

**AGENDA**  
**WORK SESSION OF THE VENETA CITY COUNCIL**  
**MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2016 – 5:30 P.M.**  
Veneta Administrative Center, 88184 8th Street, Veneta, Oregon

---

1. **LANE COUNTY PRESENTATION OF THE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN** (pgs. 3-19)
2. **ADJOURN**



# **City of Veneta Hazard Mitigation Reference**



Version 1.0 (September 2016)



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

ANNEX 6. City of Veneta Hazard Mitigation Reference ..... 303  
Introduction: City of Veneta Hazard Mitigation Reference ..... 304  
City of Veneta: Hazard Mitigation Meetings and Work Sessions ..... 305  
City of Veneta: Hazard Quantification – Risk Assessment ..... 306  
City of Veneta: Mitigation Projects ..... 313  
City of Veneta: Hazard Mitigation Plan Implementation and Maintenance ..... 317

## Introduction: City of Veneta Hazard Mitigation Reference

This annex to the Lane County Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan purpose is to consolidate information specific to the City of Veneta and serve as an executive summary. 44 CFR 201 requirements are addressed and met in the main document, this annex provides supplemental information. For more information regarding Code of Federal regulations for Local Hazard Mitigation Planning see overview in Chapter 1 and citations and abstracts for Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5 of the main document.

The 2017 Lane County Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan sanctioned by OEM and FEMA is the first for which the City of Veneta has been a formal participant. Like other formal participants (Lane County, Coburg, Creswell, Dunes City, Florence, Oakridge, Westfir), being a participant in an approved multi-jurisdiction hazard mitigation plan creates eligibility for the following important federal grants:

- Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)
- Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grants (PDM)
- Flood Mitigation Assistance Grants (FMA)

In addition to creating eligibility for federal grants, this document serves as 5-year road map for activities with the purpose and potential to make Veneta a stronger, safer, and more resilient community.

Sub-sections of this annex to the Lane County Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan describe the following:

- Individual participants and contributors, meetings and work sessions conducted during the plan development process.
- Results of the OEM prescribed hazard quantification process for each hazard type and discussion of previous occurrences, probability of future occurrence, potential vulnerability of public and private assets, and maximum credible threat posed by each hazard.
- Details regarding mitigation projects identified as priorities, including location, photos, estimated cost, grant funding options, implementation timeframe, and hazards addressed.
- Details for mitigation project implementation, review of local program, and plan update 5-year cycle.

## City of Veneta: Hazard Mitigation Meetings and Work Sessions

Development of City of Veneta material for the hazard mitigation plan involved participation by city, county, fire district, law enforcement, and project assistants. The process followed FEMA's prescribed model for organizing resources, identifying hazards, evaluating risk, identifying mitigation options, prioritizing mitigation projects. For additional details regarding the planning process, refer to Chapter 2 (Planning Process), main document.

Specific participants are listed as follows:

### City of Veneta Hazard Mitigation Team

Name	Title	Agency
Ric Ingham	City Administrator	City of Veneta
Terry Ney	Fire Chief	Lane Fire Authority
Kyle Schauer	Public Works Director	City of Veneta
Kay Bork	Planning Director	City of Veneta
Julie Reid, MPH	Emergency Preparedness Specialist	City of Veneta
Leah Borns	Graduate Intern	City of Veneta
Linda Cook, PMP	Emergency Manager	Lane County Sheriff's Office
Billy Halvorson	Sergeant	Lane County Sheriff's Office
Greg J. Wobbe, CFM	Principal	OCR West, MPTX Associates
Kaylon McAlister	GIS Tech	OCR West, MPTX Associates

### Individual City Work Sessions

Work sessions with individual cities were conducted following the initial project orientation meeting and intervening months between general planning group meetings. These individual work sessions are outlined per city below.

### City of Veneta Work Sessions

Date	Location	Meeting/Work Session
June 24, 2015	Veneta City Hall	Project overview, basic data collection
July 29, 2015	Veneta City Hall	Risk assessment, Hazard quantification
September 23, 2015	Veneta City Hall	Hazard quantification-seismic assessment review, SRGP, FEMA mitigation grant programs, mitigation ideas
November 23, 2015	Veneta City Hall	Identifying mitigation projects
January 27, 2016	Veneta project tour	Mitigation project site tour

An additional element of the planning process included a meeting at Lane County Sheriff's Office August 25, 2015 attended by planning director and public works director, along with the other participating cities. Subject matter discussed included an overview of FEMA grant programs, discussion of common mitigation ideas, and specific project ideas for the City of Veneta.

