4 | 15.6 |
| Fossil Creek Drive | Two 7'w X 5'h RCBs | 9-Year | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 3.4 | 4969.4 | 9.6 |
| Shields Street | 10'w X 6'h RCB | 150-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.7 | 5001.3 | 14.8 |
| Taft Hill Road | 5' & 3' CMPs | 400-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 5096.4 | 14.3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| STANTON CREEK | | | | | | | | | | |
| County Road 32 | 3-Sided RCB | 200-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 3.7 | 4944.5 | 11.2 |
| Lemay Avenue | None | 0 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 3 | 4952.2 | 6.8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| STONE CREEK | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lemay Avenue | Five 6'w X 3'h RCBs & Two 12'x4' RCBs | 100-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 4906.9 | 7.2 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| BURNS TRIBUTARY | -1 | | | - | | | | | | |
| Hilldale Drive | 6' RCP | 30-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 4994.5 | 8.9 |
| Shields Street | 5.5' RCP & Trail | 500-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5007.8 | 19.9 |
| Taft Hill Road | 4' CMP | 75-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 5059.8 | 15.3 |
| | | - | | | | | | | | - |
| | 2.614.4.202 | 500.14 | | 2 | | 2 | | | 4004.0 | 47.6 |
| C & S RR #1 | 3-Sided RCB | 500-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4981.0 | 17.6 |
| | 3-Sided RCB | 25-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 4.1 | 4998.6 | 8.4 |
| Trilby Road | 5.5" RCP & 4" RCP | 40-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 5027.5 | 18.3 |
| C & S KK #3 | 10 W X 4 h RCB | 15-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 5027.5 | 0.3 |
| C & S KK #4 | 8 W X 2 N RCB | 2-Year | 0 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 5042.9 | 11.9 |
| Shields Street | 5' RCP | 30-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 5053.2 | 16.2 |
| Taft Hill Road | 3" CIMP | 9-Year | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 5112.7 | 11.6 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| SIVILLE CKEEK | True CL CMD: | 150 Veer | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 1.0 | 5021.1 | 11.0 |
| Snields Street | | 150-Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.9 | 5031.1 | 11.9 |
| Tatt Hill Road | 3.5' KCP | 150-Year | U | U | U | 0 | 0 | 1.3 | 5091.6 | 19.9 |
| * Prior to Overtopping | | | | | | | | | | |

Page 904









Flood Potential from Dams and Levees

Three levees are located along the Poudre River:

Oxbow Levee – Located between Lincoln and Linden Street. This levee protects the Buckingham Neighborhood and businesses along the north side of Lincoln Avenue.

RPATH Levee – Located upstream of Timberline Road. This levee keeps water in the main channel and protects business along Timberline Road near Prospect Road.

Drake Water Reclamation Facility Levee – Protects the City's Drake Water Reclamation Facility and is located along the north and west side of the facility.

There also are numerous high hazard dams, including the four large dams on Horsetooth Reservoir operated by the Bureau of Reclamation that have the potential to impact Fort Collins. The high hazard dams have been assessed and the data is available to emergency response personnel for use in an emergency.





Mitigation Alternative Analysis

Representatives from numerous City departments (Emergency Management, Engineering, Parks, Natural Resources, Advanced Planning, Current Planning, Transportation) and outside agencies (Irrigation Ditch companies, Larimer County Engineering Department, Poudre School District, and Colorado State University) were brought together to discuss the various mitigation alternatives for each basin. An example agenda and minutes from one of these meetings are included in the Attachments. Both structural and non-structural alternatives were discussed. The following table lists the alternatives that were discussed and the reasons why some alternatives were not recommended.

| Mitiantian | | | Continue | |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
| Mitigation | D 11 | Not | Continue | XX71 1/2 / 1 1 |
| Alternatives | Recommended | Recommended | Existing | Why it was not recommended |
| Considered | | | Program | |
| Preventative | | | | |
| Activities | | | I | |
| | | | | Handled through floodplain |
| Planning and Zoning | | Х | Х | regulations. Continue to coordinate |
| | | | | as plans are updated. |
| Open Space | x | | x | |
| Preservation | | | | |
| Floodplain | x | | x | |
| Regulations | Δ | | Λ | |
| | | | | Handled through floodplain |
| Building Codes | | Х | Х | regulations. Continue to coordinate |
| | | | | as plans are updated. |
| Stormwater Design | v | | v | |
| Criteria | Λ | | Λ | |
| Drainage System | V | | V | |
| Maintenance | X | | Х | |
| Property Protection | | ł | • | |
| | | | | Not a popular option – too |
| Relocation | | Х | | expensive. |
| Acquisition | X | | X | |
| | | | | Not a popular option – too |
| Building Elevation | | Х | | expensive. |
| | | | | Up to individuals. City offers |
| Retrofitting | X | | Х | information and advice. |
| Sewer Back-up | | | | Up to individuals. City offers |
| Protection | | Х | Х | information and advice. |
| 1100000000 | | | | Up to individuals City offers |
| Insurance | | Х | Х | information. |
| Natural Resources | | | | |
| Protection | | | | |
| Wetlands Protection | x | | x | |
| Erosion and | | | | |
| Sediment Control | Х | | Х | |
| Bost Monogoment | | | | |
| Dest Management | X | | Х | |
| Flactices | | | | |
| Emergency Services | ** | | *7 | |
| Flood Warning | X | | X | |

Summary Table of Mitigation Alternatives Considered





| Mitigation Alternatives Considered | Recommended | Not Recommended | Continue Existing Program | Why it was not recommended |
|--|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Gage Expansion | Х | | | |
| Flood response | Х | | Х | |
| Critical Facilities | | x | | Structural projects will help protect |
| Protection | | 21 | | many critical facilities. |
| Structural Projects | | | | |
| Detention Ponds | Х | | | |
| Levees | Х | | | |
| Diversions | Х | | | |
| Channel | x | | | |
| Modifications | Λ | | | |
| Storm Sewers | X | | | |
| Culvert | x | | | |
| Improvements | 24 | | | |
| Public Information | | | | |
| Map Information | X | | X | |
| Outreach Projects | Х | | Х | |
| Information at Public | x | | x | |
| Library | 24 | | 24 | |
| Real Estate | | | | Left to real estate professionals. |
| Disclosure | | Х | | City will continue to provide |
| Disclosure | | | | information when requested. |
| Technical assistance | х | | х | |
| to property owners | | | | |
| Web page | X | | X | |
| Cable TV program related to flooding | Х | | | |

Recommended Mitigation Strategy

The recommended mitigation strategy contains both City-wide strategies as well as basin-specific strategies. These strategies were chosen based on their ability to reduce flood damages, cost effectiveness, feasibility, and how they fit with the overall goals, policies and other programs of the City of Fort Collins Utilities. Details on the benefit cost methodology are found in the Attachments. Individual Mitigation Action Guides for the continuing programs and the basin-specific projects can be found in the Fort Collins Community Profile in Appendix B of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan.

City-Wide Strategies

The City-wide mitigation strategies are primarily a continuation of current programs. However, there are a few specific proposed projects related to public outreach and emergency response.

Continuing Programs

The City of Fort Collins plans to evaluate as needed and continue the following existing programs:

- Drainage system maintenance (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guides, Appendix B of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan)
- Regulatory Programs floodplain regulations higher than minimum NFIP standards, stormwater design criteria, erosion and sediment control, Low Impact Development (LID) and water quality best management practices (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guides, Appendix B of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan)





- Public Outreach Guided by the City's Program for Public Information (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guides, Appendix B of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan)
 - Annual mailer to all floodplain property owners and residents
 - Annual mailer to realtors, insurance agents, and lenders
 - Updates to Stormwater web page
 - Free technical assistance to property owners for property protection measures
 - Map information service
 - Flood Awareness Week activities
 - Advertisement of services and flood information in City News.
 - Provide information on flood insurance availability, property protection measures, flood safety, flood risk, etc.
 - Information available at the public library
 - Talks and programs to community groups, schools, realtors, etc about flooding related issues
- Open Space Preservation (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guides, Appendix B of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan)
- Low Impact Development Retrofits (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guides, Appendix B of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan)
- Flood Warning and Emergency Response (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guides, Appendix B of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan)
 - Maintenance of gaging system
 - Maintenance of notification tools
 - Continued coordination between Stormwater and the Office of Emergency Management
 - Annual exercise
- Stormwater Master Planning is updating the hydrology in all of the Master Plans in the City, revising one basin per year until all plans are updated (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guides, Appendix B of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan)

These programs are in place to improve the community's awareness of flood risks, to continue to maintain and improve the infrastructure and emergency systems, and to regulate new development so that the citizens, property and floodplain itself are better protected in a future flood.

The floodplain regulations are codified in Chapter 10 of the City of Fort Collins Municipal Code. The regulations exceed minimum NFIP standards for example, require additional freeboard of 24" in the Poudre River floodplain and 18" in the other mapped floodplains, prohibiting development in the Poudre River floodway, and prohibiting Critical Facilities in the floodplain. Expected code changes in the future will clarify LID requirements as well as green infrastructure (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guide, Green Infrastructure Policies, Appendix B of the 2016 Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan).

Mitigation Actions to Be Taken By Private Individuals:

The City encourages private property owners to take steps to mitigate their risk. The City can provide technical assistance and information on the following mitigation strategies:

- Retrofitting and Floodproofing
- Flood insurance
- Sewer Back-up Protection
- Emergency Preparedness planning (sign-up for LETA911, emergency supply kit, family evacuation plan, etc.)

2015 Plan Proposed Projects





• Flood Warning System software upgrade in 2015-2016.

Specific Drainage Basin Strategies

The City of Fort Collins identified a number of jurisdiction-specific mitigation actions in the 2010 Northern Colorado Hazard Mitigation Plan. The status of these "legacy" mitigation actions have been reported on by hazard mitigation planning team members and are documented in Appendix G of the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Boxelder Creek and Cooper Slough Basins

Regional Opportunities: The Boxelder Creek floodplain also impacts the towns of Wellington and Timnath, as well as a large amount of sparsely developed and undeveloped property east of I-25. Larimer County, the City of Fort Collins and the Town of Wellington adopted a regional drainage master plan in 2008. This plan will reduce the size of the floodplain by constructing additional flood detention in the basin (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guide, Boxelder Basin Regional Stormwater, Appendix B).

Stream Stability and Habitat: The master plan also recommends opportunities to enhance the riparian habitat and address erosion along Boxelder Creek. This includes constructing sloping boulder drop structures, sloping back vertical banks and re-establishing native landscaping to promote biological diversity along the stream. The goal is to preserve areas with good habitat and enhance areas of poor habitat.

Fossil Creek Basin

Excessive Erosion/Poor Stream Habitat: Construct sloping boulder drop structures and sloping back vertical banks, and re-establish native landscaping to promote biological diversity along the stream. Preserve areas with good habitat and enhance areas of poor habitat (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guide, Stream Rehab Program, Appendix B).

Mail Creek Basin

The plan proposes channel upgrades to improve habitat ratings, stream stability and water quality. Improvements include grading to flatten out steep bank slopes, creating pools and riffles, and planting vegetation.

Dry Creek Basin

The project includes a storm sewer system to mitigate local flooding (during a 100-year storm) in the area generally north of East Vine Drive, west of Lemay Avenue, south of the Larimer and Weld Canal, and east of College Avenue. The project incorporates a combination of storm sewer and increased detention to convey local storm runoff to the future East Vine Diversion Channel. The storm drainage design coordinates with the design efforts of the East Vine Drive realignment. The project also includes the construction of a stormwater detention pond and a pond outlet under Vine Drive and the Railroad Yard north of Vine Drive at Dry Creek (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guide, North East College Corridor Outfall, Appendix B).

McClellands Basin

Stream Stability and Habitat: The goal is to preserve areas with good habitat and enhance areas of poor habitat. Projects may include constructing sloping boulder drop structures, sloping back vertical banks and re-establishing native vegetation.





Old Town Basin

This area of Fort Collins has an undersized storm sewer that does not meet our current drainage standards and does not have a proper outfall to the river. A new storm sewer system is slated for 2016 to improve drainage and reduce flooding for storms up to and including the 100 year event (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guide, Magnolia Storm Sewer, Myrtle Storm Sewer, Riverside-Mulberry Project, DT River District, Appendix B).

Poudre River Basin

Proposed Projects include:

- Open Space Preservation in coordination with the City's Natural Areas Department. Over the next 5 years there are approximately 5 parcels that are being negotiated for conservation within the floodplain.
- Acquiring property through a willing seller/willing buyer program. Special emphasis is on structures in the floodway (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guide, E. Vine Drive Property Acquisition, Appendix B).

Spring Creek Basin

Habitat Enhancement: The master plan also includes an assessment of the creek's habitat quality and enhancement opportunities. Enhancements include restoring banks with native vegetation, removing or modifying manmade barriers to fish passage and restoring portions of the creek to a more natural formation.

West Vine Basin

Construct a detention pond on the City-owned Forney property to reduce downstream flooding. This area of Fort Collins was the historic flow path of Soldier Creek that has been covered up or redirected by development over the years (Fort Collins Mitigation Action Guide, E. Vine Drive Property Acquisition, Appendix B).

Implementation

The City of Fort Collins has a Stormwater Utility. Fees are paid by all property owners based on the impervious surface of their property. Fees will generate approximately \$5 million per year for storm drainage improvements.

Flood Control projects (channels, storm sewers, culverts, detention ponds, etc.), acquisition projects, and flood warning gauges identified in the City's Drainage Basin Master Plan will be financed by the City's Stormwater Utility. Projects in all basins will compete in a city-wide prioritization process. Projects will be rated according to the following criteria:

| Rating Criteria | Criteria Weight |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Number of structures removed from the floodplain | 50% |
| 2. Benefit-to-cost ratio | 25% |
| 3. Number of street overtoppings eliminated | 25% |

The result will be a ranking of projects for construction. City staff will make recommendations based on that ranking to City Council as part of the bi-annual budget process. Some projects may be recommended out of sequence due to:

Page 911





- Right-of-way acquisition;
- Identification by regulatory requirements
- Joint projects with other departments, agencies, or developers; and
- Other priorities identified by City Council.

Funding for some of these projects may also come from grants. Existing programs will continue to be funded by the city department responsible for its implementation (Ex. Open Space Preservation – Natural Resources Department; Flooding Public Outreach – City of Fort Collins Utilities; Flood Warning Program – City of Fort Collins Utilities).

Any acquisition projects that are done for the Poudre River will be the responsibility of either the City of Fort Collins Utilities or the City's Natural Resources department to maintain. These properties will not redevelop in the future.

Plan Review and Updates

Appendix B and Appendix F will be reviewed annually for progress and necessary updates. A report will be sent to City Council in the fall of every year as part of the CRS annual progress report. This report will be available to the media and the public. Information included in this report will be:

- 1. How the reader can obtain a copy of the original plan.
- 2. A review of each recommendation in the action plan.
- 3. A discussion of why any objectives were not reached or why implementation is behind schedule.
- 4. Recommendations for new projects or revised objectives.

An update to this appendix will be prepared every five years in compliance with the CRS Coordinator's Manual in effect at the time.





List of Agencies Contacted by Email

CRS Step 3b – Coordinate

Email sent from Lori Hodges requesting data and information.

Name

Agency NOAA NOAA **Red Cross** FEMA Region VIII FEMA Region VIII - CRS Colorado State Climatologist Colorado Dept. of Local Affairs Colorado Dept. of Local Affairs CWCB CWCB - NFIP Coordinator CWCB Colorado OEM Colorado OFM Colorado OEM Colorado OEM Save The Poudre Weld County OEM Weld County OEM Weld County OEM Larimer County Long Term **Recovery Group** Lutheran Family Services Loveland Housing Authority **Boulder County OEM** Boulder County OEM Laramie County OEM Phillips County OEM Poudre Fire Authority Logan County OEM Logan County Cheyenne County OEM City of Evans OEM Kit Carson County OEM Lincoln County OEM Sedgwick County OEM Sedgwick County OEM Washington County OEM City of Greeley OEM

Bob Glancy Treste Huse Erin Mounsey Matt Buddie Barbara Fitzpatrick Nolan Doesken Don Sandoval Anne Miller Chris Sturm Jamie Prochno Kevin Houck Marilyn Gally Chad Ray Kevin Kuretich Patricia Gavelda

Roy Rudisill Merrie Leach Gracie Marquez Laura Levy

Phyllis Kane Amy Irwin Mike Chard Amy Danzl Rob Cleveland Bob Heldenbrand Chris Wolf Cody Adams Dave Donaldson Darcy Janssen David Burns Della Calhoon John Dewitt Larry Neugebauer Mark Turner Mike McCaleb Pete Morgan

Email

Robert.Glancy@noaa.gov Treste.Huse@noaa.gov Erin.Mounsey@redcross.org matthew.buddie@fema.dhs.gov barbarafitzpatrick@dhs.gov nolan@atmos.colostate.edu Don.Sandoval@state.co.us anne.miller@state.co.us chris.sturm@state.co.us jamie.prochno@state.co.us kevin.houck@state.co.us Marilyn.Gally@state.co.us Chad.Ray@state.co.us Kevin.Kuretich@state.co.us patricia.gavelda@state.co.us media@savethepoudre.org rrudisill@co.weld.co.us mleach@co.weld.co.us gmarquez@co.weld.co.us Laura@larimerltrg.org

phyllis.kane@lfsrm.org airwi@lovelandhousing.org mchard@bouldercounty.org adanzl@bouldercounty.org rcleveland@laramiecounty.com bob.heldenbrand@phillipscounty.co cwolf@poudre-fire.org loganoem@logancountyco.gov Donaldson@logancountyco.gov epr@co.cheyenne.co.us dburns@evanscolorado.gov oem@kitcarsoncounty.org Iclanduse@lincolncountyco.us LNeugebauer@sedgwickcountygov.net sedgwickcoem@yahoo.com mmccaleb@co.washington.co.us pete.morgan@greeleygov.com





Yuma County OEM Morgan County OEM Grand County OEM Roger Brown Steve Enfante Nowell Curran yumaoem@wycomm.org senfante@co.morgan.co.us ncurran@co.grand.co.us





Email to Stakeholder Agencies

Larimer County, along with the local jurisdictions of Fort Collins, Loveland, Estes Park, Wellington, Tinmath, and Berthoud are preparing a Hazard Mitigation Plan. This is an all hazards plan. However, because several of the jurisdictions participate in FEMA's Community Rating System, flooding is one of the hazards with a high priority. We are writing to you as an agency/organization that may have additional information that may help with this planning process.

Therefore, please let me know if your organization has any data or information that may be helpful in assessing the hazards, especially flooding. We would appreciate copies of any pertinent plans, reports, maps, etc. Please also let us know if your agency or organization is undertaking any projects or implementing any programs that might affect flooding or have impacts for properties in floodprone areas.

We welcome your input on the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan. Please feel free to attend any of the upcoming committee meetings or the public open house. Details on dates and times are below:

- July 27, 2015 Public Open House, Fort Collins Police Services, 6:30-8:30 pm, short presentations at 6:45 and 7:45.
- August 24, 2015, 1-3 pm Committee Meeting, location to be determined
- September 30, 2015, 2-4 pm Committee Meeting, location to be determined

A website, <u>http://www.larimerhmp2016.com/</u>, has been created that provides updates on the planning process and includes questionnaires. The draft plan is expected to be completed in October and will be posted on the website. We encourage your participation in the planning process and welcome your feedback on the draft plan.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,





HMP-CRS Team

Hazard Mitigation Planning Team Members

(Primary or Alternate attended at least 2 of 3 meetings)

Governmental

- 1 Larimer County Health and Environment
- 2 Larimer OEM
- 3 Town of Estes Park
- 4 City of Fort Collins Stormwater
- 5 City of Fort Collins Streets
- 6 City of Fort Collins OEM
- 7 City of Fort Collins Environmental Planning
- 8 City of Fort Collins Environmental Quality
- 9 City of Fort Collins Risk Management
- 10 City of Fort Collins Planning
- 11 City of Loveland Community Partnership
- 12 City of Loveland Facilities Management
- 13 City of Loveland Risk Management
- 14 City of Loveland OEM
- 15 City of Loveland PD
- 16 City of Loveland Stormwater
- 17 City of Loveland Public Works
- 18 City of Loveland Water & Power
- 19 Town of Timnath

- Other Stakeholders 1 Estes Park FPD
- 2 Crystal Lakes FPD
- 3 Glacier View FPD
- 4 Poudre Canyon FPD
- 5 Poudre FPD
- 6 CSU
- 7 Poudre Valley EMS
- 8 Big Thompson R. Restoration Coalition
- 9 Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District
- 10 Platte River Power Authority
- 11 Upper Thompson Sanitation District