The result of this overall process was a thorough evaluation of risk factors and mitigation solutions. Certain hazards were highlighted with notable significance for the City of Veneta, others found to be less relevant in a direct context. Systems and concepts considered included infrastructure resiliency, transportation network, public safety, public and private facilities. A range of both general and specific mitigation ideas and projects were identified and scoped in the field.

## City of Veneta: Hazard Quantification – Risk Assessment

An interesting element of the hazard mitigation process is risk assessment. Risk assessment begins by identifying the full range of potential hazards which may occur in the community. Once identified, these potential hazards are evaluated to determine relative importance and aids prioritization of mitigation activities.

There are various means for evaluating hazards and the risk they present. "Hazard Quantification" is a scoring method prescribed by the State of Oregon Office of Emergency Management (OEM) is used to assist with prioritizing hazards and understanding risk. It doesn't predict the occurrence of a particular hazard, but it does "quantify" the risk of one hazard compared with another. By doing this analysis, planning can first be focused where the risk is greatest. Among other things, this hazard analysis can:

- help establish priorities for planning, capability development, and hazard mitigation;
- serve as a tool in the identification of hazard mitigation measures;
- be one tool in conducting a hazard-based needs analysis;
- serve to educate the public and public officials about hazards and vulnerabilities;
- help communities make objective judgments about acceptable risk.

One of the many strengths of the hazard quantification approach is it employs a consistent methodology with the intent of objective results and findings. The methodology was first developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) circa 1983, and gradually refined by Oregon Emergency Management (OEM) over the years. The methodology produces scores that range from 24 (lowest possible) to 240 (highest possible). By applying one order of magnitude from lowest to highest, a hazard with a score of 240 is considered ten times more severe than a hazard with a rating of 24.

Maximum threat, vulnerability, and probability assessment are key components of the methodology. Maximum threat considers degree of impact under a worst case scenario, regardless of probability. Vulnerability examines potential impacts to populations, the built environment, and natural environment for 'typical' events.

Probability reviews frequency of past events as a means of predicting likelihood of future occurrence. Somewhat less vital to overall hazard quantification score (but still relevant) is history of occurrence. The four OEM prescribed hazard quantification categories are listed and described below.

### Hazard Quantification Categories

- 1) History (previous occurrences, primarily within last century)
- 2) Probability (calculated likelihood of future occurrence)
- 3) Vulnerability (number, degree or extent of people or assets at risk per hazard)
- 4) Maximum threat (credible worst-case scenario)

### Weight Factors

Weighting factors were developed for each of the four hazard quantification categories. This is done to emphasize certain categories over others in terms of risk assessment.

- 1) History (weight factor x 2)
- 2) Probability (weight factor x 7)
- 3) Vulnerability (weight factor x 5)
- 4) Maximum threat (weight factor x 10)

## Scoring Guidelines

Scoring guidelines were developed by OEM as a method of standardizing assessment and to minimize subjectivity.

**History** (weight factor for category = 2). History is the record of previous occurrences. Events to include in assessing history of a hazard event for which the following types of activities were required:

- The EOC or alternate EOC was activated;
- Three or more EOP functions were implemented, e.g., alert & warning, evacuation, shelter, etc.
- An extraordinary multi-jurisdictional response was required; and/or
- A "Local Emergency" was declared.

LOW – score at 1 to 3 points based on... 0 - 1 event past 100 years

MEDIUM – score at 4 to 7 points based on... 2 - 3 events past 100 years

HIGH – score at 8 to 10 points based on... 4 + events past 100 years

**Probability** (weight factor for category = 7)

Probability is the likelihood of future occurrence within a specified period of time.

LOW – score at 1 to 3 points based on... one incident likely within 75 to 100 years

MEDIUM – score at 4 to 7 points based on... one incident likely within 35 to 75 years

HIGH – score at 8 to 10 points based on... one incident likely within 10 to 35 years

**Vulnerability** (weight factor for category = 5)

Vulnerability is the percentage of population and property likely to be affected under an "average" occurrence of the hazard.