HMP Stakeholder List

| Primary | Alternate | | | | | | | | | | | | P and/or A | |
|------------------|------------------|------------------------|--|---|--------------------|--|----------|-----------|------------|-------|--------|--------|------------|---|
| Committee | Committee | First | | | Jurisdiction / | | | | | | Gov/No | n- | Attended 2 | |
| Member | Member | Name | Last Name | Email | Organization | Representing | Team | Kick Off? | Mid-Point? | Last? | Gov | From | Meetings | Group |
| Municipal G | overnment - I | Berthoud | | | | | | | | | | | | (|
| P | | Jan | Dowker | idowker@berthoud.org | Berthoud | Town of Berthoud | large | | | | G | Lori | | |
| | A | Jim | Anderson | | Berthoud | Town of Berthoud | large | | | Y | G | Lori | | |
| Municipal G | overnment - I | arimer | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P | | Fric | Fried | friedeb@co.larimer.co.us | County | Larimer Building Dept | large | Y | | | G | Lori | | |
| P | | Terry | Gilbert | eilberrt@ro.latimer.co.us | Coupty | Larimer CountyCommunity Development Director | large | 550 | | | G | Loci | | |
| P | | Ionella | Henderson | henderil@co.larimer.co.us | County | Lerimer Health and Environ | larne | Y | × | | G | Lori | Y | Larimer Health and Env |
| P | | Lori | Hodaer | hadrestr@ca.larimer.ca.us | Country | OEM | r coall | v | ý | v | G | Lori | v | Larimar OEM |
| 54 5 85 | | Magan | Nice | niesmi@no lotimar.co.us | County | Larimer County OEM | Innan | | 3A. | - 24 | ~ | Lori | 24 | Lannor GLIN |
| | | luces an | Minihanali | unhineridite lasimer en un | Louincy Country | Shariffa Office EM/EC | large | | 3020-1-1 | W. | 0 | Loui | | |
| D | ~ | Mark | Octomon | intrespectation and | Lerimer County | Englanding | large | × | 112001 | | 6 | Lori | | |
| P Municipal C | | IVIAIK Catala Daula | Peterson | petersmr@/cd.tarimer.cd.us | Larimer county | Engineering | rarge | 1 | | | G | LDFI | | |
| wiunicipal 6 | overiment - | ESLUS PAIR | The second s | 41 | Carlos Constanting | | 10000 | | | | 11.20 | | 100 | and the second se |
| r | | Frank | Lancaster | riancaster westes.org | Estes Park | I own Administrator | large | Ţ. | | | 9 | Eric | r | Town of Estes Park |
| | A | Travis | Machalek | tmachalek@estes.org | Estes Park | Assistant TA | large | Y | | | | Eric | | |
| P | | Corey | Pass | cpass@estes.org | Estes Park | Commander | large | Ŷ | | | G | Eric | | |
| P | | Will | Birchfield | wbirchfield@estes.org | Estes Park | Chief Building Official and Floodplain Manager | large | | | | G | Eric | | |
| | | Alison | Chilcott | achilcot@estes.org | Estes Park | Community Development | large | | | | G | Eric | | |
| P | | Karen | Thampson | kthampson@estes.org | Estes Park | Estes Park | large | Y | | | G | Eric | | |
| | А | Tina | Kurtz | tkurtz@estes.org | Estes Park | Estes Park | large | | | | G | Eric | | |
| P | | Eric | Rose | erose@estes.org | Estes Park | Estes PD | small | | | Y | G | Lori | | |
| | A | Wes | Kufeld | wkufeld@estes.org | Estes Park | Police Chief | large | | | | G | Eric | | |
| P | | Steve | McFarland | smcfarland@estes.org | Estes Park | Finance Officer | large | Y | | | G | Eric | | |
| P | | Alan | Fraundorf | afraundorf@astes.org | Estes Park | IT Manager | large | Y | | | G | Fric | | |
| 2002 | | Kate | Rusch | krusch@estes.org | Estes Park | Town of Estes Park | large | 2.5 | | | G | Eric | | |
| Munimal G | wernment - F | art Collins | 199701010 | to over a standing | | | | | | | | | | |
| in an aparto | - canancante - r | Kauin | Gartia | kgertig@fcggy com | Fort Collins | Litility Director | larna | | | | 5 | Gente | | |
| | | Carol | Wabb | cumbio@frace.com | Fort Collins | Water Utility Director | Incom | | | | G | Gauin | | |
| | | Miles | Herepreder | mborgangdar@fraou.com | Fort Collins | Itilities | Inrao | | | ×. | 6 | Gavin | | |
| | | Marcha | Hilmer Dehinsen | mhilipper biason Oferen ann | Fort Collins | CRE Coordinates (Stormuniter | range | ~ | | ~ | 6 | Cavin | ~ | Fast Calling Starmunder |
| - F . | * | les | Handes-Kouinson | ikes/see/24 answer | Fort Collins | Cita coordinatory stormwater | S mail | | | 12 | 6 | Casia | 1 | Fort collins stormwater |
| | ~ | Jon | ma ukaas Lookoo | Inaukaasiprogov.com | Fort Collins | stormwater | large | | | | 0 | Gavin | | |
| | | LINE | Lochra | clochragetogov.com | Port Collins | Stormwater | large | | | | G | Gavin | | |
| 1220 | A | Ken | Sampley | Ksampiey grogov.com | Fort Collins | stormwater | large | Y | | | G | Gavin | | |
| P | | Mark | Kempton | mkempton@rcgov.com | Port Collins | City of Fort Collins | large | Ŷ | | | G | Mike | | |
| P | 20 | Larry | Schneider | Ischneider@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | Fort Collins Streets | large | Y | 0 | | G | Gavin | Y | Fort Collins Streets |
| | A | Nicholas | Sporer | nsporer@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | Fort Collins Streets | large | Y | Y | | G | Mike | | |
| | A | Doug | Groves | degroves@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | Fort Collins Streets | large | Ŷ | | | | Mike | | |
| P | | Mike | Gavin | migavin@coudre-fire.org | Fort Collins | EM | small | Y | Y | Y | G | Lori | Y | Fort Collins OEM |
| | A | Chris | Wolf | cwolf@poudre-fire.org | Fort Collins | DEM Specialist | large | Y | | | | Gavin | | |
| | A | Diane | Green | dgreen@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | ERA | large | | | Y | G | Gavin | | |
| P | | Katy | Bigner | KBigner@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | Environmental Planner | large | Y | Y | | G | Gavin | Y | Fort Collins Env Planning |
| P | | Errin | Henggeller | ehenggeler@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | Environmental Quality | large | Y | Y | Y | | Gavin | Y | Fort Collins Env Quality |
| | A | Louis | Rellergert | LRELLERGERT@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | Environmental Quality | large | | | | G | Gavin | | |
| | 4 | Susan | Strong | sstrong@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | Environmental Quality | large | | | | G | Gavin | | |
| | | Kelly | Bernish | kbernish@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | Risk Management | large | Y | Y | | | Mike | Y | Fort Collins Risk Management |
| | | Lance | Murray | Lmurray@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | Risk Manager | large | | | | G | Gavin | | |
| P | | Lisa | Rosintoski | Irosintoski@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | PIO | large | | | Y | G | Gavin | | |
| | A | Lauri | Kadrich | Ikadrich@fegov.com | Fort Collins | Planning, Development, Transportation Director | large | | | | G | Gavin | | |
| | A | Mark | Jackson | mjackson@fegov.com | Fort Collins | Transportation | large | | | | G | Gavin | | |
| P | | Pete | Wray | pwray@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | Planner | large | Y | | Y | G | Marsha | Y | Fort Collins Planning |
| | | Mike | Calhoun | Mcalhoun@fcgoy.com | Fort Collins | Parks | large | 1.5 | | 3.5 | G | Gavin | | |
| P | | Corv | Christensen | cchristensen@fcgov.com | Fort Collins | PD Division Chief | large | Y | | | G | Gavin | | |
| 10.000 C | A | Joel | Томаг | itower@fcepy.com | Fort Collins | PD Traffic Division Supervisor | larea | 2.5 | | | G | Gavin | | |
| | 0.62 | laqueline | Kozek Thiel | ikozek-thiel@forov.com | Fort Collins | Chief Susteinability Officer | ierze | | | | ~ | Genin | | |
| Munimal G | weroment-I | oveland | Condity (1972) | Transferrary of the light of the strength | Tere comma | Since a second driky Officer | - Sei Se | | | | | 2.0411 | | |
| p | reaning of t | Mark | Califord | Mark Gairland @rituallausland | Invalued | 811 | Incom | v | | | 6 | P-+ | | |
| 0.5 | | IVERTIK | Gaistoru | in at stadistore prenydnoveland.org | Loveland | 241 | serge | 1 | | | 6 | ~ at | | |



| | A | Becky | Kamoske | Becky.Kamoske@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | 911 | large | Y | | | G | Pat | | |
|----------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|--|-------------|--|-------|---|---|---|---|-------|---|--------------------------------|
| | A | Heidi | Ryan | heidi.ryan@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | 911 | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| | A | Carmen | Bloom | Carmen.Bloom@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | 911 | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Greg | George | Grea.George@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Building & Planning | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Deb | Callies | deb.callies@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Community Partnership | large | Y | | | G | Pat | Y | Loveland Community Partnership |
| | A | Alison | Hade | Alison.Hade@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Community Partnership | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| | A | Jodi | Lessman | jodi.lessman@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Business Services | large | | Y | Y | | | | |
| | | Jason | Licon | Jason.Licon@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Airport | large | | | | | Pet | | |
| P | | Michael | Cerovski | michael.cerovski@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Loveland Fire Rescue Authority | large | Y | | | G | Pat | | |
| | А | Betsey | Hale | Betsey.Hale@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Economic Development | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Ken | Cooper | Ken.Cooper@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Facilities Management | large | γ | Y | | G | Pat | Y | Loveland Facilities Management |
| | A | Rod | Wensing | Rod.Wensing@citvofloveland.org | Loveland | City Administration | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Brent | Worthington | Brent.Worthington@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Finance | large | Y | | | G | Pat | | |
| | | Bettie | Greenberg | Bettie.Greenberg@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | HR - Risk | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| | | Julia | Holland | Julia.Holland@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | HR | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Shane | Adamson | Shane.Adamson@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | IT - Library | large | Υ | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | John | Burns | John.Burns@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | п | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Christina | Cornelison-Spight | christina.cornelison-spight@cityofloveland.c | r, Loveland | HR - Risk | large | Y | | Y | G | Pat | Y | Loveland Risk Management |
| P | | Pat | Mialy | pat.mialy@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Loveland OEM | small | γ | | γ | G | Lori | Y | Loveland OEM |
| | | Marilyn | Hilgenberg | Marilyn.Hilgenberg@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Parks & Rec | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| | | Janet | Meisel-Burns | janet.Meisel-Burns@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Parks & Rec | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Brent | Newbanks | Brent.Newbanks@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Police | large | Y | Y | Y | G | Pat | Y | Loveland PD |
| | А | Bab | Klinger | bob.klinger@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Police | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| | A | Brieana | Reed-Harmel | brieana.reed-harmel@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Power Engineering | large | Y | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Eric | Lessard | eric.lessard@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Stormwater | large | Y | X | Υ | G | Pat | Y | Loveland Stormwater |
| | A | Kevin | Gingery | Kevin.Gingery@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Stormwater | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Leah | Browder | Leah.Browder@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Public Works | large | Y | Y | | G | Pat | Y | Loveland Public Works |
| | A | Mick | Mercer | Mick.Mercer@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Streets & Solid Waste | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| | A | Gary | Dahlgren | Gary.Dahlgren@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Streets | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Steve | Adams | Steve.Adams@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Water & Power | large | Y | | | G | Pat | Y | Loveland Water & Power |
| | A | Michelle | Stalker | michelle.stalker@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Water & Power | large | | Y | Y | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Kimberly | Frick | kim.frick@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Water Rescources | large | Y | | | G | Pat | | |
| P | | Chris | Matkins | chris.matkins@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Water | large | Y | | | G | Pat | | |
| | A | Kathy | Gross | kathy.gross@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Water | large | | Y | | G | Pat | | |
| | A | Mike | McCrary | Michael.McCrary@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Weste Water | large | | | | G | Pet | | |
| | A | Larry | Howard | Larry, Howard@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Water | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| | A | Bob | Miller | Bob.Miller@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Water | large | | | | G | Pat | | |
| Municipa | al Government - | Timnath | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P | | April | Getchius | agetchius@timnathgov.com | Timnath | Town of Timnath | large | | | Y | G | Lori | Y | Town of Timnath |
| | A | Sherry | Wagner | Swagner@timnathgov.com | Timnath | PD | large | | | | G | Gavin | | |
| | A | Miliss a | Peters | mpeters@timnathgov.com | Timnath | Town of Timnath | large | | Y | | | | | |
| Municipa | al Government - | Wellington | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P | | Larry | Lorentzen | lorentil@co.larimer.co.us | Wellington | Town of Wellington | large | | | Y | G | Lori | | |
| | A | Jack | Brinkhoff | brinkhid@co.larimer.co.us | Wellington | Town of Wellington | large | | | | G | Lori | | |
| | A | Alisa | Darrow | | Wellington | Town of Wellington | large | | | Y | G | Lori | | |
| Municpa | al Government - ' | Windsor | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P | | John | Vazquez | jvazquez@windsorgov.com | Windsor | Town of Windsor | large | | | | G | Lori | | |
| | А | John | Michaels | | Windsor | Town of Windsor | large | | | Y | G | Lori | | |
| Other St | akeholders - Fire | | | | | | 10 | | | | | | | |
| P | | Jon | Landkamer | jlandkamer@estesvalleyfire.org | Estes Park | Estes Park FPD | large | Ŷ | | | G | Eric | Ŷ | Estes Park FPD |
| | A | Scott | Dorman | sdorman@estesvalleyfire.org | Estes Park | Fire Chief | large | | Y | | N | Eric | | |
| | | Carie | Dann | Carie.Dann@cityofLoveland.org | Loveland | Fire | large | | | | N | Pat | | |
| | | Bill | Lundquist | welundquist@gmail.com | Loveland | Fire | large | | | | N | Pat | | |
| | | Ingrid | McMillan-Ernst | Ingrid.McMillan-Ernst@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Fire | large | | | | N | Pet | | |
| | | Greg | Ward | Greg.Ward@cityofloveland.org | Loveland | Fire | large | | | | N | Pat | | |
| | | Steve | Charles | scharles@berthoudfire.org | FPD | Berthoud Fire Protection District | large | | | Y | N | Lori | | |
| P | | Marian | Kelly | mkelly@clvfd.org | FPD | Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | large | Y | Y | Y | N | Lori | Y | Crystal Lakes FPD |



| | A | Dan | Defibaugh | osenbaugh@hotmail.com | Crystal Lakes Fire | F Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District | large | Y | | | | Lori | | |
|---------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|--|--------------------|---|---------|---|---|---|---|--------|---|---------------------------------------|
| | A | Jim | Kubichek | greenbackcut@yahoo.com | Crystal Lakes Fire | FCrystal Lakes Fire Protection District | large | Y | | Y | | Lori | | |
| P | | Robert | Iseacson | gyfdchief1@gmail.com | FPD | Glacier View Fire Protection District | large | Y | Y | | N | Lori | Y | Glacier View FPD |
| | | Richard | Wilcox | chief@pinewoodspringsfire.org | FPD | Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District | large | | | Y | N | Lori | | |
| P | | Hugh | Collins | H.Collins@poudrecanyonfiredistrict.org | FPD | Poudre Canvon Fire Protection District | large | Y | Y | Y | N | Lori | Y | Poudre Canyon FPD |
| | | Gerry | Wagner | rflvfdchief@centurylink.net | FPD | Red Feather Fire Department | large | | | | N | Lori | | |
| P | | Jim | Montague | jmontague@poudre-fire.org | Non Profit | Poudre Fire GIS | large | γ | | | N | Gavin | Y | Poudre FPD |
| | A | Shawn | McGaffin | smgaffin@poudre-fire.org | Non Profit | Poudre Fire Prevention | large | | | | N | Gavin | | |
| | A | Bob | Poncelow | bponcelow@poudre-fire.org | Non Profit | Poudre Fire Marshall | large | | | | N | Gavin | | |
| | A | Ron | Gonzales | rgonzales@poudre-fire.org | Non Profit | Poudre Fire Prevention | large | | | | N | Gavin | | |
| | A | Mike | Coavin | | Non Profit | Poudre Fire Prevention | large | | | Y | N | Gavin | | |
| P | | Mike | Blackwill | mblackwill@wsfr.us | Non Profit | Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | large | Y | | | N | Lori | | |
| | А | Herb | Brady | hbrady@wsfr.us | Non Profit | Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | large | | | | N | Lori | | |
| Р | | Gary | Green | ggreen@wfpd.org | Wellington | Wellington FPD | small | Y | | | N | Lori | | |
| Other S | takeholders - Sch | ools | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P | | Ken | Quintana | ken.guintana@colostate.edu | Educational | Colorado State University | large | Y | Y | Y | N | Lori | γ | CSU |
| | A | Susanne | Cordery-Cotter | susanne.cordery-cotter@colostate.edu | Educational | Colorado State University Facilities Dept. | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | A | Fred | Haberecht | fred.haberecht@colostate.edu | Educational | Colorado State University Facilities Dept. | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Mike | Ellerby | Michael.Ellerby@frontrange.edu | Educational | Front Range College - Safety | large | | | | N | Gavin | | |
| | | Pete | Hall | phall@psdschools.org | Educational | Poudre School District Operations Director | large | | | | N | Gavin | | |
| | | Rick | Frei | rick.frei®thampsonschools.org | Educational | Schools | large | | | | N | Pat | | |
| Other S | takeholders - EM | S/Emergenc | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P | | Braden | Applegate | braden.applegate@uchealth.org | Non Profit | Poudre Valley EMS | large | Y | Y | | N | Lori | Y | Poudre Valley EMS |
| | A | Tim | Klippert | tbk@pvhs.org | Non Profit | UC Health Emergency Manager | large | | | | N | Gavin | | |
| | | Erin | Mounsey | Erin.Mounsey@redcross.org | Non Profit | Red Cross | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Melody | Storgaard | melady.storgaard2@redcross.org | Non Profit | Red Cross | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| P | | Mike | Larson | mlarson@tvems.com | Non Profit | Thompson Valley EMS | large | Y | | | N | Pat | | |
| | A | Mark | Turner | Mturner@tvems.com | Non Profit | Thompson Valley EMS | large | | | | N | Pat | | |
| P | | Mike | Bielmaier | MBielmaier@epmedcenter.com | Non Profit | Chief Medical | large | Y | | | N | Eric | | |
| Other S | takeholders - Oth | er - Likely to | Attend | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P | | Shayna | Jones | sheyna.jones@bigthompson.com | Non Profit | Big Thompson R. Restoration Coalition | large | Y | Y | Y | N | Pat | Y | Big Thompson R. Restoration Coalition |
| P | | Jim | Struble | jstruble@northernwater.org | Non Profit | Nothern Colorado Water Conservancy District | large | Y | | | N | Lori | γ | Northern Colorado Water Conservancy |
| | А | Jerry | Gibbens | jgibbens@northernwater.org | Non Profit | Nothern Colorado Water Conservancy District | large | | Y | Y | | | | |
| Ρ | | Jim | Bolzot | BoizotJ@prpa.org | Non Profit | Platte River Power Authority | large | Y | Y | | N | Lori | Y | Platte River Power Authority |
| | A | Brian | Moore | mooreb@prps.org | Non Profit | Platte River Power Authority | large | Y | Y | | N | Lori | | |
| P | | Chris | Bieker | chris@utsd.org | Senitation | Upper Thompson Sanitation District | large | | Y | | N | | Y | Upper Thompson Sanitation District |
| | A | Matt | Allen | matt@utsd.org | Senitation | Upper Thompson Sanitation District | large | | Y | Y | N | | | |
| P | | Matt | Hines | | | Estes Valley Recreation and Parks District | large | | | Y | N | | | |
| Other S | takeholders - Oth | er - Unlikely | to Attend | | | | 1009731 | | | | | | | |
| | | Kimberly | Culp | Kculp@leta911.org | Non Profit | LETA 911 Director | large | | | | N | Gavin | | |
| | | Karen | Reynolds | bsdacctg@boxeldersanitation.org | Non Profit | Boxelder Sanitation District | large | | | | N | Lori | | |
| | | Corey | Engen | corey@flywater.com | Non Profit | Colorado Riparian Association | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Gary | Wockner | media@savethepoudre.org | Environmental N | G Save the Poudre | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | John | Bartholow | JohnB@WebAccess.Net | Environmental N | G Save the Poudre | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Gina | Janett | ginaciao@frii.com | Environmental N | G Save the Poudre | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Jason | Godinez | godinezj@centennialarc.org | Non Profit | ARC | large | | | | N | Gavin | | |
| | | Shawn | Tierney | Shawn@SustainableLivingAssociation.org | Non Profit | Sustainable Living Association | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Jenne | Loffer | jloffer@uwaylc.org | Non Profit | United Way 211 Larimer County | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Nate | Boschman | nate@wirv.org | Non Profit | Wildland Restoration Volunteers | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Clint | Skutchan | clint@fcbr.org | Professional Asso | oc Fort Collins Board of Realtors | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Scott | Hummer | npicscott@gwestoffice.net | Public | North Poudre Irrigation | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Sean | Dougherty | sean@hawaiianshirtguy.com | Realtor (Public) | Relator (Public) | large | | | | N | Marsha | | |
| | | Chris | Harris | charris@soldiercanyon.com | Soldier Canyon F | ilt Water Treatment Facility | large | | | | N | Lori | | |
| | | Donn | Meynard | livermorechief@gmail.com | Special District | Livermore Fire Protection Dist. | large | | | | N | Lori | | |



Water Board Agenda



Utilities – Water Board 700 Wood St. PO Box 580 Fort Collins, CO 80522 **970.416.2513** 970.416.2208 - fax fcgov.com

WATER BOARD Regular Meeting Agenda

DATE: LOCATION: TIME: Thursday, July 16, 2015 117 N. Mason - Board Room (access via west side door) Dinner 5:00 pm; Meeting 5:30 - 7:30 p.m.

- 1. Call Meeting to Order Steve Malers, Chairperson
- 2. Staff Reports
 - a. Monthly Water Resources Report

 - b. Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP) Update
 c. Summary of July 14 special City Council Work Session on Water Supply Planning
- Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control (GESC) Permit Update З. (Discussion: 15 minutes) Matt Zoccali, Regulatory & Government Affairs Manager
- 4. Sole Source Purchase of a Brown Bear Hydrostatic Tractor with Aerator for the Fort Collins Water Treatment Facility (Discussion & Action: 10 minutes) Mark Kempton, Water Production Division Manager
- Northern Colorado Hazard Mitigation Plan (Discussion: 20 minutes) 5. Ken Sampley, Water Systems Engineering Manager
- New Business 6.
- 7. Future Agenda Review





Project Website (Screenshot 1)

11/18/2015

Home

Search this site

NAVIGATION HOME PROJECT SCHEDULE MEETINGS PLAN DOCUMENTS RISK ASSESSMENT SURVEYS REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

LINKS

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION









Home

Welcome to the project website for the 2016 Larimer County, Colorado Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update. Please check back often for project updates and postings. This website will be discontinued after the project is completed.

What is Hazard Mitigation?

The term "Hazard Mitigation" describes <u>actions that can help reduce or eliminate long-term</u> <u>risks caused by hazard</u>s, or disaster, such as floods, hurricanes, wildfires, landslides, tornadoes, earthquakes, dam fallures, or terrorism. As the costs of disasters continue to rise, governments and ordinary ditzens must find ways to reduce hazard risks to our communities and ourselves. Efforts made to reduce hazard risks are easily made compatible with other community goals; safer communities are more attractive to employers as well as residents. As communities plan for new development and important

component of the planning effort.

While mitigation activities can and should be taken before a disaster event has the chance to occur, after disasters hazard mitigation is essential. Oftentimes after disasters, repairs and reconstruction are often completed in such a way as to simply restore damaged property to pre-disaster conditions. These efforts may "get things back to normal", but the replication of pre-disaster conditions aften



results in a repetitive cycle of damage, reconstruction, and repeated damage. Hazard mitigation breaks this repetitive cycle by producing less vulnerable conditions through post-disaster repairs and reconstruction. The implementation of such hazard mitigation actions now by state and local governments means building stronger, safer and smarter communities that will be able to reduce future inluries and future damage.

About the Project

Larimer County created its previous Mitigation Plan In accordance with the requirements of the Federal Stafford Act, the National Flood Insurance Act, and 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). That Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan was approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) on July 26, 2010. These plans must be updated and approved by FEMA every five years and the current plan will expire on July 26, 2015. Due to the damaging floods in the fall of 2013, Larimer County was granted an 'Extraordinary Circumstances' timeline by FEMA which allows the County until March 2016 to have this new Hazard Mitigation Plan approved by FEMA.

Larimer County and its participating jurisdictions, agencies, and organizations are now in the process of updating the County's Hazard Mitigation Plan and expect to have it approved by that March 2016 date.

Larimer County will benefit from this project by:

- Ensuring eligibility for all sources of hazard mitigation funds made available through FEMA.
- Increasing public awareness and understanding of vulnerabilities as well as support for specific actions to reduce losses from future natural disaster.
- Ensuring community policies, programs, and goals are compatible with reducing vulnerability to all hazards and identifying those that are incompatible.
- Building partnerships with diverse stakeholders increasing opportunities to leverage data and
 resources in reducing workloads as well as achieving shared community objectives.
- Expanding the understanding of potential risk reduction measures to include: local plans and

http://www.jarimerhmp2016.com/





1/2

Project Website (Screenshot 2)

11/18/2015

Home

regulations; structure and infrastructure projects; natural systems protection; education and awareness programs; and other tools.

Informing the development, prioritization, and implementation of mitigation projects. Benefits
accrue over the life of the project as losses are avoided from each subsequent hazard event.

Project Outreach and Communications

The Larimer County Office of Emergency Management is leading this project for the County and wants to ensure that all community stakeholders and citizens have an opportunity to be involved in this planning process. All project information and messaging will be posted utilizing this website and updates will also be communicated via Larimer County's Office of Emergency Management Facebook page.