LOW – score at 1 to 3 points based on... < 1% affected

MEDIUM – score at 4 to 7 points based on... 1 - 10% affected

HIGH – score at 8 to 10 points based on... > 10% affected

**Maximum Threat** (weight factor for category = 10)

Maximum threat is the highest percentage of population and property that could be impacted under a worst-case scenario.

LOW – score at 1 to 3 points based on... < 5% affected

MEDIUM – score at 4 to 7 points based on... 5 - 25% affected

HIGH – score at 8 to 10 points based on... > 25% affected

To tabulate, scores for each category are multiplied by the associated weight factors to create a 'sub-score'. Adding the sub-scores for history, vulnerability, maximum threat, and probability for each hazard produces a 'total hazard quantification score' for each hazard.

The following table summarizes hazard quantification results, followed by a detailed discussion for each hazard.

**City of Veneta: Hazard Quantification Results (DRAFT)**

Hazard Type / Weight Factor (WF)	History WF x 2	Probability WF x 7	Vulnerability WF x 5	Maximum Threat WF x 10	Raw Score	Weighted Score
Wildfire	8	10	5	8	31	191
Winter Storm	10	8	8	6	32	176
Windstorm	10	7	5	7	29	164
Flood	10	7	4	5	26	139
Haz Mat Incident	4	4	4	5	17	106
Earthquake	2	2	5	6	15	103
Drought	1	1	2	7	11	89
Pandemic	2	2	4	4	12	78
Volcano	1	2	2	4	9	66
Landslide	0	1	2	3	6	47
Dam Failure	0	1	1	1	3	22
Tsunami	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: Veneta Hazard Mitigation Team

**Individual Hazard Discussion, City of Veneta**

**Wildfire**

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Wildfire (Overall)	31	191	1
Wildfire (History)	8	16	4
Wildfire (Probability)	10	70	1
Wildfire (Vulnerability)	5	25	2
Wildfire (Maximum Threat)	8	80	1

Wildfire notes: Veneta benefits from excellent response capability (Lane Fire Authority headquarters and ODF station). Significant number of structures/properties near wildland-urban interface, particularly west and south quadrant. Also, forested areas and wildfire fuels (slash) in eastern portion and along railroad, near residential development and public works headquarters. Drought conditions in recent years has resulted in tree mortality in surrounding area, particularly young Douglas fir and madrone species creating increase in standing and down flammable fuels. History primarily limited to minor fires, probability high similar pattern will continue. Vulnerability is moderated by response capability, though maximum threat involves potential for damage to numerous structures and forest tracts. See also wildfire hazard profile in Chapter 3, main document.

**Winter Storm**

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Winter Storm (Overall)	32	176	2
Winter Storm (History)	10	20	1
Winter Storm (Probability)	8	56	2
Winter Storm (Vulnerability)	8	40	1
Winter Storm (Maximum Threat)	6	60	4

Winter Storm notes: Like most cities Veneta contains an extensive network of above ground electrical lines vulnerable to damage from falling limbs and trees during winter storms. Recent

history has been frequent including notable damage and power loss in 2014 and 2015. Wind was contributing factor in recent winter storms. A warming center has been established to provide shelter for vulnerable populations in cold weather. Probability is considered high that patterns of previous occurrence will continue. Overall population potentially affected by winter storm is high since effects are not geographically contained. Transportation and roadways are vulnerable to closure during winter storms, though the city benefits from primarily level terrain with exception of western outskirts. Maximum threat is more moderate however due to somewhat limited threat of structural damage directly related to winter weather (cold, snow, ice). See also winter storm hazard profile in Chapter 3, main document.

### Windstorm

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Windstorm (Overall)	29	164	3
Windstorm (History)	10	20	1
Windstorm (Probability)	7	49	3
Windstorm (Vulnerability)	5	35	2
Windstorm (Maximum Threat)	7	70	2

Windstorm notes: Similar to winter storm, windstorm can and frequently does impact above ground electrical lines vulnerable to damage from falling limbs and trees. Recent history includes notable damage and power loss in 2014 and 2015. Numerous large trees fell at the city park in December 2015 windstorm, also damaging roof of city library. Emergency measures were taken to fall a tree threatening the city library. This same event resulted in residential structure damage in western portion of city. Probability is considered moderate-high that patterns of previous occurrence will continue. Overall vulnerability is considered moderate, roadways are notably vulnerable to closure similar to winter storms. The Columbus Day storm of 1962 can serve as an example for maximum threat, with winds measured at 86 mph in Eugene and presumably similar in Veneta. A windstorm of similar magnitude to the Columbus Day Storm could potentially damage numerous of homes in city, either by direct structural damage, falling trees, or wind blown debris. Due to its location on eastern slope of Coast Range foothills the city may have a slight protective factor from extreme wind as compared to fully exposed areas. See also windstorm hazard profile in Chapter 3, main document.

### Flood

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Flood (Overall)	26	139	4
Flood (History)	10	20	1
Flood (Probability)	7	49	3
Flood (Vulnerability)	4	20	3
Flood (Maximum Threat)	5	50	4

Flood notes: Flood is a geographically contained hazard are widespread impacts in Veneta are unlikely. Neighborhood flooding issues at Cherry Lane-Oak Island Drive, and Territorial Hwy-Cheney Drive are notable. Though located just outside city limits, road inundation on Territorial Hwy north of the city is relatively frequent concern and Long Tom River floodplain in similar vicinity. History of flooding is well noted, future probability relatively high. Overall vulnerability and maximum threat scores are somewhat lower as widespread severe damage from flooding has relatively low probability. See also flood hazard profile in Chapter 3, main document.

## Hazardous Materials Incident

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Hazardous Materials Incident (Overall)	17	106	5
Hazardous Materials Incident (History)	4	8	5
Hazardous Materials Incident (Probability)	4	28	5
Hazardous Materials Incident (Vulnerability)	4	20	5
Hazardous Materials Incident (Maximum Threat)	5	50	6

**Hazardous Materials Incident notes:** Hazardous materials incident is considered a technical hazard and involves different characteristics than natural hazards. Proximity to transport corridors and particularly intersections are significant geographic factor. Highway 126 and a rail line run east-west through Veneta. Underground gas lines serve various neighborhoods. History, probability, vulnerability are considered moderate relative to other hazard types. Maximum threat could involve such events as railroad or truck accident involving toxic release. Rupture of underground gas lines is also possible. In the event of occurrence, prevailing wind and proximity to waterways are important factors relating to public safety risk and environmental impacts. Overall risk is mitigated by excellent response capability. See also hazardous materials incident profile in Chapter 3, main document.

## Earthquake

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Earthquake (Overall)	15	103	6
Earthquake (History)	2	4	6
Earthquake (Probability)	2	14	6
Earthquake (Vulnerability)	5	20	2
Earthquake (Maximum Threat)	6	60	4

**Earthquake notes:** Earthquake is somewhat unique as it occurs much less frequently but has potential for significant damage and disruption. From a geographic standpoint occurrence would presumably effect the entire city uniformly. History of occurrence dates back over long time scales. Probability is low in any given year. Vulnerability is complex to assess due to varying standards of construction but most newer construction is considered relatively sound. Maximum threat is expected to involve minor-moderate damage to numerous structures. Importance of resiliency of infrastructure is notable. See also earthquake profile in Chapter 3, main document.

## Drought

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Drought (Overall)	11	89	7
Drought (History)	1	2	8
Drought (Probability)	1	7	9
Drought (Vulnerability)	2	10	8
Drought (Maximum Threat)	7	70	2

**Drought notes:** Drought is neither life threatening nor presents a direct risk to structures, but does involve potential for significant disruption if dramatic water shortage were to develop. Drought can exacerbate wildfire risk as related hazards, and a water shortage would likely effect the entire city uniformly. History and probability are considered relatively low. Vulnerability is relatively low as Veneta maintains redundancy to its water supply network. Maximum threat is relatively high if an event occurred where all water supply systems go were to become inoperable or water supply unexpectedly ran short. See also drought profile in Chapter 3, main document.