Sign in | Report Abuse | Print Page | Powered By Google Sites

http://www.larimerhmp2016.com/





2/2

Public Mitigation Meeting Flier



A Resilient Larimer County: Mitigating Hazards in our Backyard

Larimer County and its jurisdictions are finalizing a planning process to update the local hazard mitigation plan and would like input from the community.

Attend a Meeting

To learn more, the Larimer County Office of Emergency Management and its major cities and towns invite you to a casual evening of discussions about local natural hazards and what impacts can be expected. Your input regarding what you think can be done to mitigate these impacts is important.

Questions to think about:

- . What natural hazards impact you?
- . What can we do to reduce these impacts?
- How could natural hazards impact those you care about and services you rely on daily?

Other details include:

- open house setting
- · casual discussions facilitated by city representatives
- high-quality, up-to-date natural hazard maps
- · opportunities to learn and share ideas

Information regarding additional meeting locations and dates, as well as background on the project and hazard mitigation, are available at *www.larimerhmp2016.com*.

OPEN HOUSE

Wednesday, Dec. 2, 6-8 p.m. Larimer County Building 200 West Oak St. Boyd Lake Conference Room, 1st Floor Short presentations will be given at 6:15 p.m. and 7:15 p.m.

Contact:

Lori Hodges, Larimer County Director of Emergency Management 303-656-3214 Mike Gavin, City of Fort Collins Emergency Manager 970-416-2878

Pat Mialy, Loveland Fire Rescue Authority Emergency Manager 970-962-2534

www.larimerhmp2016.com



11/15





Flood History Educational Materials

Fort Collins Flood History Information

| Drainage Basins | Dates | Descriptions |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Cache la Poudre River | 1844, 1864, 1891, 1904, 1923, 1930, 1976, 1983, 1999, 2010, 2011, 2013 and 2014 | The three largest floods occurred in 1864, 1891 and 1904, with peaks of approximately 21,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). For comparison, the discharge of the Poudre River at "flood stage" is about 4,000 cfs. Flooding on the Poudre is primarily from snowmelt in late May and June. However, flash flooding can occur at any time. A severe flood has not occurred in more than 100 years. |
| Spring Creek | 1902, 1904, 1938, 1949, 1951, 1961, 1977, 1983 and 1997 | The 1997 flood resulted in five deaths, destruction of 120 mobile homes and damage to 2,000 homes and businesses. This flood was considered to be greater than a 500-year event. |
| Dry Creek | No serious flooding since about 1950 | The absence of even minor flooding is generally attributed to the network of irrigation canals that have some capacity for intercepting small to moderate Dry Creek flows. |
| Fossil Creek | 1902, 1938, 1965, 1977, 1979, 1997, 1999 and 2007 | Fossil Creek is relatively undeveloped and past floods have gone unnoticed. In addition to flooding hazards, Fossil Creek also is susceptible to bank erosion. |
| Boxelder Creek/ Cooper Slough | 1909, 1922, 1930, 1937, 1947, 1963, 1967, 1969 and 2007 | Boxelder Creek has a drainage area of 251 square miles and 176 square miles now are controlled by Soil Conservation Service flood control dams near Wellington. |
| Old Town Basin | 1904, 1933, 1938, 1951, 1977, 1983, 1988, 1992, 1997 and 2009 | Street flooding is the primary problem in this basin. |
| Canal Importation Basin | 1938, 1951, 1975, 1992, 1997, 1999 and 2009 | There are several small drainage areas in this basin. Development prior to drainage criteria encroached on the channels, reduced the flow capacity and caused flooding. The irrigation canals also overflow their banks and cause flooding. |
| West Vine Basin | 1980, 1997 and 1999 (Past floods were not well documented.) | Localized flooding occurs due to encroachment on drainages and from irrigation ditch spills. |









2016 HMP Goals and Objectives



We Make a Difference



Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Mitigation Strategy Goals & Objectives

Goals:

- 1. Protect people, property, and natural resources
- 2. Improve capability to reduce disaster losses
- 3. Strengthen communication and coordination among public agencies, non-governmental organizations, businesses, and citizens
- 4. Increase public awareness of natural hazards and mitigation options
- 5. Integrate hazard mitigation into other planning mechanisms

Objectives

- A. Continue to develop and expand public awareness and information programs
- B. Enhance training for hazard prevention and mitigation options
- C. Incorporate risk reduction principles into policy documents and initiatives; other institutional plans
- D. Continue to collaborate with area partners through mutual aid agreements and long-term planning efforts
- E. Reduce the vulnerability of local assets to the impact of hazards

www.LarimerHMP2016.com

MBAKERINTL.COM

165 South Union Blvd., Suite 200 | Lakewood, CO 80228 Office: 720.514.1100 | Fax: 720.479.3157





Page 925

Public Surveys Used During the HMP Process *a detailed explanation of both surveys is included in Chapter 3 of the 2016 Larimer County HMP

| Visions for a Resilier | nt Larimer County | / | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Core Community Resil | lience Themes | | | | | | | | |
| The purpose of this surve capacities and resiliency the Colorado Resiliency F amidst changing condition durable systems and con ways to improve commun responses will remain and | ey is to gather prelim conditions of their co Framework, resilienc ns or challenges – ir servation of resourc ity capacity, capabil onymous. | inary informati ommunity as w se is defined as ncluding disast es for present ity, and resilier | ion from community i vell as to develop a lo s, "that ability of com ers and climate char and future generatio ncy. The survey shou | members and ong-range vis munities to re nge – and ma ns." This surv Ild take 10-15 | d stakeholders abou ion for a resilient La abound, positively ad intain quality of live vey is designed to e 5 minutes to comple | t the current rimer County. In dapt to, or thrive healthy growth, licit input about te and all | | | |
| (Note: Survey design based on the Communities Advancing Resilience Toolkit (2012), the Terrorism and Disaster Center at the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center) | | | | | | | | | |
| * 1. What community do | you live in? | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| * 2. How long have you in less than a year 1-5 years 5-10 years over 10 years 3. The following statement. | ents are possible d | nity? lescriptions o | o f your community. Neither Disagree | Please selec | t one response fo | reach | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Nor Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | I Don't Know | | | |
| A - People in my community feel like they belong to the community. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| B - People in my community are committed to the well-being of the community. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |





Larimer Public Risk Perceptions

Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update - Risk Perception Survey

The Larimer County Office of Emergency Management is in the process of updating the County's Hazard Mitigation Plan. The updated Plan will provide our community with a clear picture of the risks we face and will outline a strategy for reducing those risks and preventing losses in the future. A key piece of the mitigation planning process involves local residents and their expert knowledge about where they live and the environment around them. As a resident of Larimer County, you are invited to share your experiences, concerns, and ideas with the planning team throughout the plan update process. The purpose of this survey is to better understand risk perceptions among members of the Larimer County community and to identify the best ways to communicate with you moving forward. This survey should take 5 - 10 minutes of your time and your results will be collected anonymously. This survey is one of many that the planning team has developed for this project and we look forward to working with you to develop a plan for resilience in Larimer County.

1. How many times has a natural hazard disrupted your daily life in the last five years?

0
 1-2
 3-5
 More than 5 times

2. What types of hazards or disasters have you experienced while living and/or working in Larimer County? Please list them below.



3. How concerned are you about the following hazards?

| | Not Concerned | Somewhat Concerned | Extremely Concerned | I don't know |
|-------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Drought | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Earthquake | 0 | 0 | \bigcirc | 0 |
| Erosion/Land Subsidence | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Extreme Temperatures | 0 | \bigcirc | \bigcirc | 0 |
| Flooding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





Press Release: Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Open House November, 2015



Utilities electric + stormwater + wastewater + water 700 Wood St. PO Box 580 Fort Collins, CO 80522 970.221.6700 970.221.6619 fax + 970.224.6003 TDD utilities@fcg.ov.com + fcg.ov.com/utilities

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

November 19, 2015

Contact: Mike Gavin Emergency Manager City of Fort Collins 970-416-2878 migavin@poudre-fire.org www.larimerhmp2016.com

A Resilient Larimer County: Mitigating Hazards in our Backyard-Open House, Dec. 2

FORT COLLINS, Colo. – Natural hazards pose a real threat to the people and property in our community. Join the Larimer County Office of Emergency Management and City of Fort Collins at an open house regarding the impacts of local natural hazards, Wednesday, Dec. 2, 6-8 p.m., Larimer County Building, 200 W. Oak St., Fort Collins, Boyd Lake Conference Room (first floor).

Larimer County and its jurisdictions are finalizing a planning process to update the local hazard mitigation plan and would like input from the community. This event will feature an open house setting with casual discussions and short presentations at 6:15 p.m. and 7:15 p.m. High-quality, up-to-date natural hazard maps will be available.

Community members are invited to share information about:

- natural hazards that impact them
- what could be done to reduce these impacts
- how natural hazards could impact those they care about as well as the services they rely
 on daily

For more information, as well as background on the project and hazard mitigation, visit <u>www.larimerhmp2016.com</u>, call City of Fort Collins Emergency Manager Mike Gavin at 970-416-2878 or TDD 970-224-6003.







Dam Inundation Summary Table

| Dam & Levee Inundation Summary Tab | le | Updated 2/11/1! | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|---------------|------------|--------|-------|---------------|--|-----------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|-----------|---|----------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| agend: No Critical Fadilities impacted by failure | | | Critical Fadility Inventory by Type | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | Percentage of City Limits | 5uildings | Drainers Barics (monted | Car Station | Manufacturing | Fire | Police | Other | Communication | Utilities (Electric, Water Waterwater) | r, Higher | Schools - Elementery, Middle and High School | Day Care, Day Camp, Atter- | Other Educational | Homes, Group Homes and Assisted | Adult Day | Hospitals | Urgent Care | Surgery | Other Critical | Notes |
| Hazard Dam Name | | and the second | | 1000000000 | | Perditorio | | | P | (interest) | Lancation | ingr series | | | | | (in the second s | | | | |
| VEX 48 | 6.9 | 1 837 | Boxelder/Cooper Skugh, Dry Greek, Gache la Poudre | 1 6 | | | 0 | D | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | o l | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | 0 |
| INES MEADOW | 4.1 | 1 7 | Cache La Poudre | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 5 | | 0 Poudre B 100 yr FP |
| ELDER B2 | 2.3 | 9 82 | Roselder/Cooper Slough, Cache la Poudre | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 1 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| ELDER B3 | 1.1 | 2 26 | Boxelder/Cooper Slough, Cache la Pouche | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| ELDER B4 | 0.5 | 6 8 | Boxelder/Cooper Slough, Cache la Poudre | 1 | | D | 0 | 0 | 0 | n | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | | 1 | | 0 |
| MBERS | 4.1 | 1 7. | Cache la Poudre | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 Pouche R 100 yr FP |
| 8 AKF | 4.7 | 9 158 | Rogelder/Cooper Slough, Cache In Poudre | 1 | | D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 6 F | 1 | 0 |
| LEGE #3 | 0.8 | 6 460 | Cadae la Poudre, Old Town, West Vine | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| MANCHE | 41 | 1 7 | Carbon la Province | | | | | 0 | n. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 1 0 | | | |
| ON CANYON | 36.7 | 27.435 | Boalder/Cover South Carba La Route a David Interactation Doublik | 25 | | | | 1 1 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 2 2 | 0 1 | 7 | 12 | | n 1 | 1 2 | | | |
| ICI AS | 7.0 | a 1.905 | Code in Druden, Day Creek | | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | | | | 0 |
| ED | 0.7 | 2 70 | Ford day Come Stands Carbola Daylor Day Comb | 1 | | | ě. | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| _n | 0.2 | 0 20 | Bolier de y cooper a objer, caune ra rodor ey bry creek | - | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ~ | | 0 | | | | | | |
| | 3.0 | • • • | Nial Creak | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| OD CONTROL BASIN MT | 1.9 | 9 1,000 | Cache la Rouare, Dry Creek | - | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 0 | | | | 0 |
| SIL UREEK | | 0 0 | Posal Creek, Cache la Poudre | 1 | | J | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | × 0 | | 1 | N. |
| IGAN | 3.9 | 452 | Cache la Poudre | 1 | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | 1 |
| SETOUTH | 12.6 | 1 2,775 | Boxelder/Cooper Slough, Cache La Poudre, Dry Creek | 5 | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | > 0 | 1 | | 1 |
| RGLASS | 4.1 | 1 7 | Cadhe la Poudre | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 3 | | 0 Pouche R 100 yr FP |
| AN CREEK | 0.5 | 4 7 | Boxelder/Cooper Slough, Cache la Poudre | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 (| 1 | 0 |
| WRIGHT | 4.1 | 1 7 | Cache la Poudre | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 1 | | 0 Pouche R 100 yr FP |
| VER | 0.8 | 3 413 | Cache la Poudre, Dry Greek | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 |) 0 | 6 | | 0 |
| IG DRAW | 41 | 1 453 | Cache la Poudre | 1 | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 1 | | 1 |
| IG POND | 0.4 | 9 62 | 2 Gache la Poudre, Dry Greek | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | 0 |
| FON SEAMAN | 3.9 | 7 453 | Cadhe la Poudre | 1 | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 1 | | 1 |
| TH POUDRE #2 | 5.0 | 3 485 | Boxelder/Cooper Skutch, Cache la Poudre, Footh11a | 1 | 1 | ö | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | > 0 | 0 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TH POUCRE #8 | 3.3 | 1 73 | Boxelder/Cooper Slouth, Cache la Pouche | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| TH POUDRE #6 | 5.9 | 7 603 | Boxelder/Cooper Skutch, Cache la Poudre | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | (| | 0 |
| TH POUDRE #6 | 4.3 | 5 547 | Boxelder/Cooper Slough, Cache la Poudre | 1 | | D | 0 | D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | D. | 0 | 0. 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | 0 |
| TH POLORE #15 | 7.9 | 9 1.805 | Gache la Poudre, Dry Creek | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | 0 |
| HANDLE | 41 | 1 7 | Cache la Poudre | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | â | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 2 0 | | | Providee B 100 yr FP |
| K ODEEK | 3.8 | 2 2 700 | Carba is Brucke. Dry Craele | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 1 0 | | | 1 |
| EDSON LAKE | 41 | 1 7/ | Carbo la Prudra | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 | | | Detuctor R 100 or SP |
| aine | 12.4 | 1 225 | Bound dat/Conner Sig and Carlos in Bounder | - | | | ě. | 0 | 2 | 0 | ě. | 0 | 1 | ~ ~ | | 0 | 0 0 | | | | 1 |
| ADDS | -0.0 | 0 | Developing society a couply counter to house of | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | - | | 0 0 | | | | |
| IN DIDOR | 0.0 | 0 04 | Charles De Carlo | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | | | | |
| ALL RUDGE | 0.1 | 0 00 4 7/ | Cadre la Poudre, Dry Creek | - | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <u></u> | 0 | 0 | | | | | Configuration Uncontraction |
| SNK/S | 4.1 | 1 / | Lache la Poudre | 1 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 9 0 | | | Commed to Horsetcoom |
| DIER CANYON | 20.5 | 4 12,407 | Boxelder/Cooperstough, Cache La Poudre, Canal Importation, Dry Creek | G 28 | | 4 | 3 | 0 1 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 0 | 8 <u>1</u> | | | 2 |
| NG CAN TON | 462 | 9 30,210 | Lache La Poudre, Canal Importation, Foothills, Fossil Greek, Fox Meadow | N 44 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 1 | 0 | | 2 2 | 4 2 | 9 | 11 1 | 0 | s 1 | 1 3 | | | 4 |
| CY LARE | 1.0 | 285 | Cache la Poudre, Dry Creek | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 | | 1 | 0 |
| REN LAKE | 1.5 | 8 780 | Cache la Poudre, Foothills, Fox Meadows | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 1 | 0 0 |) () | | 1 | 0 |
| ER SUPPLY NO 3 | 1.8 | 611 | Gache la Poudre, Dry Greek | 2 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| FER SUPPLY NO 4 | 0.2 | 2 83 | 2 Gadhe la Poudre, Dry Greek | 1 | | D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| DSOR #8 | 6.9 | 4 830 | Boxelder/Cooper Slough, Cache la Poudre, Dry Creek | 1 | | D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | N (| 1 | 0 |
| Je Name | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KE TREATMENT PLANT WO LEVEE | 0.3 | 6 34 | Cache is Poudre, Foothills | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| OW WO LEVEE | 0.0 | 3 223 | Gache la Poudre, Dry Creek | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 (| 1 | 0 |
| (BERLINE WO LEVEE | 0.1 | 7 29 | Gadhe la Poudre, Sprine Credo | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 0 | 0 0 | | | 1 |



²⁷² Dam inundation maps are available for the City's use but are not made public.

City of Fort Collins: Stormwater Master Plan Recommended Basin Improvements







Appendix E – Update on Mitigation Actions from the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan

At the start of the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Hazard Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan update process, the MH SPT worked with participating jurisdictions to gather information and report on the status on the mitigation actions from the 2010 Northern Colorado Hazard Mitigation Plan. Over 200 actions were analyze and reported on. The results are included in the table below.

| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins- Lovelan d Municip al Airport | Aircraft Accident s | Annual review and update of master plan | Ongoing |
| x | x | x | | | | Fort Collins- Lovelan d Municip al Airport | Aircraft Accident s | Construct a larger passenger terminal building: This is a long range planning item and will be reviewed yearly with the 6 year CIP update. This is low priority. | Priority dependent upon demand. When more flights and airlines come in it will drive the need for this to be done. |
| x | x | x | | | | Fort Collins- Lovelan d Municip al Airport | Aircraft Accident s | Construct and staff an air traffic control tower: This is a long range planning item and will be reviewed yearly with the 6 year CIP update. This is low priority. | In progress with a virtual tower. Should be opened in August 2015 |
| х | x | x | | | | Fort Collins- Lovelan d Municip | Aircraft Accident s | Establish and maintain runway protection zones: The airports protections zones are established by zoning and are constantly threatened by | Ongoing |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|---------------------------|---|-------------|
| | | | | | | al Airport | | development. This is high priority. Staff attend planning meetings and keep planners and developers informed of the airports influence areas. | |
| x | x | x | | | | Fort Collins- Lovelan d Municip al Airport | Aircraft Accident s | Extend the length of the primary runway: The runway extension is tentatively planned for 2012. The environmental assessment will begin this coming summer and will take a year and a half to complete. After the assessment the design will start construction late summer 2012. This is medium priority. | Not started |
| x | x | x | | | | Fort Collins- Lovelan d Municip al Airport | Aircraft Accident s | Increase the width and potential of the cross-wind runway: The FAA says no funding of crosswind runways, which means we will take money from Loveland Fire Department to fund expansion. This is low priority. | Not started |
| x | x | x | | | | Fort Collins- Lovelan d Municip al Airport | Aircraft Accident s | Install a new runway parallel to the primary runway: Install new and improved approach lighting for the main runway: This is a long range planning item and will be reviewed yearly with the 6 year CIP update. This is low priority. | Not started |
| x | x | x | | | | Fort Collins- Lovelan d Municip | Aircraft Accident s | Pursue property acquisitions on lands adjacent to Airport property: No land acquisitions to date, but discussions with FAA have started in regard to | Not started |







| arimer | oveland | ort Collins | stes Park | /ellington | erthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|--------|---------|-------------|-----------|------------|---------|--|---------------------------|---|-----------|
| | L, | Ľ | Ű | N | B | al Airport | | the dairy NW of the airport. This is medium priority. | |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins- Lovelan d Municip al Airport | Aircraft Accident s | The runways were recently resurfaced. | Completed |
| x | x | x | | | | Fort Collins- Lovelan d Municip al Airport | Aircraft Accident s | Work with the Transportation Safety Administration to be prepared for aircraft-related emergencies: TSA is constantly changing regulations to the ever changing security threats. As such we recently had to install fencing and access gates to secure the hangar areas. This high priority project is ongoing until the airport parameter is completely fenced (6' chain link with 1' barbed wire on top). With the hangar areas secured TSA mandated that we access badge all of the tenants, airplane owners, business owners, employees and anyone that has access to the Airport Operations Area (AOA). The airport went from having 44 badges to 590 to date. This required the airport to have its own stand alone badge access system. Fence and Gates, \$480,000 to date, \$400,00 to go. Badging \$30,000 to date. | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|---|---|---|--|
| | | x | | | | | All Inceden t | The PFA Training Center, including the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) now has 100% back-up power via diesel. The computers and TV communications were also upgraded. | completed |
| | | | | | | | Avalanc he | n/a | |
| | | x | | | | | Biologic al Hazards / Influenz a | Based upon the Leadership and Coordination chapter of our local influenza Response Plan, the primary focus is to limit the number of illnesses and deaths through education and inoculation, preserve continuity of essential governmental functions through the continuity of operation plans, minimize social disorder and minimize economic losses. Inoculation clinics have been implemented along with additional table top exercises for preparedness. | Completed |
| × | x | x | x | x | x | Larimer County Health Depart ment | Biologic al Hazards / Influenz a | Participation with the Larimer County Pandemic Steering Committee | Emergency Management and Public Health Officails participated in the committee and developed a Community Pandemic Flu Response |





| arimer | oveland | ort Collins | stes Park | /ellington | erthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|--------|---------|-------------|-----------|------------|---------|---|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | Ľ | Ü | > | B | | | | Plan. This plan is due for an update. The committee no longer exists. |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Police Depart ment | Civil Disturba nce | A full scale active shooter exercise is proposed for 2010. All sworn personnel will attend this training, which is done at a local school. This is active training using volunteers as victims and as suspects. Simmunition is also used to add realism to the training. Tactics, searches, room entries, suspect contact, and victim rescue are all topics taught during this training. This is high priority. | Exercise was held at CSU between Fort Collins, CSU Police, Loveland PD, OEMS, Poudre Fire Authority, Public Health, Thompson Valley EMS in 2010 for active shooter. A follow up was held in 2012. |
| x | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | All communities involved in the development of this Plan have identified employees who may become involved in potential incident responses to civil disturbances. These identified employees have completed the National Incident Management System (NIMS) training appropriate to their level of responsibility. | In 2014, as part of the CEMP, Larimer County created a Training and Exercise Annex for all personnel involved in emergency management activities, |





| L | nd | ollins | ark | gton | pn | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|--------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---|--------------------------|--|---|
| Larime | Lovelaı | Fort Cc | Estes P | Wellin | Bertho | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | requiring NIMS coursework at varying levels. Same for Loveland and Fort Collins. Ongoing training in NIMS occurs for all jurisdictions. |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Police Depart ment | Civil Disturba nce | An Operations tabletop, in part to exercise response plans, was conducted and is proposed for 2010. This is medium priority. | Fort Collins did the Ops TTX. Loveland had LE involved in the airport exercise in 2014. Annual exercises continue to occur. |
| x | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Conduct annual emergency training exercises (table-top, functional, and/or full-scale exercises) to evaluate response plans. | All jurisdictions do this annually with TTX, Games, Functional Exercises and Full Scale. |
| x | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Develop and/or maintain emergency operations plans involving all local emergency responders. | In 2014, Larimer County updated their old EOP to a Comprehensi |




| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | ve Emergency Management Plan that was approved by the Board of Commissione rs and the Sheriff in January 2015. Fort Collins and Loveland reviewed annually and updated as needed. Re- written and re-published every three years. |
| x | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Develop plans to increase the number of horse-mounted law enforcement units. | In 2014, Larimer County added ESF 11b - Large Animal Response, to the CEMP. Loveland not started. |
| x | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Develop plans to increase the number of local law enforcement K-9 units. Each dog costs approximately \$6,000 to purchase untrained. Training consists of approximately 10-weeks of off- | The Sheriff's Office K-9 program is currently at capacity and in a maintenance program now |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|---|--------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | site training, plus at least 18 hours of training per month. | that it has been built out. They continue to increase or replace dogs as they retire or get injured. Loveland complete. |
| x | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Encourage local law enforcement officers to attend civil disturbance-relatcourses at the FEMA Emergency Management Institute. | Ongoing. |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Police Depart ment | Civil Disturba nce | Fort Collins Police also have a Mobile Field Force and all ranks continually train on ICS to maintain NIMS compliancy | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Police Depart ment | Civil Disturba nce | Fort Collins Police Department sworn and non-sworn employees take NIMS and ICS100 as basic training. It has been taught annually, but will now be scaled back to being taught every two years. Almost all of the staff have received ICS at the 200 level. This on-going action item is medium priority. | This has been accomplished and is an ongoing item. |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Police Depart ment | Civil Disturba nce | Fort Collins Police, within the officer, sergeant, and lieutenant rank attend a one day training session in July of each year, with 2 hours | Yes this occurred. And continues training |







| er | pu | ollins | ark | gton | png | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---|--------------------------|---|---|
| Larime | Lovela | Fort Co | Estes F | Wellin | Bertho | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | dedicated to Mobile Field Force training, or riot control. Training is done with the department. Another one day session is proposed for 2010. This proposed action item is high priority. | occurs for active shooter and riot control. Loveland started an Active Assailant Program and trains on that program. |
| | | × | | | | Fort Collins Police Depart ment | Civil Disturba nce | Fort Collins School Resource officers work with individual schools in developing and training of active shooter protocol. This on going action item is high priority. | This occurs and is ongoing. |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Police Depart ment | Civil Disturba nce | In 2009, the Fort Collins Police Department (FCPD) developed plans for activation of the Police Services building Operations Room, which can serve as a EOC of sorts if necessary. A staff tabletop was conducted in June 2009 regarding the use of this room. Another tabletop is proposed for 2010 with other City emergency responders in an EOC setting. This proposed action item is medium priority. | Using a Police Ops Center at 2221 S. Timberline Training Room for a command center. Training has been done on EOC Ops. Loveland PD set up a police command center at 810 E. 10th Street, Loveland, 2nd Floor Training |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | Room. Training occurs. Tabletop exercises in the EOC and Command Rooms |
| x | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Incorporate law enforcement K-9 units into horse-mounted law enforcement training programs whenever possible. | Loveland has not yet started. The Sheriff's Office K-9 units have not trained with mounted patrol. There is not plan to in the near future. |
| x | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Local law enforcement agencies maintain active and well-trained SWAT teams. Local fire and EMS agencies are incorporated into the SWAT training to improve intra- agency working relations during crisis response. | Well maintained and active. |
| | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Local law enforcement officers have received training in crowd control and routinely work large scale events to further develop their knowledge, skills and abilities to handle large crowds. | Ongoing |





| | | | | | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|--------------------------|---|--|
| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | | | | |
| x | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Provide inter-agency training opportunities to improve the capabilities of local horse- mounted law enforcement units. | Loveland does this, on- going. The Sheriff's Posse conducts training regularly. |
| x | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Purchase additional less-lethal weapons for local law enforcement agencies. Options currently being addressed include Tasers, which cost approximately \$1,000 per unit, and pepper-ball shotguns, which cost approximately \$850 per unit. | This has been completed and is ongoing. Loveland outfitted all officers with Tasers, and FLIRs (Forward Looking Infra- Red). 2- FN303 launchers for patrol. Fort Collins is in the process of using cameras and Tasers. LCSO has tasers and less- lethal projectiles. |



| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | × | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Work with local school district safety committees to plan for and be prepared for possible disturbances at school district facilities. | Emergency Management partners throughout Larimer County, along with the School Districts, meet every month to work through planning requirements . One project is a Reunification Plan for emergencies and disasters at schools. Loveland meets with Thompson School District monthly as well to talk through procedures. Fort Collins meets with Poudre School District regularly. |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|--------------------------|---|---|
| | x | | | | | | Civil Disturba nce | Working with the Colorado Information Analysis Center and the local Terrorism Liaison Officer Program assists in providing intelligence which may assist in a Civil Disturbance. | Ongoing |
| x | x | x | x | | x | Public Works or other appropri ate departm ent | Dam Failure | Maintain and improve existing stormwater engineering systems. | Yes and is ongoing. |
| x | x | x | x | | x | Public Works or other appropri ate departm ent | Dam Failure | Maintain current and accurate emergency notification contact information or agencies, departments, private companies and/or individuals that may be eeded to respond in the event of a dam failure. | EAP has all of the emergency contact information. Loveland and Fort Collins has a stormwater plan with all this information as well |
| x | x | x | | | x | Public Works or other appropri ate departm ent | Dam Failure | Maintain current and accurate flood risk maps. | Fort Collins maps reviewed annually and after every incident to update. Larimer County 2013 Flood changed the |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | mapping and we now need new mapping. A floodplain remapping effort has begun and is being managed by the Colorado Water Conservation Board. |
| | | | x | | | Public Works or other appropri ate departm ent | Dam Failure | Maintain current and accurate flood risk maps. | On going Maintain flood risk maps |
| x | x | x | | | x | Public Works or other appropri ate departm ent | Dam Failure | Review and update existing emergency operations plans on an annual basis to address the issue of dam failures and/or flooding. | EAPs address this need each year. Meet regularly with BOR and have regular calls with BOR during high flow incidents. |
| x | | | x | | | Public Works or other appropri ate | Dam Failure | Review and update existing emergency operations plans on an annual basis to address the issue of dam failures and/or flooding. | On going Review update EOP |







| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | departm ent | | | |
| x | x | | x | | x | Public Works or other appropri ate departm ent | Dam Failure | Work with the Colorado Division of Water Resources and/or Bureau of Reclamation to ensure that periodic assessments are conducted at area dams and that appropriate measures are taken to correct any deficiencies or issues noted. | Yes and ongoing. |
| | | x | | | | Public Works or other appropri ate departm ent | Dam Failure | Work with the Colorado Division of Water Resources and/or Bureau of Reclamation to ensure that periodic assessments are conducted at area dams and that appropriate measures are taken to correct any deficiencies or issues noted. | On going Correction - work with State of CO Engineers for NFIP Dam compliance |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Utilities | Drought / Extreme Heat | Facility audit program expansion. | Done. |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Utilities | Drought / Extreme Heat | Financial incentives for commercial water-saving upgrades. | Done. |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Utilities | Drought / Extreme Heat | Irrigation technology rebates. | Done. |





| | | ns | ¥ | u | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|------|---------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| ler | and | Colli | Par | ngtc | pnou | | | | |
| arim | ovel | ort (| stes | Velli | erth | | | | |
| × | × | ш | ш | > | ш | | Drought | Local agencies are currently | The proposed |
| | | | | | | | / | studying the feasibility of | reservoir is |
| | | | | | | | Extreme | increasing available domestic | referred to as |
| | | | | | | | Heat | water supply through the | 'Chimney |
| | | | | | | | | construction of Windy Gap | Hollow.' The |
| | | | | | | | | Reservoir above Carter Lake. At | Record of |
| | | | | | | | | this time, the land purchase has | Decision has |
| | | | | | | | | been is completed and the | been issued |
| | | | | | | | | project is in the public input | in the |
| | | | | | | | | phase. The project estimated to | affirmative |
| | | | | | | | | cost a total of \$270 million | from |
| | | | | | | | | when completed. | Reclamation, |
| | | | | | | | | | and the |
| | | | | | | | | | project |
| | | | | | | | | | proponents |
| | | | | | | | | | are currently |
| | | | | | | | | | working with |
| | | | | | | | | | the State of |
| | | | | | | | | | Colorado for |
| | | | | | | | | | a 401 |
| | | | | | | | | | Certification, |
| | | | | | | | | | intended to |
| | | | | | | | | | be followed |
| | | | | | | | | | by a 404 |
| | | | | | | | | | permit from |
| | | | | | | | | | the US Army |
| | | | | | | | | | Corps of |
| | | | | | | | | | Engineers. |
| | | | | | | | | | Assuming 110 |
| | | | | | | | | | by the |
| | | | | | | | | | Environment |
| | | | | | | | | | al Protection |
| | | | | | | | | | Agency this |
| | | | | | | | | | work should |
| | | | | | | | | | be completed |
| | | | | | | | | | within the |
| | | | | | | | | | next vear |
| | | | | | | | | | Engineering |
| | | | | | | | | | design is |





| | | S | | _ | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|-------|------|---------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Ŀ | bue | ollin | Park | gtor | pnc | | | | |
| arimo | ovela | ort C | stes | /ellir | ertho | | | | |
| Ë | L(| Ĕ | ŭ | 8 | B | | | | expected to |
| | | | | | | | | | begin in the |
| | | | | | | | | | first quarter |
| | | | | | | | | | of 2016. |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| х | х | | | | | | Drought | Local agencies are in the | This project |
| | | | | | | | / | process of studying the | continues to |
| | | | | | | | Extreme | reasibility of increasing | move anead |
| | | | | | | | пеаг | supply through the | nublic input |
| | | | | | | | | construction of Glade Reservoir | public input phase. The |
| | | | | | | | | north of Fort Collins. This | initial |
| | | | | | | | | project is currently in the initial | Environment |
| | | | | | | | | public input phase. | al Impact |
| | | | | | | | | | Statement |
| | | | | | | | | | has been |
| | | | | | | | | | completed. |
| | | | | | | | | | However, a |
| | | | | | | | | | supplemental |
| | | | | | | | | | EIS IS being |
| | | | | | | | | | the Record of |
| | | | | | | | | | Decision has |
| | | | | | | | | | not been |
| | | | | | | | | | issued. The |
| | | | | | | | | | permitting |
| | | | | | | | | | process may |
| | | | | | | | | | require |
| | | | | | | | | | another |
| | | | | | | | | | couple of |
| | | | | | | | | | years. |
| х | х | | | | | | Drought | Local governments may | Has not been |
| | | | | | | | / | consider requiring water saving | done. May be |
| | | | | | | | | | considered in |
| | | | | | | | | | the future. |





| ler | and | Collins | : Park | ngton | pnou | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-------|-------|---------|--------|-------|-------|------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Larim | Lovel | Fort (| Estes | Welli | Berth | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Extreme Heat | plumbing features in new construction projects. | Recommend ations occur but not requirements . Loveland's requirements match federal and state requirements |
| x | x | | | | | | Drought / Extreme Heat | Local water providers as well as public works agencies provide education to property owners about use of drought-resistant or native vegetation requiring reduced amounts of water. | Reports come out to residents regarding energy and water savings and education. Large public education program regarding this. Loveland offers an optional 'hydrozone' development option to developers or HOA's, and reduces the raw water requirments to match the demands of those development |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | | s. An extensive list of suitable plants for each hydrozone are included in the City's 'Site Development Performance and Standards Guidelines' document. This program has been received well as developers want a lower raw water requirement and the public seems to enjoy the lower water use plantings. |
| × | × | | | | | | Drought / Extreme Heat | Local water providers periodically implement domestic water use restrictions during identified periods of drought. Increases in water tap and/or water use fees are also addressed during times of drought. | Restrictions implemented and ongoing. Loveland successfully work with its citizens to encourage wise water use during drought through |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | education and information sharing. Water use restrictions have rarely been implemented for a very short period, but that option is reserved for extreme conditions. Loveland does not have an inclining block rate structure. |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Utilities | Drought / Extreme Heat | Low income retrofit program. | Done., |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Utilities | Drought / Extreme Heat | Online access to water history. | Done. |
| | | x | | | | Fort Collins Utilities | Drought / Extreme Heat | Public information campaign expansion. | Fort Collins has expanded their Public Information campaign for all-hazards. PIO and JIC fundtions |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | | have expanded and continue to train. |
| x | x | | | | | | Drought / Extreme Heat | The City of Loveland hosts an annual Public Works Day. This annual event provides public education in the area of water conservation to the citizens of Loveland. | The City's Public Works Day is held every year, but was cancelled in 2015 due to inclement weather. Passport to Water & Power was held on July 23, 2015 and had an excellent turnout of citizens that were interested in learning more about where their water and power comes from. Outreach activities also include Children's water festival at local schools. |



| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| x | x | | | | | | Drought / Extreme Heat | The City of Loveland recently completed a major project to increase available domestic water supply through the construction of Green Ridge Glade Reservoir west of Loveland. This project was completed in 2004 at a total cost of \$20 million. | Green Ridge Glade Reservoir has been in continuous service since it was first filled in 2004/05. The City does on- going dam inspections and maintenance to insure it is in good working order. |
| | | x | | | | | Earthqu ake | Additionally, infrastructure vulnerability assessments will be conducted in 2012. | Ongoing |
| x | x | x | | | | | Earthqu ake | Build hazard awareness through K-12 education programs, public courses information distribution, and appropriate offerings of hazard-relatedin local colleges and universities. | Each school has on OEM and builds these programs for their areas. The jurisdictional OEMs support these measures as needed. |
| x | x | x | | | | | Earthqu ake | Maintain open communications with the Colorado Geologic Survey to | OEM receives notifications from CGS regularly and |





| rimer | veland | ort Collins | tes Park | ellington | erthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-------|--------|-------------|----------|-----------|---------|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Га | Fo | Fc | Es | M | Be | | | remain informed on earthquake risk assessments. | lines of communicati on remain open. |
| x | x | x | | | | | Earthqu ake | Predict collateral damage and cascading failures based on models of infrastructure interdependencies. | Loveland addresses this in their COOP plan. Larimer is working on their COOP now and needs to address this further. Building Department for Larimer recently went through all building codes to look for mitigation actions for earthquake and other hazards. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Expansiv e Soils / Subside nce | Local Land Use Plans, Capital Improvement Plans, and Building/Zoning Codes address all of these issues. | All plans address this. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | Fire Preventi on Bureaus | Fires - Urban | The majority of mitigation efforts focus on fire prevention and public education activities. The local fire departments adopt and enforce standardized model fire codes which are adopted into both | True for all jurisdictions. Loveland has 2012 Int'l Fire Code adopted. |



| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|---|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | municipal code as well as county ordinance. | |
| | | x | | | | Poudre Fire Authorit Y | Fires - Wildlan d | Completing home assessments. | Has been done and is ongoing in various fire departments / districts. |
| x | x | x | | | | Lovelan d Fire & Rescue, Poudre Fire Authorit y | Fires - Wildlan d | Conducting "Red Zone" wildfire risk assessments of the various residential neighborhoods within their identified wildland- urban interface zones. There are currently approximately 296 neighborhoods identified throughout Larimer County. This high priority project is on going and is funded by grants. | Various departments do Red Zone risk assessments annually and will continue. Growth of this program is warranted |
| | x | | | x | | Fire Preventi on Bureaus | Fires - Wildlan d | Develop a CWPP. | These exist throughout the county and we have a Larimer County CWPP. |
| | | x | | | | Poudre Fire Authorit Y | Fires - Wildlan d | Develop a Poudre River Corridor Fire Management Plan. | The High Park Wildfire in 2012 caused changes to this action since the fuel model changed significantly in this area. City of Fort |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|-------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | | Collins Water Utilities is looking at this for the future due to the impacts from High park Wildfire. |
| x | x | | | | | Larimer County Coordin ating Group | Fires - Wildlan d | Larimer County Emergency Services administers open burning permit programs designed to regulate the safe use of fire for fuels reduction projects completed by area property owners. | All jurisdictions in Larimer participate in the opn burning permit program except Berthoud, who participates in Boulders program |
| x | × | | | | | Larimer County Coordin ating Group | Fires - Wildlan d | Larimer County Emergency Services maintains web-based wildland fire information, including links to the FireWise wildland fire safety education program (http://www.co.larimer.co.us/ wildfire/). LCES would like to expand this high priority project in 2010. Funding to implement this action item is from existing program funds and grants. | LCSO still give info on FireWise. Other jurisdictions throughout Larimer also use this. Expansion of this program throughout Larimer is needed. |





| ler | and | Collins | Park | ngton | pnou | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--|-------------------------|---|---|
| Larim | Lovel | Fort (| Estes | Welli | Berth | | | | |
| x | | | | | | Larimer County Coordin ating Group | Fires - Wildlan d | Larimer County has established and enforces building and planning codes specific to construction in the wildland urban interface. These codes require defensible space on new construction in the wildland-urban interface. | Larimer County just reviewed all land use, wildfire, and building codes and will be making recommenda tions to the BCC on changes to the codes. |
| x | | | | | | Larimer County Coordin ating Group | Fires - Wildlan d | Larimer County has historically provided tree slash disposal options to homeowners in the wildland-urban interface in order to promote the establishment of defensible space around residential dwellings. A proposed, high priority action item for 2010 is to continue to provide thisservice. Procurement of grant funding is necessary to implement this action item. | Larimer is working with communities to do their own slash disposal programs with assistance from the county, but we no longer have this program. |
| | | | x | | | Larimer County Coordin ating Group | Fires - Wildlan d | Larimer County has historically provided tree slash disposal options to homeowners in the wildland-urban interface in order to promote the establishment of defensible space around residential dwellings. A proposed, high priority action item for 2010 is to continue to provide | On going Our PIO assists FD with slash disposal public info and slash site collection management |





| mer | eland | t Collins | es Park | llington | thoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|------|-------|-----------|---------|----------|-------|---|-------------------------|---|---|
| Lari | Lov | For | Este | We | Ber | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | thisservice. Procurement of grant funding is necessary to implement this action item. | |
| x | x | | | | | Larimer County Coordin ating Group | Fires - Wildlan d | Larimer County provides public wildland fire education and information to homeowners. Topics include wildland fire safety and awareness, defensible spaces, and urban interface issues. | This occurs through several jurisdictions, including state agencies. Info distributed via multi- media, social media, and public events. Would like to expand this program to include more measures in the future. |
| | | | | | x | Berthou d Fire Protecti on District | Fires - Wildlan d | Numerous proposed mitigation action items were generated during the completion of the CWPP. | Countywide CWPP has been updated a few times and the LCSO reviews the actions regularly. |
| | | x | | | | Poudre Fire Authorit y | Fires - Wildlan d | Return Fort Collins Natural Areas back on a schedule of two prescribed fires per annum. | The 2012 Wildfire Season made the fire depts re-evaluate this program and therefore |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|-------------------------|--|---|
| | | × | | | | | Eiros - | Vulnerability assessments are | may not have 2 prescribed fires per year, but the program continues. Depends upon the risk of each season. |
| | | × | | | | | d | performed in the urban wildland area as part of the Community Wildfire Protection Plan. This plan includes identification of fuels management, home assessments, Firewise education, evacuation/escape routes, and restoration plans to name a few of the critical components. | Ungoing |
| | | x | | | | Poudre Fire Authorit Y | Fires - Wildlan d | Website for homeowners accopanied by informational mailings to homeowners. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | Poudre Fire Authorit Y | Fires - Wildlan d | Wildland Urban Interface fire plans. | Ongoing |
| x | x | | | | | Larimer County Coordin ating Group | Fires - Wildlan d | Working with local communities to create and implement CWPPs. | CWPP's exist. Implementati on efforts on- going. |





| | | S | | c | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|------|-------|----------|---------|---------|-------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| mer | eland | : Collin | es Park | lingtoi | thoud | | | | |
| Lari | Love | Fort | Este | Wel | Berl | | | | |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | A letter of map revision (LOMR) was approved for the Choice Center student residential housing project formerly constructed in the Spring Creek special flood hazard area (SFHA). The LOMR flood risk update became effective on July 25, 2014, formally removing 800 residents living in 2 residential structures from the SFHA as a result of fill, building elevation and engineered flood conveyance. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | Stormw ater MP/FP Adminis tration Staff assisted CWCB and FEMA staff | Flood - Flash and Riverine | A RiskMAP update for the Poudre River Basin has commenced to better define the flood risk for the Poudre River. Hydrology has been submitted to FEMA and is currently under review and revised hydraulic modeling has commenced. An updated flood risk map for the Poudre River corridor is expected in Summer 2014. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | A Social Media campaign was added for Flood Awareness Week this year. It included one message per week leading up to Flood Awareness Week and five messages during Flood Awareness Week. | Ongoing |
| | | | x | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | A Social Media campaign was added for Flood Awareness Week this year. It included one message per week leading up to Flood Awareness Week and | Also NFIP compliant with Flood education |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | five messages during Flood Awareness Week. | preparation/ awareness |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Along 1st Street, cured-in-place pipe was installed. Bank collapse downstream of the LPATH levee in the Riverbend Ponds area was performed with the installation of rip-rap and engineered fill material | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Arapahoe Bend - Repaired the east bank of one pond at that was eroded during the 2013 flood. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | As a result of the Canal Importation Ponds and Outfall project, several floodplains in central west Fort Collins have been reduced or eliminated. These floodplain changes are currently under review and will be adopted in late 2012. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Assisted with water quality standards setting, design review and system evaluation for various proposed new developments. Led a stormwater quality tour of existing stormwater treatment facilities as a component of a City of Fort Collins employee education program. Gave two lectures at CSU for Civil Engineering and Landscape Architecture students regarding LID-based stormwater management policies and technologies | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | BellwetherChannel–Reestablishedpositivedrainage to keep water fromcovering the bike path. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Benson Lane – Eliminated erosion from the hill between 930 and 931 Benson Lane by installing a concrete pan and energy dissipaters in the pan. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Boxelder Creek at Prospect Road – This project is currently in the design phase. The project includes a flood control channel and new bridge at Boxelder Creek and Prospect Road. The purpose of the project is to prevent overtopping of Prospect Road in a 100-year flood event. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Burns Tributary Channel – restoration of channel bank including removing a homeowner placed retaining wall on City property, regarding slopes, and erosion protection. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Canal Importation Basin – a gasoline station at 1337 W. Elizabeth Street is gone (with underground storage tanks | Completed |





| er | and | ollins | Park | ıgton | pno | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---------|
| Larim | Lovela | Fort C | Estes | Wellir | Berth | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | removed), replaced by a coffee shop. | |
| | | × | | | | Stormw ater MP/FP Adminis tration Staff | Flood - Flash and Riverine | City staff completed hydrology updates for three of the City's Stormwater Master Plan basins to include new EPASWMM hydrologic models in lieu of the effective, outdated MODSWMM model. The basin updates included Dry Creek, the Canal Importation Basin, and Boxelder Creek basin. The 100-year floodplain for the Dry Creek basin will be updated as part of an upcoming CLOMR/LOMR for the Dry Creek at Vine Flood Control project. The Boxelder Creek 100-year floodplain will be updated as part of an upcoming CLOMR/LOMR for the East Side Detention Facility flood control project which is being designed and built by the Boxelder Basin Stormwater Authority. Lastly, the Canal Importation Basin 100-year floodplain is currently being updated by the City. An extensive public outreach process is occurring to notify residents of the floodplain changes within the basin. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | City Stormw ater | Flood - Flash and Riverine | City Stormwater developed and hosted a one-day functional training exercise to improve communication and response among City, County, State and Federal agencies responding to | |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| | | | | | | | | flood and debris-generation from the High Park fire burn area that would threaten City and County residents and public infrastructure. | |
| | | x | | | | Stormw ater MP/FP Adminis tration Staff | Flood - Flash and Riverine | City Stormwater staff completed design of the City's first stream rehabilitation reach (Fossil Creek Reach 4, Sub reach 1). Construction of the project is slated to begin on October 1, 2014. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | Stormw ater MP/FP Adminis tration Staff | Flood - Flash and Riverine | City Stormwater staff worked closely with the City Parks Department to complete the design for the stream rehabilitation of a reach of McClelland's Creek through the new Southeast Community Park. | Ongoing |
| | | X | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | City website was updated to improve customer access to Stormwater services. Please see http://www.fcgov.com/utilitie s/what-we-do/stormwater. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Clearview Channel – Construction was completed on improvements to Clearview Channel between Briarwood Road and Hillcrest Drive. Improvements included rebuilding the channel to repair eroded areas and prevent future erosion, improving maintenance access and enhancing channel habitat. | Completed |