## Pandemic

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Pandemic (Overall)	12	78	8
Pandemic (History)	2	4	6
Pandemic (Probability)	2	14	6
Pandemic (Vulnerability)	4	20	5
Pandemic (Maximum Threat)	4	40	8

Pandemic notes: Pandemic is a unique hazard which presents significant public safety risk but no potential for damage to structures. Geographic potential is uniform. History and probability are both low when considering major outbreak of disease. Vulnerability and maximum threat are moderate considering most credible scenarios. See also pandemic profile in Chapter 3, main document.

## Volcano

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Volcano (Overall)	9	66	9
Volcano (History)	1	2	8
Volcano (Probability)	2	14	6
Volcano (Vulnerability)	2	10	8
Volcano (Maximum Threat)	4	40	8

Volcano notes: Volcano is similar to earthquake in that it occurs very infrequently. Veneta is situated approximately 80 miles from the closest volcano source, far enough to minimize probable impacts to minor ash-fall across the city if wind patterns allow. History, probability and vulnerability are relatively low, maximum threat considered moderate. See also volcano profile in Chapter 3, main document.

## Landslide

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Landslide (Overall)	6	47	10
Landslide (History)	0	0	10
Landslide (Probability)	1	7	9
Landslide (Vulnerability)	2	10	8
Landslide (Maximum Threat)	3	30	10

Landslide notes: Landslide is considered to have very low history, probability, and vulnerability rankings, as the majority of Veneta is situated on level terrain. Maximum threat would likely involve a slide in Bolton Hill area on south-western portion of city. Infrastructure could be affected, but most likely in combined scenario initiated by earthquake. See also landslide profile in Chapter 3, main document.

## Dam Failure

Hazard (Category)	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comparative Rank
Dam Failure (Overall)	3	22	11
Dam Failure (History)	0	0	10
Dam Failure (Probability)	1	7	9
Dam Failure (Vulnerability)	1	5	11
Dam Failure (Maximum Threat)	1	10	11

Dam Failure notes: There is no history of dam failure affecting Veneta and geographic location makes impact low probability. Vulnerability and maximum threat are correspondingly low. See also dam failure profile in Chapter 3, main document.

## Tsunami

Tsunami notes: Tsunami was not fully evaluated due to low probability. Notable are potential indirect effects of evacuation from coastal areas, and importance of Veneta as a staging area in tsunami scenario. See also tsunami profile in Chapter 3, main document.

DRAFT

## City of Veneta: Mitigation Projects

This section describes mitigation projects identified by Veneta during the planning process. See Chapter 4, main document for additional information regarding mitigation action item methodology and prioritization.

### Veneta Mitigation Action Items

Mitigation Action Item (a). Retrofit Jeans Road Lift Station sewer lift station at Territorial/Hwy 126. Construct above grade housing, install new elevated pumps, install generator.

Location	44.05465N, -123.35283W	
Coordinating Agencies	Veneta Public Works	
Implementation Timeframe	6-18 months	
Estimated Cost	est. \$80,000 – 140,000	
Potential Funding Sources	HUD-CDBG, FEMA PA-106	
Hazards Mitigated	Flooding, Winter Storm, Windstorm	
Comments	Mitigate flooding and storm related impacts. Flooding of pump bays can damage pump motor, Winter/windstorm related power failure can cause sewage to back up within 45 minutes. Above grade, storm-hardened elevated structure and system with emergency back-up power source will mitigate potential impact.	
Current Site Photos		

Mitigation Action Item (b). Install generator and manual override for card-lock fueling stations (2). Install generators at clinic, senior center/food bank, church/shelter.

Location	44.05581N, -123.35119W	
Coordinating Agencies	City of Veneta, Lane Fire Authority, CFN	
Implementation Timeframe	12 months	
Estimated Cost	est. \$30,000 – 40,000	
Potential Funding Sources	FEMA	
Hazards Mitigated	Windstorm, winter storm	
Comments	Establish disaster resilient fuel source for first responder and city vehicles.	
Current Site Photo		

**Mitigation Action Item (c).** Wildfire fuels reduction on undeveloped lots in eastern portion of city. East Hunter Road and east of Public Works.