| <u>ـ</u> | pu | llins | ark | gton | pn | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|----------|---------|---------------------|---------|---------|--------|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| -arime | -ovelar | ⁼ ort Co | Estes P | Welling | 3ertho | | | | |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Completed an update of the City's Stormwater Master Plan to include stream rehabilitation and water quality projects and received approval on a funding mechanism from City Council to include \$650,000 annually for stream rehabilitation and water quality projects. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Conducted innovative public outreach for the Stormwater Master Plan update including development of a social media outreach approach, develop and implement an online stormwater quiz, update to the Stormwater Master Planning web page, and a booth at the New West Fest public event. | Completed |
| x | | x | | x | | Boxelde r Creek Regional Alliance | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Construction of a siphon / waste way along the Larimer Weld Canal at Boxelder Creek. | This project is called the Larimer Weld Canal Crossing Structure (LWCCS) and consists of a weir overflow (spill). Construction of the \$0.9 Million project will begin in fall or winter 2015 and will be completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | by Spring 2016. |
| x | | x | | × | | Boxelde r Creek Regional Alliance | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Construction of Edsor Reservoir. | This projectwas renamedas the EastSideDetentionFacility(ESDF) andrelocated dueto siteconstraints toBoxelderCreekbetween CR50 and 52 inorder toprovide theneededdetention. Inaddition,improvements to CR 52 areincluded withthe detentionfacilityconstruction.Theconstructioncontracttotals \$7.5Million andincludes boththe ESDF andCR52Improvements. |





| ler | and | Collins | Park | ngton | pno | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Larim | Lovel | Fort (| Estes | Welli | Berth | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | Construction began on Aug. 3, 2015 and is scheduled for completion by Spring 2016. The project is being completed by the BBRSA and Timnath in partnership. |
| x | | x | | x | | Boxelde r Creek Regional Alliance | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Construction of I-25 split flow diversion channel. | With the revisions to the BBRSA Master Plan Improvement s, the diversion channel improvement s were eliminated. |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Coordinated with several City departments and City Boards to develop a prioritization matrix (MCDA Tool) that was used for prioritizing upcoming stream rehabilitation projects. Presented the City's stream rehabilitation and water quality update at the annual CASFM conference. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | Stormw ater | Flood - Flash | Coordinating with CDOT to perform stream rehabilitation | Ongoing |





| | | | | | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | | | | |
| | | | | | | MP/FP Adminis tration Staff | and Riverine | and scour countermeasures on Spring Creek at US Highway 287/College Avenue. Design of the project will begin in fall 2014, with construction scheduled to begin in fall 2015 | |
| x | | x | | x | | Boxelde r Creek Regional Alliance | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Diversion of Coal Creek to Clark Reservoir. | This project was completed in 2012 by the Boxelder Basin Regional Stormwater Authority (BBRSA). The BBRSA ws formed by the City of Fort Collins, Larimer County and the Town of Wellington. The total project cost was approximatel y \$5.1 Million. Funding of approximatel y \$3 Million from a FEMA Hazard Mitigatin Grant was |





| mer | eland | : Collins | es Park | lington | choud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|------|-------|-----------|---------|---------|-------|------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Lari | Love | Fort | Este | Wel | Bert | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | used towards this project. |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Dry Creek at Vine Drive Flood Control project - This project is currently in the design phase. This project includes the design of a detention pond at Vine Drive and Dry Creek. The purpose of the project is to provide a stormwater outfall for the areas around North College Avenue. The project will also provide flood control benefits along Dry Creek from Vine Drive south to the Cache la Poudre River. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | During the summer of 2013, the City began the public outreach process related to adopting the State Rules and Regulations for Regulatory Floodplains in Colorado that were adopted in January 2011 by the Colorado Water Conservation Board. A website (http://www.fcgov.com/utilitie s/what-we- do/stormwater/flooding/flood plain-regulations#stateregs was established for communicating about the changes. Presentations were made to various Boards and | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| | | | | | | | | Commissions and community organizations. Because the City already had adopted many of these rules, there are relatively minor changes that are needed. These rules were adopted by City Council on November 5th, 2013. | |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Flood Awareness Week was held July 12-19, 2014. Stormwater's efforts included mailings of an updated flood awareness brochure to each City floodplain resident and property owner. Stormwater also set up flood awareness displays in 12 public buildings, placed flood awareness messages on bus benches, hung banners from Utility poles in four downtown locations, and broadcast flood awareness videos on the City Cable Channel 14. A separate mailer about floodplain management services offered by the City of Fort Collins will be sent to local realtors, insurance agents and lenders. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Floodplain maps and rain gauge data are available for iPhones, Android and Windows Smartphones. Users can search by address or zoom to a specific location to see the floodplain map. Rain gauge data can be viewed in real-time. | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Fossil Creek Stream Stability – The design for the Fossil Creek stream stability project is underway. The project includes laying back vertical eroded banks and planting hundreds of native plants and shrubs along the section of Fossil Creek immediately west of Lemay Avenue. | Ongoing |
| | | х | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Fox Meadows Detention basin – Improved appearance and maintenance accessibility by removing a deteriorating fence. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | In May of 2012, the Physical Map Revision to Spring Creek became effective. This new FEMA mapping reflected four flood mitigation projects and resulted in 120 homes and businesses being removed from the floodplain and reduced risks for 850 properties. City stormwater fees, along with a \$2.7 million FEMA Pre Disaster Mitigation (PDM) grant, paid for these improvements. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | In response to water quality concerns after the Hewlett Gulch and High Park Fires in Poudre Canyon, two new rain gages and a water quality gage were installed. These gages will be used by the Fort Collins Utilities Water Treatment Plant staff to monitor water quality and determine if intakes should | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| | | | | | | | | be shut down. In addition, in a cooperative agreement with CDOT, the USGS has installed four new rain gages flanking the Poudre Canyon, and in a cooperative agreement with Loveland, has installed one rain gage between Buckhorn and Redstone Canyons. | |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | In the Canal Importation Basin, the \$21.5 million Canal Importation Ponds and Outfall project has been completed. Final remapping is in process and it is expected that there will be over 150 homes removed from the 100 year floodplain. Three (3) stormwater detention ponds were constructed (Glenmoor, Red Fox and Kane ponds) and three other detention ponds were modified (Avery, Fairbrooke, and Plum ponds). Groundwork on this project was initiated in 2008. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | In the Canal Importation Basin, the Windsor Court stormwater overflow channel in the Lexington Greens subdivision was completed. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | In the Foothills basin at the Sailors Reef subdivision, rehabilitation of the stormwater drainage system was completed using cured-in- place pipe technology. | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | In the Mail Creek basin, the Manhattan detention pond was enlarged to add capacity and create wetlands habitat. Subdrains were replaced in the Mountain Ridge Subdivision detention pond to enhance extended detention. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | In the Old Town Basin, the Linden Street Improvements included \$250,000 of stormwater piping & drainage infrastructure that coincided with water and wastewater improvements. An outfall to the Poudre River was constructed that included a water quality component. This project was part of the Downtown River District Improvements, which covered two blocks of urban redevelopment, and local flooding issues in the area were mitigated with its completion. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | In the Poudre River basin, the 2013 cleanup effort was completed. Downed trees and debris that could threaten bridge piers were removed from the channel corridor. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | In the Spring Creek basin, at the Pleasant Valley and Lake (PV&L) irrigation ditch through the Rossborough subdivision, regrading of the stormwater inflow and outflow channel | Completed |




| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---------|
| | | | | | | | | across the PV&L irrigation ditch was completed. | |
| | | x | | | | Stormw ater MP/FP Adminis tration Staff assisted CWCB and FEMA staff | Flood - Flash and Riverine | initiating the RiskMAP process to update the floodplains for the Cache La Poudre (Poudre) River and identified and secured local funding for Fort Collins' local match. Staff coordinated efforts and assisted with aerial mapping in advance of hydrologic modeling. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | LOMR will be initiated before the end of 2014 as a change order to previous work associated with the new Mason Corridor MAX bus rapid transit system. This dedicated public transportation guideway crosses the Spring Creek SFHA in the same reach affected by the Choice Center LOMR. The closure of all construction at the end of the summer 2014 season triggered the LOMR process, and as of the writing of this document, all change order approvals were being routed through the Fort Collins Purchasing department for fiscal review and approval. It is anticipated the LOMR funding will be approved, and the LOMR is expected to be approved and effective at the end of 2015 or beginning of 2016. | Ongoing |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Low Impact Development (LID) – The City adopted regulations that require new public infrastructure projects as well as new development and redevelopment sites to provide a treatment system that will capture at least 50% of the Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV) as defined by the City's Stormwater Criteria Manual and treat it in an "LID-type" device or technology. In addition, a minimum of 25% of new pavement is to be permeable to promote stormwater infiltration. The goals of these new regulations are to reduce the impact of pollutants discharged from developed areas on our "receiving waters, reduce stormwater volume for smaller storm events, and reduce the risk of flooding by distributing and infiltrating stormwater runoff from developed areas locally before reaching major drainageways. | Completed |
| | | | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Mail Creek – Sloped back the bank and installed new concrete wingwalls to allow access for loader to clean concrete pad in mail creek at the trash skimmer. Removed trash storage area and catwalk. Replaced head gate. | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Maintained the City Flood Warning System's (FWS) network of 75 gage installations, comprising 57 rain gages, 43 stream gages, six weather stations, three repeaters and two base stations. | rws oncail staff conducted a tabletop exercise and training session focused on flood response operations for a dam breach that included local emergency response agency (PFA) and a representativ e from the State Office of Dam Safety. Stormwater OnCall season included a rain and hail event on June 15 that flooded an apartment complex and damaged cars and buildings. Spring high flow on the Poudre required |





| | | S | | ۱ | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|----------|------|-------|------|------|-----|------|--------|---------|----------------|
| <u>ب</u> | pu | ollin | ark | gtor | pn | | | | |
| ime | 'ela | t Cc | es F | Ilin | tho | | | | |
| Lar | Lov | For | Est | We | Ber | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | LETA-911 |
| | | | | | | | | | autodialer |
| | | | | | | | | | notifications |
| | | | | | | | | | to low-lying |
| | | | | | | | | | residents and |
| | | | | | | | | | businesses. |
| | | | | | | | | | The City's |
| | | | | | | | | | Facebook |
| | | | | | | | | | and Twitter |
| | | | | | | | | | social media |
| | | | | | | | | | outlets were |
| | | | | | | | | | used to |
| | | | | | | | | | update the |
| | | | | | | | | | public of |
| | | | | | | | | | rainfall |
| | | | | | | | | | events with |
| | | | | | | | | | the capability |
| | | | | | | | | | of causing |
| | | | | | | | | | local |
| | | | | | | | | | flooding. On |
| | | | | | | | | | September |
| | | | | | | | | | 12-15, 2013 |
| | | | | | | | | | the City |
| | | | | | | | | | responded to |
| | | | | | | | | | flooding on |
| | | | | | | | | | the Poudre |
| | | | | | | | | | River. The |
| | | | | | | | | | TIOOD warning |
| | | | | | | | | | system |
| | | | | | | | | | worked |
| | | | | | | | | | extremely |
| | | | | | | | | | well and |
| | | | | | | | | | provided |
| | | | | | | | | | for |
| | | | | | | | | | iui |
| | | | | | | | | | response |
| | | | | | | | | | efforts ^ |
| | | | | | | | | | variety of |
| | | | | | | | | | notification |
| | | | | | | | | LARIMER | nouncation |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | tools, including the autodialer, web page, and social media were used to notify the public of evacuations and road closures. |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Maintenance activities were performed on existing LID facilities including a Permeable Interlocking Concrete Pavement project in downtown Fort Collins. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | McClellands Creek Stream Stability - Phase 2 of the McClellands Creek stream rehabilitation project was completed in Spring 2013 which completed rehabilitation work on a 2/3- mile section of McClellands Creek. The rehabilitation project included laying back vertical eroded banks, installing new stream meanders and planting | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | hundreds of native plants and shrubs along the stream banks. | |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | McClellands Creek Stream Stability - Phase 2 of the McClellands Creek stream rehabilitation project was completed in Spring 2013 which completed rehabilitation work on a 2/3- mile section of McClellands Creek. The rehabilitation project included laying back vertical eroded banks, installing new stream meanders and planting hundreds of native plants and shrubs along the stream banks. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Meldrum and Myrtle Intersection – Replaced and rehabbed the storm water infrastructure including replacing all laterals and intakes and one manhole top section. | Completed |
| x | | x | | x | | Boxelde r Creek Regional Alliance | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Middle Boxelder Creek stream improvements. | With the revisions to the ESDF facility and updated BBRSA Master Plan Improvement s, the Middle Boxelder Creek stream improvement |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | s were eliminated. |
| | | × | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Monitored runoff at nine sampling locations throughout the city. Monitored winter runoff that assessed the impact of deicing products on Spring Creek. Participated in the design of a new Low Impact Development (LID) test site to be located at 215 N. Mason St. Partnered with other City Departments on conceptual plans for locating and designing a Green Streets Demonstration Project. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | New regulations related to requiring emergency response and preparedness plans for non-residential structures were adopted by City Council in March 2013. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Old Town Basin – remapping of the flood plain has shifted Centennial High School at 300 East Laurel St. to moderate risk. The Fort Collins Police annex has been redeveloped for other government use and is no longer considered a critical facility. One additional property was not included in the 2008 Plan as a critical facility: Fort Collins City Hall, 300 LaPorte, west building. | Completed |





| L | nd | ollins | Park | gton | pnq | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| Larime | Lovela | Fort Co | Estes F | Wellin | Bertho | | | | |
| | | × | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | One additional stream stage monitoring point was added on the Poudre River. The Stormwater Utility made arrangements for assessing river flow conditions well upstream of the Poudre @ Mouth gage, which is two hours upstream of the College Avenue Bridge. Working through the Poudre Fire Authority, Stormwater OnCall requested personnel at the Colorado State Bureau of Wildlife Fish Hatchery below Kinikinik make daily observations of river stage at their diversion dam (shown below) , and to contact Stormwater OnCall in the case of rapid rise in river stage. The Fish Hatchery observations added approximately four (4) hours of lead time to the City's flood preparedness effort, and improved flood response lead time for Larimer County emergency management officials as well. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | One new gage was added to the City Floodwarning System (FWS) in 2011. Streamflow and rainfall are now being monitored upstream (west) of the BNRR railroad where it crosses Fossil Creek. This gage was located to assess any backwater ponding due to obstruction of flow through the | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| | | | | | | | | RR trestle to the east. Alarm thresholds and notification procedures for this location will be added to the Stormwater OnCall manual for the 2012 flood season. This is an area that was recently annexed into the City. | |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Participated in the planning and visioning for the Downtown Core River Project on the Cache la Poudre River near College Avenue. Provided technical review and comments for the Block One Bank Remediation project on the Cache la Poudre River near Linden Street | Completed |
| | | x | | | | Stormw ater MP/FP Adminis tration Staff | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Participated in the planning and visioning for the Downtown Core River Project on the Cache la Poudre River near College Avenue. The project will result in flood reduction benefits for the areas around North College Avenue and the Cache la Poudre River. Overtopping of College Avenue will also be eliminated in the 100-year flood event. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Performed public outreach to the community informing them of the benefits and costs of various stormwater treatment methods including the soon to be adopted LID-type technologies. | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Pitkin/Stover to Spring Creek Improvement Project - Design has been completed and the construction crew has installed the first 800' of 42" RCP with only 280' left in this first phase of the project. The project will continue with Phase two in the Spring of 2015 in coordination with the Street Department's pavement replacement program. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Poudre River bank repairs - Several areas of bank erosion along the Cache la Poudre River have been repaired or are in the repair design process. Many of these sites were eroded during the September 2013 flood with additional erosion occurring during the 2014 Spring Runoff. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Poudre River Basin - 2014 cleanup effort was completed. Downed trees and debris that could threaten bridge piers were removed from the channel corridor. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Prospect and Overland – Installed two new inlet banks and two manhole access points. Replaced all existing stormline mains and continue piping channel north along Overland Trail to Lake Street. Eliminates standing water in | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| | | | | | | | | the intersection of Prospect and Overland. | |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Provided technical expertise to the CDOT North I-25 Widening project regarding flooding impacts from Boxelder Creek and the Cache la Poudre River. Provided technical expertise to develop rating curves for a new flood warning gage on Fossil Creek west of College. Provided coordination and technical support in the planning efforts for the Boxelder Creek improvements in the vicinity of Prospect Road. | Ongoing |
| | | х | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Riverbend Pond area - Repaired erosion that exposed a district sewer main. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Selected an engineering consultant team to assist City staff in designing the rehabilitation of streams throughout the City. Initiated preliminary design of the first stream reach (Fossil Creek Reach 4, Subreach 1) and conducted public outreach on the conceptual design. For McClelland's Creek: 1) Provided design, permitting, and project management services (McClellands Creek, Reach 2, Subreaches 1 and 2). 2) Developed permanent | Ongoing |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| | | | | | | | | educational signage for the McClellands Creek rehabilitation project. | |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Spring Creek Basin – three facilities are now out of the 100 year floodplain due to capital improvement projects remapping: the Poudre Fire Authority Station at 200 Mathews Street, the Platte River Power Authority Timberline substation at 2000 E. Horsetooth Road, and the Orthopedic Center of the Rockies at 2500 E. Prospect Road. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Spring Creek Basin – three facilities are now out of the 100 year floodplain due to capital improvement projects remapping: the Poudre Fire Authority Station at 200 Mathews Street, the Platte River Power Authority Timberline substation at 2000 E. Horsetooth Road, and the Orthopedic Center of the Rockies at 2500 E. Prospect Road. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | City of Fort Collins | Flood - Flash | Staff prepared a letter sent by the City of Fort Collins to U.S. Congressional Representatives in support of the continuation | Completed |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| | | | | | | | and Riverine | of FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grants | |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Staff worked on developing a set of standard details for LID installations in the City of Fort Collins to be completed in 2015. Staff also performed an audit of existing BMP construction and inspection practices and developed construction and inspection checklists for use by contractors and engineers during the installation of stormwater BMP facilities. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Stormwater MP/FP Administration Staff developed and promulgated new methodologies and design guidance to help consulting engineers and City departments complete capital improvements in floodways and floodplains. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | The 1997 flood marker at Creekside Park along Spring Creek was replaced with a new marker that identifies not only the 1997 flood, but also other recurrence intervals. The marker was designed in cooperation with Art in Public Places. Additional interpretive signage about flooding and the stormwater utility are being developed for display at the park. | Ongoing |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|
| | | x | | | | Colorad o State Universi ty (CSU) | Flood - Flash and Riverine | The City contracted with Colorado State University (CSU) on the design and installation of monitoring equipment at various stormwater treatment and capture locations. The City and CSU Partnered on the design of retrofit BMP structures to improve the performance of existing stormwater treatment and control structures | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | The list of critical facilities in the floodplain are being updated as part of the Flood Warning System On-Call manual review. Critical facilities are also being assessed for areas subject to dam inundation. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | The Poudre River floodplain regulations were reviewed. A working committee comprising citizens, business owners and consultants provided feedback. New regulations related to requiring emergency response and preparedness plans for non-residential structures were adopted by City Council in March 2013. | Completed |





| ner | land | Collins | s Park | ington | pnou | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-------|------|---------|--------|--------|-------|------|----------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Larin | Love | Fort | Este | Well | Bertl | | | | |
| | | х | | | | | Flood - | The State of Colorado | Completed |
| | | | | | | | Flash | Department of Public Safety | |
| | | | | | | | and | made available in late 2012 | |
| | | | | | | | Riverine | additional grant funding for | |
| | | | | | | | | infrastructure capable of | |
| | | | | | | | | providing early warning of | |
| | | | | | | | | flooding conditions related to | |
| | | | | | | | | runoff from 2012 Colorado | |
| | | | | | | | | wildfire burn areas (High Park | |
| | | | | | | | | and Waldo Canyon). In 2013, in | |
| | | | | | | | | the lower Cache la Poudre | |
| | | | | | | | | watershed below the area of | |
| | | | | | | | | the High Park Fire, City | |
| | | | | | | | | Stormwater installed one | |
| | | | | | | | | additional rain and streamflow | |
| | | | | | | | | gage to its Flood Warning | |
| | | | | | | | | System (FWS) at a location on | |
| | | | | | | | | the Poudre River | |
| | | | | | | | | approximately two hours travel | |
| | | | | | | | | time upstream of the existing | |
| | | | | | | | | Mouth of the Canyon gage. | |
| | | | | | | | | Utilizing the backbone of the | |
| | | | | | | | | City's existing FWS telemetry | |
| | | | | | | | | network, Larimer County | |
| | | | | | | | | installed four (4) new rain and | |
| | | | | | | | | streamflow gages in smaller | |
| | | | | | | | | watersheds west of Fort Collins | |
| | | | | | | | | that are subject to High Park | |
| | | | | | | | | burn area runott. In addition, | |
| | | | | | | | | City Stormwater developed and | |
| | | | | | | | | nosted a one-day functional | |
| | | | | | | | | training exercise to improve | |
| | | | | | | | | communication and response | |
| | | | | | | | | among City, County, State and | |
| | | | | | | | | Federal agencies responding to | |
| | | | | | | | | from the Link Dark fire k | |
| | | | | | | | | Trom the High Park fire burn | |
| 1 | | | | | | | | area that would threaten City | |





| mer | eland | : Collins | es Park | lington | choud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|------|-------|-----------|---------|---------|-------|------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| Lari | Love | Fort | Este | Wel | Bert | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | and County residents and public infrastructure. | |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Water quality retrofits were included on several street capital improvements projects including the North College corridor improvements, the Pitkin/Stover Storm Sewer project, the Horsetooth and Timberline intersection improvements and the Vine and Shields intersection improvements. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | West Vine Outfall - The West Vine Basin Outfall Channel is currently under construction. This is a Master Plan project to alleviate 100-year flooding in the older, northwest portion of the City. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Work was initiated in Summer 2013 to update the hydrology and hydraulics models in the Canal Importation Basin. This modeling effort will build upon and finalize the modeling completed with the Canal Importation Ponds and Outfall (CIPO) project and will result in updated floodplain mapping | Ongoing |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | for the entire Canal Importation basin using the best and most accurate modeling software. Additional areas that are in the process of being remapped due to modeling updates and development projects include the West Vine Basin, Stone Creek Basin, McClellands Creek Basin, and Old Town Basin. | |
| | | | x | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | All storm water ways are reviewed for compliance with applicable laws. All new subdivisions must meet Standards and go through Planning Department and Engineering Department review processes. All drainage systems, culverts and detention basins must be designed with good engineering practices. (NFIP COMPLIANCE) | On going Strom water ways compliant |
| | | | x | | | | Flood - Flash and Riverine | Review of all commercial and residential construction within the Town of Estes Park for compliance with floodplain regulations. (NFIP COMPLIANCE) | On going Commercial/ residential review compliant |
| | | x | | | | | Hail Storm | n/a | |
| | | x | | | | | Hazardo us Material s - Fixed Facility | Primary means for mitigation in commercial occupancies is through fire code inspection programs administered by the local fire department. This | Ongoing |





| | ри | llins | ark | ton | pr | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|--|--|---|---|
| Larimei | Lovelar | Fort Co | Estes Pa | Welling | Berthou | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | includes a hazardous materials mitigation program. Many of these occupancies also participate in the OSHA Voluntary Partnership Program. A few of these occupancies also are required to report through the EPA EPCRA and CERCLA programs. | |
| x | x | x | x | × | x | Local Emerge ncy Respons e Agencie s | Hazardo us Material s - Transpo rtation | Develop response plans for transportation-related hazardous materials incidents in proximity to heavily populated areas and identified critical facilities. Examples of areas of concern include, but are not limited to, shopping mall areas along major transportation routes, hospitals, and large-scale public assembly areas. | LEPC is getting back together to start working through planning elements. HazMat Teams work closely annually. LRFA has HM specific response plan. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | Local Emerge ncy Respons e Agencie s | Hazardo us Material s - Transpo rtation | Improve early warning and emergency notification capabilities. | Yes and ongoing. Reverse 911 system enhanced in 2009. Roadway flashing notification signs on major roads. Transmission issues on AM radio station |





| | | | | | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-------|------|-------|------|------|------|--|--|---|---|
| | q | llins | ark | ton | p | | | | |
| ner | elan | S | s Pa | ling | hot | | | | |
| -arii | 0/6 | Fort | Este | Nel | Bert | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | repaired. Enhanced social media and website procedures. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | Local Emerge ncy Respons e Agencie s | Hazardo us Material s - Transpo rtation | Improve hazardous materials recognition and inspection programs within the local fire departments. | Yes and ongoing. Loveland just completed an An Arc Map layer was created to show target hazards, hazardous aterials storage, hazardous activities, populations densities,and property values. This densities,and property values. This integrated into the currently being integrated integrated into the CAMEO program along with Marplot/ALO HA files for use in the field, the |



| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | | center, and in the EOC. |
| x | x | × | × | x | x | Local Emerge ncy Respons e Agencie s | Hazardo us Material s - Transpo rtation | Maintain adequate supplies of emergency equipment to appropriately respond to a moderate sized event. | HazMat Team has a HazMat cache stocked and the team is equipped with what is required for an event. Additional materials are available from mutual aid partner agencies in the Haz Mat Consortium. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | Local Emerge ncy Respons e Agencie s | Hazardo us Material s - Transpo rtation | Maintain trained and equipped hazardous materials response team, consisting of technicians and specialists. | Larimer has a HazMat Consortium existing of technicians. Has an IGA that is active. HazMat trains regularly. |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|--|---|---|
| | | x | | | | | Hazardo us Material s - Transpo rtation | Poudre Fire maintains a trained and equipped hazardous materials response team consisting of technicians and specialists. They provide emergency preparedness education to their citizens. Evacuation and safe refuge areas have been identified and provided during incidents. All first responders receive recognition training in hazardous materials. Hazardous materials. Hazardous material routes have also been established and enforced within the City of Fort Collins. Emergency notification systems have been upgraded over the last several years and are continually tested. | Ongoing |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | Local Emerge ncy Respons e Agencie s | Hazardo us Material s - Transpo rtation | Provide areas of safe refuge for their citizens. | We have a shelter program and a partnership with the American Red Cross. Short term sheltering is also part of existing planning processes. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | Local Emerge ncy Respons e | Hazardo us Material s - | Provide emergency preparedness education to their citizens. | Loveland and Fort Collins has a Safety and Outreach campaign |







| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | Agencie s | Transpo rtation | | that includes education to residents on HazMat. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | Local Emerge ncy Respons e Agencie s | Hazardo us Material s - Transpo rtation | Provide hazardous materials recognition training to all first responders. | Ongoing |
| | | | | | | | Lanslide / Rockslid e | n/a | |
| | | x | | | | Colorad o State Universi ty | Lighting | Colorado State University installed and continually tests their Thor Guard Lightning Prediction Warning System which covers a majority of the main campus. | Completed |
| | | x | | | | | Lighting | Fort Collins OEM utilizes a weather satellite system to assist with prediction of strikes. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Lighting | Many new facilities have placed grounding systems at their facilities to assist with mitigation efforts. | Ongoing |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Terroris m / WMD | Develop and/or maintain emergency operations plans involving all local emergency responders, including annual emergency training exercises. | Done and ongoing. |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|------------------------|---|---|
| x | х | х | x | x | x | | Terroris m / WMD | Encourage local law enforcement officers to attend terrorism/WMD-related coursat the FEMA Emergency Management Institute. | Done and ongoing. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Terroris m / WMD | Ensure that local law enforcement agencies have sufficient weapons to respond to a moderate incident. | Done and ongoing. |
| x | x | х | x | х | x | | Terroris m / WMD | Maintain active and well- trained SWAT teams, incorporating fire and EMS agencies into the SWAT training to improve intra- agency working relations. | Done and ongoing. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Terroris m / WMD | Provide National Incident Management System (NIMS) training to personnel whomay be involved in responding to a terrorism/WMD incident. | Done and ongoing. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Terroris m / WMD | Provide terrorism/WMD awareness training and equipment to all first responders. | Done and ongoing. PFA just got a number of RIDs and PRDs for the Radiological Program. Also participated in a training course. |
| x | x | х | x | x | x | | Terroris m / WMD | Work with local school district safety committees to plan for and be prepared for possible | Done and ongoing. |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|---------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | incidents involving school district facilities. | |
| | | | | x | | | Tornado | Currently exploring the possibility of adding tornado sirens. This proposed action item is medium priority. Funding would have to be obtained through grants and a tentative timeline is within the next five years. | Loveland has looked at sirens in 2008 and there is now discussion about bringing it back to council. Fort Collins got rid of sirens years ago and is no longer looking at this as a tool. Larimer County is not looking at sirens due to the large geographical area. All jurisdictions are looking at other avenues of notification that are consistent for tornadoes and other fast-moving weather events. |





| | | ns | ~ | u | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|------|-------|---------|--------|---------|-------|------|---------|---|--|
| mer | eland | t Colli | es Par | llingto | thoud | | | | |
| Lari | Lov | For | Este | We | Ber | | | | |
| x | X | × | × | × | × | | Tornado | Improving the early warning capabilities within the local communities. | Done and ongoing. Reverse 911 system enhanced in 2009. Installed roadway flashing notifications signs on all major roads. Transmission issues on AM radio station repaired. Loveland became a NWS Storm Ready Community. |
| × | x | х | x | x | x | | Tornado | Incorporating building collapse training into the Special Operations Team training requirements. | Done and ongoing. Regular component of SOT training. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Tornado | Installing emergency generators in many public buildings and critical facilities. | Loveland has installed generators in all critical facilities and looking at putting one in the Chilson Facility for an employee care center. |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|---------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | All other jurisdictions this is an ongoing item. All LCSO facilities and many county buildings also have generators. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Tornado | Promoting the inclusion of tornado shelters in new construction. | Done and ongoing. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Tornado | Providing areas of safe refuge for affected people. | Done and ongoing. |
| x | x | x | × | x | x | | Tornado | Providing emergency preparedness education to the community. | Done and ongoing. In Loveland all city-owned buildings have shelter areas and evac routes ID'd. Each building and floor has an assigned monitor to assist. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Tornado | Providing specialized rescue training to first responders, including developing and maintaining Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) teams. | Done and ongoing. We participate in CO Task Force 1 USAR program. Regular component |





| | | SI | | c | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| ner | eland | Collir | s Park | lingto | pnoq | | | | |
| Larir | Love | Fort | Este | Wel | Bert | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | of LFRA and SOT training. Local team maintained that responds with mutual aid to other jurisdictions. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Utility Interrup tion | Establish and/or continue the process of placing all existing utilities underground. | Slow progress but ongoing. Loveland Completed. W/WW and power lines are installed UG and electric transformers and switchgears are installed UG unless circumstance s dictate differently. Substations are installed aboveground for safety and security reasons. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Utility Interrup tion | Install emergency generators in many public buildings and critical facilities. | Loveland has installed generators in all critical facilities and looking at |





| | | IS | | ۲ | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-------|-------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| ler | and | Collir | Park | ngto | pnou | | | | |
| -arim | -ovel | ⁼ ort (| Estes | Nelli | Berth | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | putting one in the Chilson Facility for an employee care center. All other jurisdictions this is an ongoing item. All LCSO facilities and many county buildings also have generators. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Utility Interrup tion | Maintain an adequate supply of emergency equipment to appropriately respond to a moderate sized event. | Ongoing. Loveland Completed. City power division maintains emergency response equipment and materials in a secured warehouse along with emergency vehicles being stored in a secure fenced-in area. |
| х | x | x | x | х | х | | Utility Interrup tion | Provide emergency preparedness education to the community. | Ongoing. Loveland provides educational |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | materials for residential and commerical customers through the website, social media, print and e- mail. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Utility Interrup tion | Provide specialized training to local emergency responders. | Ongoing. Loveland Not Started. Line crews and electrical engineering staff can give hazardous recognition training to first reponsders dictated by individual entities. (Police, fire and others identified by the EMS team). This can also include response to chlorine gas leaks at water treatment plant. |





| | | 10 | | | | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|-----|------|---------|------|-------|------|------|----------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| L | pu | Silling | bark | gton | png | | | | |
| ime | vela | Ŭ t | es F | ellin | rthc | | | | |
| Lar | ΓŎ | Foi | Est | Ň | Be | | | | |
| х | х | х | х | х | х | | Utility | Require all utilities for new | Yes and |
| | | | | | | | Interrup | construction projects to be | ongoing. |
| | | | | | | | tion | installed underground. | Loveland will |
| | | | | | | | | | evaluate that |
| | | | | | | | | | policy on a |
| | | | | | | | | | case-by-case |
| | | | | | | | | | lines are |
| | | | | | | | | | installed |
| | | | | | | | | | underground |
| | | | | | | | | | unless site |
| | | | | | | | | | constraints |
| | | | | | | | | | don't allow. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Utility | Take measures to protect | Ongoing |
| X | ^ | ~ | ~ | ^ | ~ | | Interrup | above-ground utilities from | Loveland |
| | | | | | | | tion | falling or flying debris. | Completed. |
| | | | | | | | | | Currently we |
| | | | | | | | | | have no plans |
| | | | | | | | | | to alter the |
| | | | | | | | | | installation |
| | | | | | | | | | and |
| | | | | | | | | | maintenance |
| | | | | | | | | | of the power |
| | | | | | | | | | system. |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | operations |
| | | | | | | | | | follows |
| | | | | | | | | | closely the |
| | | | | | | | | | industry |
| | | | | | | | | | standards for |
| | | | | | | | | | installation of |
| | | | | | | | | | both the |
| | | | | | | | | | overhead and |
| | | | | | | | | | underground |
| | | | | | | | | | infrastructur |
| | | | | | | | | | e. |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | x | | | Utility Interrup tion | Wellington is currently working on burying all lines within town boundaries. They are also working on requiring al new lines to be buried. This proposed action item is a medium priority tem that will be addressed through codes and regulations. The Town of Wellington hopes to mplement this change within the next year. | Ongoing |
| | | | x | | | | Utility Interrup tion | Beaver Point and Peakview Circuit Upgrades | Complete Beaver Point and Peakview circuit upgrades |
| | | | x | | | | Utility Interrup tion | Take measures to protect above-ground utilities from falling or flying debris | On going Measures to protect utilities |
| | | х | | | | | Wind Storm - Severe | Emergency preparedness is the primary mitigation action item. This is done through education, training and exercises. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Wind Storm - Severe | Public works departments and utility providers maintain on- call crews to assist during high wind events. | Ongoing |
| | | x | | | | | Wind Storm - Severe | Transportation departments maintain traffic control devices for detouring/re-routing or closing traffic through the hazardous areas. | Ongoing |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | x | | | | Wind Storm - Severe | Establish and/or continue process of placing all existing utilities underground | On going Correction – Harden infrastructur e as opposed to underground placement |
| | | x | | | | City of Fort Collins | Winter Storm - Severe | Fort Collins has upgraded its EOC to provide WEBEOC for better tracking of resources and the overall incident, additional ICS training, upgrading of our emergency notification system, offering NOAA "Weather Spotter" courses, certification as a "Storm Ready Community", hosting an annual emergency preparedness fair, and ongoing public education through direct delivery presentations, pamphlets, calendars and website upgrades. | Ongoing. |
| | | X | | | | | Winter Storm - Severe | Identification of the special needs population which will require special assistance and acquiring temporary snow storage sites that provide proper draining. | Ongoing. |
| x | x | x | x | x | x | | Winter Storm - Severe | Local public works and public safety agencies have established schedules to refine, revise, and adapt their preparedness and response plans at least once annually. | Ongoing. Loveland has a stand-alone Severe Weather Plan and a Snow Removal Plan. These |



| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | | plans along with the LEOP, COOP, and dept level em plans all have defined plan maintenance schedules. |
| | | x | | | | | Winter Storm - Severe | Maintaining adequate fleets of snow moving equipment | Ongoing. |
| | | x | | | | | Winter Storm - Severe | Maintaining and updating the Snow Removal Plans | Ongoing. |
| | | x | | | | | Winter Storm - Severe | Plans are reviewed, updated and exercised for this event. Several courses at the Emergency Management Institute (IEMC) have been attended by City of Fort Collins personnel who focused on preparedness and response to a winter storm event. Public education programs focus on preparedness for severe winter storms. | Ongoing. |
| | | x | | | | | Winter Storm - Severe | Providing safe refuge for affected citizens | Ongoing. |
| | | | x | | | | Winter Storm - Severe | Police, fire and emergency medical service professionals train frequently to be prepared to respond to a wide variety of emergency situations, including wind storms | On going Police, Fire and EMS train and prepare |





| Larimer | Loveland | Fort Collins | Estes Park | Wellington | Berthoud | Lead | Hazard | Action | Status |
|---------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|----------|------|---------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| | | | х | | | | Winter | Maintain and update Winter | On going |
| | | | | | | | Storm - | Storm, Ice Storm, and snow | Public Works |
| | | | | | | | Severe | removal plans | maintain and |
| | | | | | | | | | update plans |
| | | | х | | | | Winter | Provide emergency | On going |
| | | | | | | | Storm - | preparedness education to the | OEM (Estes |
| | | | | | | | Severe | community | Park) |
| | | | | | | | | | provides |
| | | | | | | | | | edu/prepare |
| | | | | | | | | | dness to the |
| | | | | | | | | | community |
| | | | | | | | | | |





Appendix F - FEMA Approval Documents & Jurisdictional Adoptions







R8-MT

August 2, 2016

The Larimer County Commission P.O. Box 1190 Fort Collins, Colorado 80522

Dear County Commissioners:

We are pleased to announce the approval of the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as meeting the requirements of the Stafford Act and Title 44 Code of Federal Regulations 201.6 for a local hazard mitigation plan. The plan approval extends to the following participating jurisdictions that has adopted the plan: Larimer County; the Cities of Fort Collins and Loveland; The Townes of Estes Park and Windsor; and the Districts of Crystal Lakes Fire Protection, Estes Valley Recreation and Park, Platte River Power Authority, Poudre Canyon Fire Protection, Upper Thompson Sanitation and Wellington Fire Protection.

The approved jurisdictions are eligible for FEMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance grant programs. All requests for funding will be evaluated individually according to the specific eligibility and other requirements of the particular programs under which the application is submitted. Approved mitigation plans may be eligible for points under the National Flood Insurance Program Community Rating System.

This plan is approved through August 1, 2021. A local jurisdiction must revise its plan to reflect changes in development, progress in local mitigation efforts, changes in priorities, and resubmit for approval within five years to continue to be eligible for mitigation project grant funding.

We have provided comments and recommendations on the enclosed Plan Review Tool. We wish to thank the jurisdictions for participating in the planning process and commend their continued commitment to reducing future disaster losses. Please contact Steve Boand, Acting State Hazard Mitigation Officer, Colorado Department of Emergency Services, at Steven. Boand@state.co.us or (303) 915-6063 with any questions on the plan approval or mitigation grant programs.

Sincerely,

letterson

Jeanine D. Petterson Mitigation Division Director

Enclosures: Plan Review Tool

cc: Steve Boand, Acting State Hazard Mitigation Officer.

www.fema.gov
LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

The *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool* demonstrates how the Local Mitigation Plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR §201.6 and offers States and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the community.

- The <u>Regulation Checklist</u> provides a summary of FEMA's evaluation of whether the Plan has addressed all requirements.
- The <u>Plan Assessment</u> identifies the plan's strengths as well as documents areas for future improvement.
- The <u>Multi-jurisdiction Summary Sheet</u> is an optional worksheet that can be used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of the each Element of the Plan (Planning Process; Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation; and Plan Adoption).

The FEMA Mitigation Planner must reference this *Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide* when completing the *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool*.

| Jurisdiction: Larimer County, Colorado | Title of Plan: Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan | | Date of Plan: February 2016 | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Local Point of Contact: Image: Contact in the second s | | Address: 200 West Oak Street, 2 nd Floor PO Box 1190 Fort Collins, CO 80522 | | |
| Phone Number: 970.498.7147 | | E-Mail: lrhodges@larimer. | org | |

| State Reviewer: | Title: | Date: |
|---------------------|---|---------------|
| Patricia L. Gavelda | Local Mitigation Planning Program Manager | March 3, 2016 |
| Stephany Juneau | DHSEM/MARS | |

| FEMA Reviewer: | Title: | Date: |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Margaret Doherty | Community Planner | April 11 and May 19, 2016 |
| Date Received in FEMA Region VIII | March 4 and May 10, 2016 | |
| Plan Not Approved | April 15, 2016 | |
| Plan Approvable Pending Adoption | May 19, 2016 | |
| Plan Approved | August 2, 2016 | |

SECTION 1: MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET

| | MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | | | | Requ | irements Me | t (Y/N) | |
| # | Jurisdiction Name | Jurisdiction Type | Jurisdiction Contact | Email | A. Planning Process | B. HIRA | C. Mitigation Strategy | D. Update Rqtms. | E. Adoption Resolution |
| 1 | Larimer | County | Lori Hodges, Director OEM | hodgeslr@co.larimer.co.us | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 2 | Berthoud | Town | Alisa Darrow, Asst. Town Administrator | adarrow@berthoud.org | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 3 | Berthoud Fire Protection | District | Steve Charles, Chief | scharles@berthoudfire.org | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 4 | Crystal Lakes Fire Protection | District | Marian Kelly, Chief | mkelly@clvfd.org | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 5 | CSU | University | Ken Quintana, Emergency Manager | ken.quintana@colostate.edu | Y | Y | Y | NA | N |
| 6 | Estes Park | Town | Frank Lancaster, Town Manager | flancaster@estes.org | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 7 | Estes Park Medical Center | District | Mike Bielmaier, EMS Director | MBielmaier@epmedcenter.c om | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 8 | Estes Valley Fire Protection | District | Scott Dorman, Chief | sdorman@estesvalleyfire.org | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 9 | Estes Valley Recreation and Park | District | Mary Davis, Interim Executive Director | mary@evrpd.com | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 10 | Fort Collins | City | Wade Troxell, Mayor | wtroxell@fcgov.com | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 11 | Glacier View Fire Protection | District | Todd Westfall, Chief | gvfdchief1@gmail.com | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 12 | Johnstown | Town | Tom Hellen, Public Works Director | thellen@townofjohnstown.c om | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 13 | Livermore Fire Protection | District | Donn Maynard, Chief | livermorechief@gmail.com | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |

| | MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | | | | Requirements Met (Y/N) | | | |
| # | Jurisdiction Name | Jurisdiction Type | Jurisdiction Contact | Email | A. Planning Process | B. HIRA | C. Mitigation Strategy | D. Update Rqtms. | E. Adoption Resolution |
| 14 | Loveland | City | Cecil Gutierrez, Mayor | Mayor@cityofloveland.org | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 15 | Loveland Fire Rescue Authority | District | Pat Mialy, Emergency Manager | pat.mialy@cityofloveland.or g | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 16 | Northern CO Water Conservation | District | Jim Struble, Security and Emergency Manager | jstruble@northernwater.org | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 17 | Pinewood Springs Fire Protection | District | Richard Wilcox, Chief | <u>chief@pinewoodspringsfire.o</u> rg | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 18 | Platte River Power Authority | District | Jim Boizot, Safety Officer | BoizotJ@prpa.org | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 19 | Poudre Canyon Fire Protection | District | Hugh Collins, Chief | H.Collins@poudrecanyonfire district.org | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 20 | Poudre Fire Authority | District | Mike Gavin, Battalion Chief / OEM | migavin@poudre-fire.org | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 21 | Thompson Valley EMS | District | Randy Lesher, Chief | rlesher@tvems.com | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 22 | Timnath | Town | April Getchius, Town Manager | agetchius@timnathgov.com | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 23 | Upper Thompson Sanitation | District | Chris Bieker, District Manager | <u>chris@utsd.org</u> | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 24 | Wellington | Town | Jack Brinkhoff, Mayor | brinkhjd@co.larimer.co.us | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 25 | Wellington Fire Protection | District | Gary Green, Chief | ggreen@wfpd.org | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 26 | Windsor | Town | John Vazquez, Mayor | jvazquez@windsorgov.com | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |
| 27 | Windsor Severance Fire Rescue | District | Herb Brady, Chief | hbrady@wsfr.us | Y | Y | Y | NA | Y |

SECTION 2: REGULATION CHECKLIST

| REGULATION CHECKLIST | Location in | | |
|--|--|-----|-----|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans) | Pian (section and/or | Met | Met |
| ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS | | | |
| A1. Does the Plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(1)) | Section 3, pp. 11-36; Appendix A, pp. 254-283 | х | |
| A2. Does the Plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as other interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement §)) | Section 3.6, pp. 24-34; Appendix C, pp. 831-840 | х | |
| A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1)) | Section 3.6, pp. 24-32 | х | |
| A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3)) | Section 3.8, pp. 34-36 | х | |
| A5. Is there discussion of how the community(ies) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii)) | Section 7.1.2, pp. 252-253; Appendix B, pp. 284 -Each individual Community profile under Plan Maintenance and Implementation | х | |
| A6. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a 5-year cycle)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i)) | Section 3.8, pp. 34; Section 7.1.2, pp. 252-253; Appendix B, pp. 284 -Each individual Community profile under Plan Maintenance and Implementation | x | |

ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT

| B1. Does the Plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction(s)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)) | Section 5.3, pp. 58-62; Appendix B, pp. 284 -Each individual Community profile under Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment | x | |
|---|--|---|--|
| B2. Does the Plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)) | Appendix B, pp. 284 – each individual Community profile under Previous Occurrences and Probability of Future Occurrences | x | |

| REGULATION CHECKLIST | Location in Plan | Mat | Not |
|---|---------------------------------|-----|-----|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans) | (section and/or | wet | wet |
| bs. Is there a description of each identified flazard s | Appendix B, pp. 284 – each | | |
| impact on the community as well as an overall summary | Individual Community profile | | |
| of the community's vulnerability for each jurisdiction? | under Hazard Identification & | Х | |
| (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)) | Risk Assessment and | | |
| | Vulnerability Assessment | | |
| B4. Does the Plan address NFIP insured structures | Section 5.3.6, pp. 157, | | |
| within the jurisdiction that have been repetitively | Community Profile: City of Fort | Х | |
| damaged by floods? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)) | Collins, p. 482 | | |

| ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY | | |
|--|---|---|
| C1. Does the plan document each jurisdiction's existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)) | Appendix B, pp. 284 – each individual Community profile under Capabilities Assessment | x |
| C2. Does the Plan address each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii)) | Appendix B, pp. 284 – each individual Community profile under the Land Use Planning and Codes table | x |
| C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long- term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i)) | Section 6.2, pp. 233-235 | x |
| C4. Does the Plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii)) | Section 6.4, pp. 236-250; Appendix B, pp. 284 – each individual Community profile lists a number of Mitigation Actions Guides | x |
| C5. Does the Plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including cost benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii)) | Section 6.4, pp. 236-250; Appendix B, pp. 284 – each individual Community profile under Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning and Mitigation Action Guides | x |
| C6. Does the Plan describe a process by which local governments will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii)) | Appendix B, pp. 284 – each individual Community profile under Land Use Planning & Codes and Integrating Hazard Mitigation into Local Planning; Appendix C, pp. | x |
| | | |

Larimer County, CO 2016

| REGULATION CHECKLIST | Location in | | Not | | | | |
|--|--|--------|-----|--|--|--|--|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans) | Plan (section and/or | Met | Met | | | | |
| ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION | | | | | | | |
| D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Section 4.5, pp. 43-46 | х | | | | | |
| D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Section 6, pp. 231-250 and Appendix E | х | | | | | |
| D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Section 6, pp. 231-250 and Appendix E | х | | | | | |
| ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS | | | | | | | |
| ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION | | | | | | | |
| E1. Does the Plan include documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5)) | | | NA | | | | |
| E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5)) | Section 2, p. 10; Section 3.7, pp. 33-34 | x | | | | | |
| ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS E2. As of December 8, 2016, all jurisdictions, except Colorado State University, have adopted the plan. | | | | | | | |
| ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENT ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA) | S (OPTIONAL FOR STATE RE | VIEWEI | RS | | | | |
| F1. | | | | | | | |
| F2. | | | | | | | |
| ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS | | | | | | | |

SECTION 3: PLAN ASSESSMENT

A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas where these could be improved as part of the next plan update.