Location	44.04878N, -123.34126W // 44.05112N, -123.34488W	
Coordinating Agencies	Lane Fire Authority, ODF, City of Veneta	
Implementation Timeframe	12 months	
Estimated Cost	Est. \$60,000 – 70,000	
Potential Funding Sources	FEMA, ODF	
Hazards Mitigated	Flooding	
Comments	Fuels reduction, defensible space, east Veneta.	
Current Site Photo		

**Mitigation Action Item (d).** Seismic retrofit, Bolton Hill / Dogwood Water Storage and Conveyance System

Location	44.04213N, -123.36417W	
Coordinating Agencies	City of Veneta	
Implementation Timeframe	18-24 months	
Estimated Cost	Est. \$30,000 – 40,000 (Phase 1: tank base); Est. \$3,000,000 – 4,000,000 (Phase 2: main trunk lines)	
Potential Funding Sources	FEMA, HUD-CDBG, OSRGP	
Hazards Mitigated	Earthquake	
Comments	Phase 1: install tank base reinforcement flange, anchoring. Phase 2: main trunk lines, seismic retrofit.	
Current Site Photo		

**Mitigation Action Item (e).** Elevate low sections of East Hunter Road and roadway / bridge north of Veneta.

Location	44.04551N, -123.33715W // 44.05465N, -123.35283W	
Coordinating Agencies	City of Veneta, ODOT, USACE,	
Implementation Timeframe	12-36 months	
Estimated Cost	est. \$2,000,000 – 4,000,000	
Potential Funding Sources	FEMA, DOT, USACE	
Hazards Mitigated	Flooding	
Comments	Mitigate flooding impacts, road inundation. Rock frequently washes out on East Hunter Road. Territorial inundation, cause long detour around Suttle Road or Trail Hill Road.	
Current Site Photo		

**Mitigation Action Item (f).** Storm hardening retrofit for community center.

Location	44.05003N, -123.34695W	
Coordinating Agencies	City of Veneta	
Implementation Timeframe	12-24 months	
Estimated Cost	est. \$20,000 – 40,000	
Potential Funding Sources	FEMA	
Hazards Mitigated	Windstorm, winter storm	
Comments	Reinforce roof for wind resiliency / mitigation.	
Current Site Photo		

Mitigation Action Item (g). Stormwater drainage improvements, Cherry Lane / Oak Island Drive.

Location	44.03962N, -123.34773W
Coordinating Agencies	City of Veneta
Implementation Timeframe	12-24 months
Estimated Cost	est. \$80,000 – 140,000
Potential Funding Sources	FEMA
Hazards Mitigated	Flooding
Comments	Drainage, conveyance improvements, mitigate neighborhood stormwater flooding
Current Site Photo	

Mitigation Action Item (h). Residential floodproofing, elevation, mitigation reconstruction: Cheney Drive / Territorial Hwy.

Location	44.04168N, -123.35190W
Coordinating Agencies	City of Veneta
Implementation Timeframe	12-24 months
Estimated Cost	est. \$10,000 – 150,000
Potential Funding Sources	FEMA
Hazards Mitigated	Flooding
Comments	Mitigate residential flooding, possible mitigation reconstruction.

Mitigation Action Item (i). Public education, outreach, community preparedness and resiliency.

Location	44.0513N, -123.3608W
Coordinating Agencies	City of Veneta
Implementation Timeframe	12 months
Estimated Cost	est. \$20,000 –30,000
Potential Funding Sources	FEMA
Hazards Mitigated	All hazards
Comments	Educate community on preparedness measures, hazard mitigation activities.

## City of Veneta: Hazard Mitigation Plan Implementation and Maintenance

To ensure the incorporation of the overall goals and strategy of the hazard mitigation plan, City of Veneta hazard mitigation team members will be invited to participate in future plan development or existing plan update committees. Additionally, this Hazard Mitigation Action Plan will be cited as a technical reference for future plan update processes. Planning documents and mechanisms applicable to this process may include the following:

- City of Veneta Comprehensive Plan
- Capital Improvement Plans
- Emergency Management Plan
- Local Community Wildfire Protection Plans
- City of Veneta Floodplain Development Regulations
- Building Code
- Subdivision Code
- Erosion Control
- Stormwater Management

Additionally, progress to implement this plan will be monitored on an ongoing basis by city administration. Annual reviews and update under a 5-year cycle will be pursued. Using these methods the overarching goal of a stronger, safer, more resilient community can be reached.