Element A: Planning Process

The kick-off meeting was very well attended; attendance appears to have dropped off as the process continued. Although it appears that every jurisdiction participated in the process; the message of how each jurisdiction should assess its unique risks and develop mitigation strategies seems to have not gotten through.

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

The County risk assessment is very well done. The plan does a good job of identifying the potential impacts of climate change. This provides a good baseline for the County that can be improved upon as the plan is updated. The community profile risk assessment appear repetitive and the methodology does not address the unique vulnerabilities of each jurisdiction. It may be appropriate to only analyze the high priority hazards (particularly when the county risk assessment is so thorough); however, if the analyses do not result in key issues or specific problems that need mitigating, the mitigation strategy for each jurisdiction will not include any true mitigation actions. For instance, in the case of the Town of Berthoud, the community profile only included the winter storm and HazMat hazards. This left little for the Town to consider in terms of mitigation. Additionally, the fire protection districts can only be responsible for assets they own or operate. Their risk assessment should consider the impacts of natural hazard events on these facilities, not the structures located throughout their district boundaries for which they have no land use authority or ownership. Their mitigation strategies should include actions to prevent the loss or damage to their assets or programs to promote wildfire mitigation. A couple of the jurisdictions noted that they would like to assess their risks and develop mitigation actions—wasn't that the point of this process?

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

The County and the larger municipalities include many excellent mitigation actions. It is also acceptable to include preparedness actions and county-wide mitigation projects that will benefit multiple communities in the plan; however, each participating jurisdiction must have specific mitigation actions for which they are responsible for implementing. Many of the mitigation actions submitted are terribly vague. The point of the mitigation planning process is to identify specific mitigation projects that will reduce losses to each community's assets. When funding becomes available, the jurisdictions would be better situated to take advantage of the opportunity, if they had developed action plans for specific projects that are eligible for FEMA funding.

Element D: Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation

This plan is a marked improvement over the previous plan in every aspect, particularly in regards to the vulnerability assessment. With the next update, continue to be more specific per the comments above.

B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

Congratulations on completing your local mitigation plan. Below are suggestions for moving the mitigation plan forward and continuing the relationship with your stakeholders:

- The mitigation strategy includes projects that may be eligible for FEMA's grant programs. Contact your State Hazard Mitigation Officer for application information.
- Each year, FEMA partners with the State on training courses designed to help communities be more successful in their applications for grants, including the Unified Hazard Mitigation Grant Assistance Application Development Course and the Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA) course. Contact your State Hazard Mitigation Officer for course offering schedules.
- It may be appropriate to set up a Community Assistance Visit with FEMA to provide technical assistance to communities in the review and/or updating of their floodplain ordinances to meet the new model ordinance. Consider contacting your State NFIP Coordinator for more information.
- The US Department of Transportation's Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) grant program provides financial and technical assistance as well as national direction and guidance to enhance State, Territorial, Tribal, and local hazardous materials emergency planning and training. See this website for more information: http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/grants-stateprograms

BERTHOUD FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. 2016 – 20160920-1

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the Berthoud Fire Protection District ("District") has experienced past incidents to include, but not limited to: a tornado, flooding, wildfires and other natural and human-caused events and recognizes the threat that various natural and human-caused events pose to people and property within the District; and

WHEREAS, undertaking certain hazard mitigation actions may reduce the potential for injury or death to people and destruction of property from future hazard occurrences; and

WHEREAS, the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provided mitigation funds to Larimer County to support development of a multijurisdictional hazard mitigation plan; and

WHEREAS, a Mitigation Planning Committee including personnel from twenty-seven (27) different jurisdictions within Larimer County, including the District, has prepared a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan ("Plan"), attached hereto as Exhibit A (electronically / Thumb Drive) and incorporated herein, based on data collection, stakeholder input, community asset/vulnerability analysis and identification of preferred mitigation alternatives (the "Plan"); and

WHEREAS, the Plan was developed per the requirements of the FEMA-prescribed mitigation planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Colorado Office of Emergency Management and FEMA, has reviewed the Plan and approved it contingent upon the official adoption of the Plan by all participating governmental bodies.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Berthoud Fire Protection District, Larimer County, Colorado as follows:

1. <u>Adoption of Plan.</u> The Board of Directors hereby adopts the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, as an official plan for the District.

2. <u>Submittal to State and Federal Authorities and to Take Necessary Actions.</u> The Board of Directors hereby authorizes the Fire Chief to submit this Adoption Resolution to the Colorado Division of Emergency Management and Federal Emergency Management to enable the Plan's final approval, and to take such actions as are recommended and assigned to the District in the Plan. 3. <u>Guidance Policy: No Third Party Liability.</u> The Plan constitutes a guidance policy regarding future service and hazard mitigation recommendations, for use by the Board in its sole discretion regarding planning, development and operation of the District's resources, and does not establish absolute requirements or funding commitments for any item not identified in the current fiscal year budget. All identified items are expressly subject to budget and appropriation of funds therefor. The Plan shall not be deemed to give rise to any mandated appropriations, claim or cause of action by any officer, employee, or official of the District, or any other person or entity.

4. <u>Severability.</u> If any part, section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this Resolution or the adopted Plan is for any reason held to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions.

5. <u>Effective Date.</u> This Resolution shall take effect and be enforced immediately upon its approval by the Board.

ADOPTED this 20th day of September, 2016

Berthoud Fire Protection District By:

Attest:

By: Agphin Mar



RESOLUTION OF THE CRYSTAL LAKES FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT TO ADOPT THE LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District recognizes the threat that natural hazards pose to people and property within our community; and,

WHEREAS, undertaking hazard mitigation actions will reduce the potential for harm to people and property from future hazard occurrences; and,

WHEREAS, an adopted hazard mitigation plan is required as a condition of future funding for mitigation projects under multiple FEMA pre- and post-disaster mitigation grant programs; and,

WHEREAS, the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been prepared in accordance with FEMA requirements at 44 C.F.R. 201.6; and,

WHEREAS, the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District Board has reviewed the Plan, participated as necessary in the process to create the Plan, and agrees with its provisions.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District Board that the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District adopts the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as this jurisdiction's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, and resolves to execute the actions in the Plan.

ADOPTED this 16th day of June, 2016 at the meeting of the Crystal Lakes Fire Protection District Board.

CRYSTAL LAKES FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

anieDetibuugh

Attest:



555 Prospect Avenue PO Box 240 Estes Park, Colorado 80517 (970) 586-2317

BEFORE THE BOARD OF Park Hospital District dba Estes Park Medical Center

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE LARIMER MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, Larimer County has experienced past flooding, wildfires and other natural and human-caused hazard events that pose risks to public health and safety and which may cause serious property damage; and

WHEREAS, the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provided mitigation funds to the County to support development of a multi-jurisdictional mitigation plan; and

WHEREAS, the planning process fostered by all participating Larimer County jurisdictions and agencies offers the opportunity to consider natural and human-caused hazards and risks, and to identify mitigation actions to reduce future impacts of such hazards; and

WHEREAS, a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed by the Mitigation Planning Committee, including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions within Larimer County, and partner organizations; and

WHEREAS, the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan recommends several mitigation actions that will help minimize and reduce safety threats and damage to private and public property; and

WHEREAS, two public meetings were held on July 27, 2015 and December 2, 2015 to present draft planning documents and to solicit input during the development of the plan; and

WHEREAS, the draft plan was made available for public comment from December 10, 2015 through January 10, 2016 to solicit questions and comments and to present the plan and the proposed mitigation actions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Park Hospital District, Colorado, that:

- 1. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is hereby adopted as an official plan of Larimer County.
- 2. The offices identified in the Plan are hereby directed to pursue implementation of the recommended priority actions that are assigned to their respective departments / divisions.
- 3. Any action proposed in the Plan shall be subject to and contingent upon budget approval, if funding is required and this resolution shall not be interpreted so as to mandate any such appropriations.



555 Prospect Avenue PO Box 240 Estes Park, Colorado 80517 (970) 586-2317

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Office of Emergency Management will be administering and monitoring the Larimer Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, in collaboration with all community partners, and will provide revisions and updates to the Board of Commissioners as needed to remain current.

DATED THIS 25 DAY OF OCTOBER, 2016.

Board of Park Hospital District, COLORADO

VanDert log By: President

ATTEST:

County Clerk

ESTES VALLEY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT RESOLUTION NO. 2016-03

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE LARIMER MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the Estes Valley Fire Protection District ("District") has experienced past flooding, wildfires and other natural and human-caused events and recognizes the threat that various natural hazards pose to people and property within the community; and

WHEREAS, undertaking certain hazard mitigation actions may reduce the potential for harm to people and property from future hazard occurrences; and

WHEREAS, the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provided mitigation funds to the County of Larimer to support development of a multi-jurisdictional mitigation plan; and

WHEREAS, a Mitigation Planning Committee including personnel from twentyseven different jurisdictions in Larimer County, including the District, has prepared a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein, based on data collection, stakeholder input, community asset/vulnerability analysis and identification of preferred mitigation alternatives (the "Plan"); and

WHEREAS, the Plan was developed per the requirements of the FEMAprescribed mitigation planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Colorado Office of Emergency Management and FEMA, has reviewed the Plan and approved it contingent upon the official adoption of the Plan by all participating governmental bodies.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Estes Valley Fire Protection District, Larimer County, Colorado as follows:

1. <u>Adoption of Plan</u>. The Board of Directors hereby adopts the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, as an official plan for the District.

2. <u>Submittal to State and Federal Authorities and to Take Necessary</u> <u>Actions</u>. The Board of Directors hereby authorizes the Fire Chief to submit this Adoption Resolution to the Colorado Division of Emergency Management and Federal Emergency Management Agency to enable the Plan's final approval, and to take such actions as are recommended and assigned to the District in the Plan. 3. <u>Guidance Policy: No Third Party Liability</u>. The Plan constitutes a guidance policy regarding future service and hazard mitigation recommendations, for use by the Board in its sole discretion regarding planning, development and operation of the District's resources, and does not establish absolute requirements or funding commitments for any item not identified in the current fiscal year budget. All identified items are expressly subject to budget and appropriation of funds therefor. The Plan shall not be deemed to give rise to any mandated appropriation, claim or cause of action by any officer, employee, or official of the District, or any other person or entity.

4. <u>Severability</u>. If any part, section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this Resolution or the adopted Plan is for any reason held to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions.

5. <u>Effective Date</u>. This Resolution shall take effect and be enforced immediately upon its approval by the Board.

ADOPTED this 22 day of TUNE, 2016. Estes Valley Fire Protection District $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}$ is A limit defined an interval lie $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}$ is

Doug Klink, Chairman

Attest:

With B_{i} Bic i ten was de veloped par the implicements of the f_{i} bit is presented by the f_{i} bit is presented by the f_{i} bit is the manifest of f_{i} bit is presented by the f_{i} bit is the f_{i} bit is the manifest of $f_{$

Secretary (Let Collectory (Let an expected variants to wild observed at the CARAR) We they do all the Collectory (Let y do all the proposed at the fille and proposed in the control and be written at the proposed in the control and the proposed in the pro

MOW, THERERORS, EE IF REMAILS by the Board of Disastors of the issue Valley First Protoction District, I summar Country, Colonado 24 follows:

 <u>Manuface of Plan</u>. The Isoard of Directory hereby (dept) the Cathran Courty Multi-correlations. Disease Mittgaries, Plan, as an efficial plan, for the District.

2. Submittel is hour and invited in the designation of the line of the function of the second straight in the first of the second straight in the second straight of the second straight of the second straight in the second straight of the second straight in the first of the second straight in the first of the second straight in the first of the second straight in the first of the second straight in the first of th

ESTES VALLEY RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT RESOLUTION 2016-03 LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD AND MITIGATION PLAN

A RESOLUTION OF THE ESTES VALLEY AND PARK DISTRICT ACCEPTING AND APPROVING THE LARIMER COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD AND MITIGATION PLAN.

WHEREAS, Estes Valley Recreation and Park District has experienced past flooding, wildfires and other natural and human-caused hazard events that pose risks to public health and safety and which may cause serious property damage; and

WHEREAS, the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provided mitigation funds to Larimer County to support development of a multi-jurisdictional mitigation plan; and

WHEREAS, the planning process fostered by all participating Larimer County jurisdictions and agencies offers the opportunity to consider natural and human-caused hazards and risks, and to identify mitigation actions to reduce future impacts of such hazards; and

WHEREAS, a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed by the Mitigation Planning Committee, including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions within Larimer County, and partner organizations; and

WHEREAS, the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan recommends several mitigation actions that will help minimize and reduce safety threats and damage to private and public property; and

WHEREAS, two public meetings were held on July 27, 2015 and December 2, 2015 to present draft planning documents and to solicit input during the development of the plan; and

WHEREAS, the draft plan was made available for public comment from December 10, 2015 through January 10, 2016 to solicit questions and comments and to present the plan and the proposed mitigation actions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ESTES VALLEY RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT, COLORADO, THAT:

- 1. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is hereby adopted as an official plan of Estes Valley Recreation and Park District.
- 2. The offices identified in the Plan are hereby directed to pursue implementation of the recommended priority actions that are assigned to their respective departments / divisions.
- 3. Any action proposed in the Plan shall be subject to and contingent upon budget approval, if funding is required and this resolution shall not be interpreted so as to mandate any such appropriations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Office of Emergency Management will be administering and monitoring the Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, in collaboration with all community partners, and will provide revisions and updates to the Board of Directors of The Estes Valley Recreation and Park District as needed to remain current.

Adopted this 19th day of July, 2016.

Ken Czarnowski, President Ronald Duell, Vice-President David Kiser, Treasurer Gengler, Secretary Stanl Marie Richardson, Director At-Large

RESOLUTION 2016-048 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FORT COLLINS ADOPTING THE 2016 LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the City has experienced flooding, wildfires and other natural and humancaused hazard events that pose risks to public health and safety and may cause serious property damage; and

WHEREAS, on June 1, 2010, the City adopted the Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan; and

WHEREAS, a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan ("Mitigation Plan") has been developed as an update to the 2010 Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan by the Mitigation Planning Committee, including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions within Larimer County and partner organizations; and

WHEREAS, the Mitigation Plan recommends several mitigation actions that will help minimize and reduce safety threats and damage to private and public property; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that it is in the best interests of the City that the Mitigation Plan be adopted.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FORT COLLINS as follows:

That the City Council hereby makes and adopts the determinations and Section 1. findings contained in the recitals set forth above.

Section 2. That the Mitigation Plan, dated June 21, 2016, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk, and available for public inspection, is hereby approved and adopted, thereby replacing and superseding the Northern Colorado Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Council of the City of Fort Collins this 21st day of June, A.D. 2016.



ATTEST:

Unkelman

RESOLUTION NO. 12-16

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, Larimer County, including the Town of Estes Park, has experienced past flooding, wildfires and other natural and human-caused hazard events that pose risks to public health and safety and which may cause serious property damage; and

WHEREAS, the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed by the Mitigation Planning Committee, including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions within Larimer County, including the Town of Estes Park, and partner organizations; and

WHEREAS, the planning process by all participating Larimer County jurisdictions and agencies offered the opportunity to consider natural and human-caused hazards and risks, and to identify mitigation actions to reduce future impacts of such hazards; and

WHEREAS, the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan recommends mitigation actions that will help minimize and reduce safety threats and damage to private and public property; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Estes Park desires to formally adopt the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE TOWN OF ESTES PARK:

- 1. The Town of Estes Park hereby adopts the May 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan for the Town of Estes Park.
- 2. The appropriate officials of the Town of Estes Park are authorized to submit this Resolution and any related documents to the Colorado Division of Emergency Management and Federal Emergency Management Agency.

INTRODUCED, READ, AND PASSED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE TOWN OF ESTES PARK on this <u>28</u> day of <u>June</u>, 2016.

TOWN OF ESTES PARK, COLORADO

ATTEST:



BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF LARIMER, STATE OF COLORADO

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE LARIMER MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, Larimer County has experienced past flooding, wildfires and other natural and human-caused hazard events that pose risks to public health and safety and which may cause serious property damage; and

WHEREAS, the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provided mitigation funds to the County to support development of a multi-jurisdictional mitigation plan; and

WHEREAS, the planning process fostered by all participating Larimer County jurisdictions and agencies offers the opportunity to consider natural and human-caused hazards and risks, and to identify mitigation actions to reduce future impacts of such hazards; and

WHEREAS, a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed by the Mitigation Planning Committee, including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions within Larimer County, and partner organizations; and

WHEREAS, the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan recommends several mitigation actions that will help minimize and reduce safety threats and damage to private and public property; and

WHEREAS, two public meetings were held on July 27, 2015 and December 2, 2015 to present draft planning documents and to solicit input during the development of the plan; and

WHEREAS, the draft plan was made available for public comment from December 10, 2015 through January 10, 2016 to solicit questions and comments and to present the plan and the proposed mitigation actions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Larimer County, Colorado, that:

- 1. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is hereby adopted as an official plan of Larimer County.
- 2. The offices identified in the Plan are hereby directed to pursue implementation of the recommended priority actions that are assigned to their respective departments / divisions.
- 3. Any action proposed in the Plan shall be subject to and contingent upon budget approval, if funding is required and this resolution shall not be interpreted so as to mandate any such appropriations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Office of Emergency Management will be administering and monitoring the Larimer Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, in collaboration with all community partners, and will provide revisions and updates to the Board of Commissioners as needed to remain current.

DATED THIS 31 ST DAY OF May 2016. **BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS** and a second Puter COUNTL LARIMER COUNTY, COLORADO All Internet SEAL By: Chairman COLORADO Course Covinty Cle

2- See Strate Strate State and a second s Second se

Titate interaction decomposition of the second As a decomposition with the second As a decomposition second s

Merin (1968): Bañkaria an bañkaria - Erin Galegia - Erin (1977) - Erin (1990): Bahela an Britan (1977) Garieria:

- r The Mujin ye pay on the structure of the policements speech on particle or an official policies of ¹ marks
- t de outbre de la participant de la par Por la participant de la participant de
- - 410X17m*158

RESOLUTION # R-067

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, in accordance with section C.R.S. §29-1-203 governmental entities may cooperate or contract one with another to provide any function, service or facility lawfully authorized to each of the respective units of governments; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with C.R.S. §29-1-201, governmental entities are permitted and encouraged to make the most efficient and effective use of their powers and responsibilities by cooperating and contracting with other governments; and

WHEREAS, Loveland Fire Rescue Authority ("Authority") and Larimer County are independent governmental entities duly organized and existing in accordance with Colorado law and are called upon to respond to emergency hazards contained within their respective jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, the Authority recognizes the threat that natural hazards pose to people and property within our community; and

WHEREAS, undertaking hazard mitigation actions will reduce the potential for harm to people and property from future hazard occurrences; and

WHEREAS, adoption of Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan is required as a condition of future funding for mitigation projects under multiple FEMA pre- and post-disaster mitigation grant programs; and

WHEREAS, the Authority is located within Larimer County and the City of Loveland Planning Area, and fully participated in the mitigation planning process to prepare this Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Colorado Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Region VIII officials have reviewed the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan and approved it contingent upon official adoption by the participating governments and entities; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent and desire of the Authority to adopt the Multi-Hazard Mitigation plan in the interest of the health, safety and welfare of the greater Loveland area residents; and

WHEREAS, the LFRA Board finds that it is in the best interests of the LFRA and the citizens served to adopt the "Larimer County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan" attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference (the "Plan").

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LOVELAND FIRE RESCUE AUTHORITY AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That the Plan as set forth in Exhibit A is hereby adopted.

<u>Section 2.</u> That the Fire Chief is hereby authorized and directed to submit this resolution adopting the Plan to the Colorado Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Region VIII officials to secure final approval of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Section 3. That this Resolution shall go into effect as of the date and time of its adoption.

ADOPTED this 29th day of June, 2016.

Jeffrev Chairperson

Mark Miller, Fire Chief

ATTEST:

A on hol one Sec

RESOLUTION # R-47-2016

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, in accordance with section C.R.S. §29-1-203 governmental entities may cooperate or contract one with another to provide any function, service or facility lawfully authorized to each of the respective units of governments; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with C.R.S. §29-1-201, governmental entities are permitted and encouraged to make the most efficient and effective use of their powers and responsibilities by cooperating and contracting with other governments; and

WHEREAS, City of Loveland ("City") and Larimer County are independent governmental entities duly organized and existing in accordance with Colorado law and are called upon to respond to emergency hazards contained within their respective jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, the City of Loveland recognizes the threat that natural hazards pose to people and property within our community; and

WHEREAS, undertaking hazard mitigation actions will reduce the potential for harm to people and property from future hazard occurrences; and

WHEREAS, adoption of a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is required as a condition of future funding for mitigation projects under multiple FEMA pre- and post-disaster mitigation grant programs; and

WHEREAS, the City of Loveland is located within Larimer County and the City of Loveland Planning Area, and fully participated in the mitigation planning process to prepare this Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Colorado Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Region VIII officials have reviewed the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and approved it contingent upon official adoption by the participating governments and entities; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent and desire of the City to adopt the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation plan in the interest of the health, safety and welfare of City residents; and

WHEREAS, the Council of City of Loveland finds that it is in the best interests of the City to adopt the "Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan" attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference (the "Plan").

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOVELAND, COLORADO AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That the Plan as set forth in Exhibit A is hereby adopted.

<u>Section 2.</u> That the City Manager is hereby authorized and directed to submit this resolution adopting the Plan to the Colorado Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Region VIII officials to secure final approval of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Section 3. That this Resolution shall go into effect as of the date and time of its adoption.

ADOPTED this 5th day of July, 2016.

ATTEST:

Inity curs City Clerk

Cecil A. Gutierrez, Mayor



Approved as to form:

Teresa Ablao Assistant City Attorney

Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional













The following Larimer County Jurisdictions, Special Districts, and Organizations have collaboratively participated in this Hazard Mitigation Planning Process.

Larimer County



NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT and MUNICIPAL SUBDISTRICT, NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

RESOLUTION D-1283-10-16 MS-350-10-16

ADOPTION OF THE LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS

- The NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, in partnership with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the Colorado-Big Thompson (C-BT) Project. The C-BT Project collects water from the upper Colorado River basin in Grand County and delivers the water via the Alva B. Adams Tunnel and other C-BT facilities located partially in Larimer County to over 30 municipal and industrial water users serving more than 800,000 people, and 640,000 irrigable acres within its boundaries in eight northeastern Colorado counties, including Larimer County.
- The MUNICIPAL SUB-DISTRICT, NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, owns and operates the Windy Gap Project, which collects water from the upper Colorado River basin in Grand County and delivers it via Windy Gap and C-BT facilities located partially in Larimer County to ten municipal and industrial water users within its boundaries in northeastern Colorado.
- 3. The East Slope Distribution System for the C-BT and Windy Gap is partially located within Larimer County, and Larimer County facilities include Mary's Lake, Lake Estes, Pinewood Reservoir, Flatiron Reservoir, Carter Lake Reservoir, Horsetooth Reservoir, the East Portal of the Alva B. Adams Tunnel, several diversions, canals, tunnels, penstocks, power plants, control and measurement facilities, and other appurtenant facilities.
- 4. C-BT facilities are owned by the Bureau of Reclamation and Northern Water, and approximately three-fourths of C-BT and Windy Gap watersheds are under management by the U.S. Forest Service, National Park Service, or other federal and state agencies.

October 13, 2016

- 5. NORTHERN WATER and the MUNICIPAL SUB-DISTRICT desire to protect C-BT and Windy Gap facilities and water supplies, its employees and the public from the threat that natural hazards pose, and is undertaking hazard mitigation actions to reduce the potential for harm to people, property, and water supplies from future hazard occurrences.
- 6. NORTHERN WATER has entered into the C-BT Headwaters Partnership through a Memorandum of Understanding with the Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Forest Service, and Colorado State Forest Service to proactively restore forest and watershed health, and preplan post-wildfire response to protect C-BT infrastructure and water supplies.
- 7. NORTHERN WATER and the MUNICIPAL SUB-DISTRICT desire to comply with the requirements of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (P.L. 93-288), as amended by the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, which requires development and adoption of a Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan as a condition of eligibility for FEMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance programs.
- 8. Larimer County, with assistance from Michael Baker International, has gathered information and prepared the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, dated May 2016 (Plan).
- 9. The Plan has been prepared in accordance with FEMA requirements at 44 C.F.R. 201.6.
- 10. NORTHERN WATER and the MUNICIPAL SUB-DISTRICT have participated in the development of the Plan as a jurisdiction, provided information for the Plan as described in Appendix C, reviewed the Plan, and affirms that its portions the Plan will be updated no less than every five years.
- 11. NORTHERN WATER will transmit a letter to Larimer County, dated October 13, 2016, which comments on various aspects of the document, primarily clarifying NORTHERN WATER and MUNICIPAL SUB-DISTRICT jurisdictional boundaries and their authorities within those boundaries.
- 12. Adoption of the Plan by NORTHERN WATER and the MUNICIPAL SUB-DISTRICT demonstrates the jurisdiction's commitment to fulfilling the mitigation goals and objectives outlined in the Plan for the jurisdiction.

October 13, 2016

13. Adoption of the Plan helps to coordinate the responsible agencies to carry out their responsibilities under the Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED

1. NORTHERN WATER and the MUNICIPAL SUB-DISTRICT adopt the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as a component of its overall multi-hazard mitigation plan strategy.

CERTIFICATE

I, Eric W. Wilkinson, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a Resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Directors of Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District and the Municipal Sub-District, Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, at regular meetings of said Boards held in Berthoud, Colorado, on October 13, 2016.

Secretary

Resolution 2016-1

Resolution of the Livermore Fire Protection District to adopt the Larimer Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan of 2016

Whereas, Livermore Fire Protection District recognizes the threat of wildfires and other natural and human-caused hazard events that pose risks to public health and safety and which may cause serious property damage within our community; and

Whereas, the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been prepared in accordance with FEMA requirements at 44 C.F.R. 201.6; and

Whereas, a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed by the Mitigation Planning Committee, including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions within Larimer County, and partner organizations; and

Whereas, the Board of Directors has reviewed the Plan and affirms that the Plan will be updated no less than every five years; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Livermore Fire Protection District Board that the Livermore Fire Protection District adopts the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as this jurisdiction's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, and resolves to execute the actions in the Plan.

ADOPTED this 20th day of October, 2016 at the meeting of the Board of Directors of the LIVERMORE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

LIVERMORE, FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT **LFPD Board President**

ATTEST: FPD Secretary

Adoption Resolution

Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District

Board of Directors

PO Box 370, Laporte, CO 80535

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Larimer County Emergency Management, with the assistance from Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District, has gathered information and prepared the Larimer Hazard Mitigation Plan and,

WHEREAS, the Larimer Hazard Mitigation Plan has been prepared in accordance with FEMA requirements at 44 C.F.R. 201.6; and,

WHEREAS, Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District is a local unit of government that has afforded the citizens an opportunity to comment and provide input to the Plan and the actions in the Plan; and

WHEREAS, Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District Board of Directors has reviewed the Plan and affirms that the Plan will be updated no less than every five years;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District Board of Directors that Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District adopts the Larimer Hazard Mitigation Plan as this jurisdiction's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, and resolves to execute the actions in the Plan.

ADOPTED this 13th day of July, 2016 at the meeting of the Poudre Canyon Fire Protection District Board of Directors.

Brett Ridges, Presider

Resolution 16-8 Board of Directors Poudre Fire Authority

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE LARIMER MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, Larimer County, City of Fort Collins and Poudre Fire Authority has experienced past flooding, wildfires and other natural and human-caused hazard events that pose risks to public health and safety and which may cause serious property damage; and

WHEREAS, the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provided mitigation funds to the County to support development of a multi-jurisdictional mitigation plan; and

WHEREAS, the planning process fostered by all participating Larimer County jurisdictions and agencies offers the opportunity to consider natural and human-caused hazards and risks, and to identify mitigation actions to reduce future impacts of such hazards; and

WHEREAS, a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed by the Mitigation Planning Committee, including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions (including Poudre Fire Authority) within Larimer County, and partner organizations; and

WHEREAS, the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan recommends several mitigation actions that will help minimize and reduce safety threats and damage to private and public property; and

WHEREAS, two public meetings were held on July 27, 2015 and December 2, 2015 to present draft planning documents and to solicit input during the development of the plan; and

WHEREAS, the draft plan was made available for public comment from December 10, 2015 through January 10, 2016 to solicit questions and comments and to present the plan and the proposed mitigation actions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Poudre Fire Authority Board that:

1. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is hereby adopted as an official plan of Poudre Fire Authority.

- 2. The offices identified in the Plan are hereby directed to pursue implementation of the recommended priority actions that are assigned to their respective departments / divisions.
- 3. Any action proposed in the Plan shall be subject to and contingent upon budget approval, if funding is required and this resolution shall not be interpreted so as to mandate any such appropriations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Fort Collins Office of Emergency Management will be administering and monitoring the Larimer Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, in collaboration with all community partners, and will provide revisions and updates to the Poudre Fire Authority Board as needed to remain current.

DATED THIS 24th DAY OF May, 2016.

Poudre Fire Authority Board, Larimer County, Colorado

By: __ Poudre Fire Authority Board

ATTEST:

ton A. Abward

Resolution 20/6-07

A RESOLUTION OF THE PINEWOOD SPRINGS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT, LYONS, COLORADO, ACCEPTING AND APPROVING THE 2016 LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

Whereas, the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District, with assistance from Larimer County, has gathered information and prepared input to the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan; and

Whereas, the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been prepared in accordance with FEMA requirements at 44 C.F.R. 201.6; and

Whereas, the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District approves any minor changes to the plan providing that it meets the FEMA requirements as set forth in 44 C.F.R. 201.6; and

Whereas, the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District is a local government that has afforded the citizens an opportunity to comment and provide input in the Plan and the actions in the Plan; and

Whereas, the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District has reviewed the Plan and affirms that the Plan will be updated no less than every five years;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District Board of Directors that the Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District adopts the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as this jurisdiction's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, and resolves to execute the actions in the Plan.

ADOPTED this <u>/2</u> day of <u>October</u>, 20/6 at a meeting of the

Pinewood Springs Fire Protection District Board of Directors.

Johnson, Scretary ean R

RESOLUTION NO. 15-16

WHEREAS, Platte River Power Authority ("Platte River"), with the assistance from Larimer County, has gathered information and participated in the preparation of the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan has been prepared in accordance with the FEMA requirements set forth at 44 C.F.R. 201.6; and

WHEREAS, Larimer County is a local unit of government that has afforded the citizens an opportunity to comment and provide input to the Plan and the actions in the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the management of Platte River has reviewed the Plan and affirms that its participation in the Plan will be updated no less than every five years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of Platte River Power Authority that Platte River Power Authority recognizes the Larimer County Hazard Mitigation Plan as this jurisdiction's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, and resolves to execute the actions required of the Platte River Power Authority under the Plan.

AS WITNESS, I have executed my name as Assistant Secretary and have affixed the corporate seal of the Platte River Power Authority this $\frac{\partial 8}{\partial 8}$ day of $\frac{\partial 1}{\partial 1}$, 2016.

Assistant Secretary

Adopted: July 28, 2016 Voted: 7-0


RESOLUTION 2016 - 1

RESOLUTION OF THE GLACIER VIEW FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT TO ADOPT THE LARIMER MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN OF 2016

WHEREAS, Glacier View Fire Protection District recognizes the threat of wildfires and other natural and human-caused hazard events that pose risks to public health and safety and which may cause serious property damage within our community; and

WHEREAS, the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been prepared in accordance with FEMA requirements at 44 C.F.R. 201.6; and

WHEREAS, a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed by the Mitigation Planning Committee, including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions within Larimer County, and partner organizations; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors has reviewed the Plan and affirms that the Plan will be updated no less than every five years; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Glacier View Fire Protection District Board that the Glacier View Fire Protection District adopts the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as this jurisdiction's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, and resolves to execute the actions in the Plan.

ADOPTED this 19th day of September, 2016 at the meeting of the Board of Directors of the GLACIER VIEW FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT.

GLACIER VIEW FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

By:

GVFPD Board President

1 L Se

GVFPD Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-002

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE THOMPSON VALLEY HEALTH SERVICES DISTRICT ADOPTING THE 2016 LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the Thompson Valley Health Services District ("District") recognizes the threat that natural hazards pose to people and property within our community; and

WHEREAS, undertaking hazard mitigation actions will reduce the potential for harm to people and property from future hazard occurrences; and

WHEREAS, the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan ("Plan") has been prepared in accordance with FEMA requirements contained in 44 C.F.R. 201.6; and

WHEREAS, the District is a local unit of government that fully participated in the process to prepare the Plan and agrees with its provisions; and

WHEREAS, the District's Board of Directors has reviewed the Plan and affirms that the Plan will be updated no less than every five years.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE THOMPSON VALLEY HEALTH SERVICES DISTRICT THAT:

The Board hereby adopts the 2016 Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as this jurisdictions Hazard Mitigation Plan, and resolves to execute the actions in the Plan.

Adopted this 29 day of Sect., 2016.

THOMPSON VALLEY HEALTH SERVICES DISTRICT

Patricia Farnham, President

helin (- / By:

Secretary

TOWN OF TIMNATH, COLORADO RESOLUTION NO. 104, SERIES 2016

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE LARIMER MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, Larimer County, as well as the Town of Timnath, have experienced past flooding, wildfires and other natural and human-caused hazard events that pose risks to public health and safety and which may cause serious property damage; and

WHEREAS, the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provided mitigation funds to the County to support development of a multi-jurisdictional mitigation plan; and

WHEREAS, the planning process fostered by all participating Larimer County jurisdictions and agencies offers the opportunity to consider natural and human-caused hazards and risks, and to identify mitigation actions to reduce future impacts of such hazards; and

WHEREAS, a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed by the Mitigation Planning Committee, including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions within Larimer County, and partner organizations; and

WHEREAS, the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan recommends several mitigation actions that will help minimize and reduce safety threats and damage to private and public property; and

WHEREAS, two public meetings were held on July 27, 2015 and December 2, 2015 to present draft planning documents and to solicit input during the development of the plan; and

WHEREAS, the draft plan was made available for public comment from December 10, 2015 through January 10, 2016 to solicit questions and comments and to present the plan and the proposed mitigation actions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF TIMNATH, COLORADO AS FOLLOW:

1. The Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is hereby adopted as the official plan of the Town of Timnath.

Approval

The Plan is hereby approved in substantially the form as attached hereto, subject to technical or otherwise non-substantive modifications, as deemed necessary by the Town Manager in consultation with the Town Planner, Engineer, Legal Counsel, and other applicable staff or consultants.

INTRODUCED, MOVED, AND ADOPTED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF TIMNATH, ON DECEMBER 7, 2016.

TOWN OF TIMNATH, COLORADO

Jill grossman-Belisle, Mayor

Milissa Peters, CMC Town Clerk



TOWN OF BERTHOUD

RESOLUTION NO. 16-16

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AND AFFIRMING THE LARIMER COUNTY AND WELD COUNTY 2016 MULTI-AGENCY HAZARD MITIGATION PLANS.

WHEREAS, the Town of Berthoud ("Town") is a Colorado municipality with all powers and authority provided by Colorado law; and

WHEREAS, the Town recognizes the threat that natural hazards pose to people and property within the community; and

WHEREAS, planning and undertaking hazard mitigation actions will reduce the potential for harm to people and property from future hazard occurrences; and

WHEREAS, a fully-adopted Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is a requirement for future funding of mitigation projects by the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and

WHEREAS the Town of Berthoud is located within both Larimer and Weld county Emergency Managers Planning Area; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Berthoud, through Police Chief Jim Anderson, is a full participant in the Larimer County and Weld County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plans; and

WHEREAS, the Colorado Office of Emergency Management and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Region VIII have reviewed and approved both of the Larimer County 2016 and Weld County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plans.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF BERTHOUD, COLORADO AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is hereby incorporated into the Resolution as if set forth fully.
- 2. The Weld County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is hereby incorporated into the Resolution as if set forth fully.

- 3. Both the Larimer County 2016 and Weld County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plans are adopted as the official Plans of the Town of Berthoud.
- 4. The Town Clerk is hereby authorized and empowered to notify such persons or entities as may be necessary of the Town's adoption of the Larimer County 2016 and Weld County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, and to provide all interested persons with copies of this Resolution.

TOWN OF BERTHOUD, COLORADO

Steve Mulvihill, Mayor

Alisa Darrow, Town Clerk

this Agreement and shall not be construed to affect in any manner the terms and provisions herein.

XVIII. Becoming a Party to this Agreement

Each Party agrees to allow any other entity, including government and nongovernment emergency response and recovery partners, to join in this Agreement after formal approval by the prospective Party and notification by the Larimer County Office of Emergency Management of such action to each of the other Parties to this Agreement. To the extent that entities outside of Larimer County choose to join in this Agreement, notification shall also be provided to the office of emergency management in the county in which the entity is located.

XIX. Execution

This Agreement shall be executed by each Party on a separate signature page. This Agreement and the original signature pages shall be filed with and held by Larimer County Emergency Management or its successor agency, at 200 West Oak Street, Fort Collins, CO 80522. Copies of signature pages shall be provided to each Party, and such copies shall have the full force and effect as if they were originals. A copy of the full Agreement will be provided to the Colorado State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management.

As outlined in the foregoing Mutual Aid Agreement, the below Party executes this Agreement on the most recent date indicated below.

| PARTY: Town of Estes Park |
|---------------------------|
| By: |
| Title: Mayor |
| Date: June 28, 2016 |
| ATTEST AS TO SIGNATURES: |
| Title: |
| Date: |

TOWN OF WINDSOR

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-29

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AND REAFFIRMING THE LARIMER COUNTY AND WELD COUNTY 2016 MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLANS

WHEREAS, the Town of Windsor ("Town") is a Colorado home rule municipality with all powers and authority provided by Colorado law; and

WHEREAS, the Town recognizes the threat that natural hazards pose to people and property within the community; and

WHEREAS, planning and undertaking hazard mitigation actions will reduce the potential for harm to people and property from future hazard occurrences; and

WHEREAS, a fully-adopted Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is a requirement for future funding of mitigation projects by the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Windsor is located within both the Larimer County and the Weld County Emergency Managers Planning Area; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Windsor, through Police Chief John Michaels, is a full participant in the Larimer County and Weld County mitigation planning processes, and the preparation of the Larimer County 2016 and Weld County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plans; and

WHEREAS, on September 13, 2010, the Town previously adopted the 2009 Northeast Colorado emergency Managers Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, which has since been changed from an eleven county area to Weld and Larimer Counties adopting their own plans; and

WHEREAS, the Colorado Office of Emergency Management and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Region VIII have reviewed and approved both of the Weld County 2016 and Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plans.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF WINDSOR, COLORADO, AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The Weld County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is hereby incorporated into this Resolution as if set forth fully.
- 2. The Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is hereby incorporated into this Resolution as if set forth fully.

- 3. Both the Weld County 2016 and the Larimer County 2016 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plans are hereby adopted as official plans of the Town of Windsor, Colorado.
- 4. The Town Clerk is hereby authorized and empowered to notify such persons or entities as may be necessary of the Town's adoption of the Larimer County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and of the Weld County 2016 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, and to provide all interested persons with copies of this Resolution.

TOWN OF WINDSOR, COLORADO

Kristie Melendez, Mayor

ATTEST: Hitto Sui Patti Garcia, Town Clerk

2



P.O. Box 568 • Estes Park, CO 80517 Ph: 970-586-4544 • Fax: 970-586-1049 www.utsd.org

UPPER THOMPSON SANITATION DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-06-03

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the Upper Thompson Sanitation District ("District") has experienced past flooding, wildfires and other natural and human-caused events and recognizes the threat that various natural hazards pose to people and property within the community; and

WHEREAS, undertaking certain hazard mitigation actions may reduce the potential for harm to people and property from future hazard occurrences; and

WHEREAS, the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provided mitigation funds to the County of Larimer to support development of a multi-jurisdictional mitigation plan; and

WHEREAS, a Mitigation Planning Committee including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions in Larimer County, including the District, has prepared a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein, based on data collection, stakeholder input, community asset/vulnerability analysis and identification of preferred mitigation alternatives (the "Plan"); and

WHEREAS, the Plan was developed per the requirements of the FEMA-prescribed mitigation planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Colorado Office of Emergency Management and FEMA, has reviewed the Plan and approved it contingent upon the official adoption of the Plan by all participating governmental bodies.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Upper Thompson Sanitation District, Larimer County, Colorado as follows:

1. <u>Adoption of Plan</u>. The Board of Directors hereby adopts the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, as an official plan for the District. 2. <u>Submittal to State and Federal Authorities and to Take Necessary Actions</u>. The Board of Directors hereby authorizes the District Manager to submit this Adoption Resolution to the Colorado Division of Emergency Management and Federal Emergency Management Agency to enable the Plan's final approval, and to take such actions as are recommended and assigned to the District in the Plan.

3. <u>Guidance Policy; No Third Party Liability</u>. The Plan constitutes a guidance policy regarding future service and hazard mitigation recommendations, for use by the Board in its sole discretion regarding planning, development and operation of the District's resources, and does not establish absolute requirements or funding commitments for any item not identified in the current fiscal year budget. All identified items are expressly subject to budget and appropriation of funds therefor. The Plan shall not be deemed to give rise to any mandated appropriation, claim or cause of action by any officer, employee, or official of the District, or any other person or entity.

4. <u>Severability</u>. If any part, section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this Resolution or the adopted Plan is for any reason held to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions.

5. <u>Effective Date</u>. This Resolution shall take effect and be enforced immediately upon its approval by the Board.

ADOPTED this 21st day of June, 2016.

Upper Thompson Sanitation District

By

Jack Sr. Acco

Attest:

A. Duell Ron Duell, Secretary

RESOLUTION 28–2016

A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN OF WELLINGTON, COLORADO ADOPTING THE LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, Larimer County and Municipalities within Larimer County have experienced past flooding, wildfires and other natural and human-caused hazard events that pose risks to public health and safety and which may cause serious property damage; and

WHEREAS, the State of Colorado and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) provided mitigation funds to the County to support development of a multijurisdictional mitigation plan; and

WHEREAS, the planning process fostered by all participating Larimer County jurisdictions and agencies offers the opportunity to consider natural and human-caused hazards and risks, and to identify mitigation actions to reduce future impacts of such hazards; and

WHEREAS, a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed by the Mitigation Planning Committee, including personnel from twenty-seven different jurisdictions within Larimer County, and partner organizations; and

WHEREAS, the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan recommends several mitigation actions that will help minimize and reduce safety threats and damage to private and public property; and

WHEREAS, two public meetings were held on July 27, 2015 and December 2, 2015 to present draft planning documents and to solicit input during the development of the plan; and

WHEREAS, the draft plan was made available for public comment from December 10, 2015 through January 10, 2016 to solicit questions and comments and to present the plan and the proposed mitigation actions.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE TOWN OF WELLINGTON, LARIMER COUNTY, COLORADO.

1. The Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is adopted as the Town of Wellington's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

2. This Board resolves to execute the actions in the Plan and directs staff to pursue implementation of the actions identified in the Plan for the Town of Wellington.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR/CLERK

HOFF, MAYOR

RESOLUTION 2016-04 ADOPTION LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, WELLINGTON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT (DISTRICT) with the assistance from LARIMER COUNTY, OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT and MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC., has gathered information and prepared the LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN (PLAN); and,

WHEREAS, the PLAN has been prepared in accordance with FEMA requirements at 44 C.F.R. 201.6; and,

WHEREAS, the DISTRICT is a local unit of government that has afforded the citizens an opportunity to comment and provide input in the PLAN and the actions in the PLAN; and

WHEREAS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the DISTRICT has reviewed the PLAN and affirms that the PLAN will be updated no less than every five years;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the BOARD OF DIRECTORS that the DISTRICT adopts the PLAN as this jurisdiction's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, and resolves to execute the actions in the Plan.

ADOPTED this 1st day of JUNE, 2016 at the meeting of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the DISTRICT.

WELLINGTON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

Board President, Kenneth Pettit

Attest:

A RESOLUTION OF THE WINDSOR-SEVERANCE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS ADOPTING THE LARIMER COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-04

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the Windsor-Severance Fire Protection District recognizes the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as the Windsor-Severance Fire Protection District Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan:

WHEREAS, the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan has been prepared in accordance with FEMA requirements at 44 C.F.R. 201.6; and,

WHEREAS, Windsor-Severance Fire Protection District is a local unit of government that has afforded the citizens an opportunity to comment and provide input in the Plan and the actions in the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors has reviewed the Plan and affirms that the Plan will be updated no less than every five years;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors that Windsor-Severance Fire Protection District adopts the Larimer County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as this jurisdiction's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, and resolves to execute the actions in the Plan.

ADOPTED this 14 day of 14, 2016 at the meeting of the Board of Directors of the Windsor-Severance Fire Protection District.

Jim Abbott, President, Board of Directors Windsor-Severance Fire Protection District

Attest

Michael Young, Secretary, Board of Directors Windsor-Severance Fire Protection District