RIVERSIDE COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION AGENCY INVENTORY

City of Norco

EXPLANATION OF PART II FORMS

Hazard Identification and Summary	Part I of this form identifies: 1. The jurisdiction and the contact person 2. The jurisdiction's size and population 3. Specific disaster and safety planning information for the jurisdiction. Part II of this form identifies: 1. Specific known hazards within the boundaries of the jurisdiction. 2. Specific known hazards near or adjacent to the boundaries of the jurisdiction. 3. Specific facilities owned and operated by the jurisdiction. 4. Locations damaged from prior disasters or hazard causing events. 5. Information about the jurisdiction's EOC
Specific Hazards Summary	This table identifies the specific location and hazard information identified by each jurisdiction as a potential threat.
What is HAZUS?	HAZUS (Hazards U.S.) is a GIS-based software used for estimating earthquake losses based on current scientific and engineering knowledge. It was developed under a cooperative agreement by the National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) with funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). This earthquake loss estimation tool is currently in use by communities throughout the United States and provides a planning guide for jurisdictions of the potential physical and economical impact of an earthquake that has occurred in their are
Summarized HAZUS Results	Earthquake risks for each city were developed in terms of the vulnerability of the population and infrastructure and costs associated with physical and economic damages or destruction. Earthquake scenarios were used based on the major earthquake faults in the County of Riverside. Risk assessments were developed only for the cities because of the broad overlay of the special district's boundaries and the specific data available from the cities. Several of the HAZUS and GIS maps contained in Part I of the plan depict potential impact of various hazards throughout the County on the cities and special districts.
Local Jurisdiction Vulnerability Worksheet	This table is a listing of the primary hazards identified by the working groups. Each jurisdiction was asked to evaluate the potential for an event to occur in the specific area of their jurisdiction. They were also asked to evaluate the potential impact of that event on their jurisdiction. The jurisdictions were asked to use a rating of between O and 4 (4 being the most severe). The jurisdictions were then asked to rank the hazards as they relate to their jurisdiction from 1 to 19. County OES conducted an extensive evaluation of the severity and probability potential for the county as a whole and those numbers were provided to the jurisdictions as a guide. A separate table was created to address the hazards relating to agriculture and this table can be found in the Agriculture Annex section of Part I of the Plan.

Local Jurisdiction Mitigation Goals	This table is a listing of the various mitigation strategy goals developed by the working groups. Once this list was compiled, each jurisdiction was asked to prioritize that mitigation strategy based upon the needs of each jurisdiction. These were rated as High, Medium, Low, or N/A. A separate set of strategy goals were created to address the hazards relating to agriculture and this table can be found in the Agriculture Annex section of Part I of the Plan.
Local Jurisdiction Proposed Mitigation Action And Strategy Proposal	FEMA required each jurisdiction to go through the process of developing a Mitigation Strategy Proposal. The purpose of this activity\y was so that each jurisdiction became familiar with the process of determining and identifying a Mitigation Strategy Proposal. This process is used when requesting FEMA Pre-Hazard Mitigation Funds.
Development Trends Questionnaire	This questionnaire identifies specific land use and other information required by State OES and FEMA for each jurisdiction. The land use information asks for current and future data. County OES will use this data for future HAZUS assessments
Crosswalk Review	This is a State OES and FEMA document used to evaluate the contents of the entire plan and each jurisdiction's submittal of information

HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND SUMMARY WORKSHEET

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

Agency/Jurisdiction:	NORCO		
Type Agency/Jurisdiction:	City		
Contact Person: Title:			
First Name:	Bob	Last Name:	Franck
Agency Address: Street:	P.O. Box 428		
City:	Norco		
State:	CA		
Zip:	91760		
Contact Phone	951-737-8097	FAX	
E-mail	bfranck@ci.norco.ca.us		

Population Served	25,250	Square Miles Served	14

Does your organization have a general plan?	NO
Does your organization have a safety component to the general plan?	NO
What year was your plan last updated?	

Does your organization have a disaster/emergency operations plan?	YES
What year was your plan last updated?	1998
Do you have a recovery annex or section in your plan?	NO
Do you have a terrorism/WMD annex or section in your plan?	NO

DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE:

AIRPORT IN JURISDICTION	NO
AIRPORT NEXT TO JURISDICTION	YES
DAIRY INDUSTRY	YES
POULTRY INDUSTRY	YES
CROPS/ORCHARDS	NO
DAMS IN JURISDICTION	NO
DAMS NEXT TO JURISDICTION	YES
LAKE/RESERVOIR IN JURISDICTION	NO
LAKE/RESERVOIR NEAR JURISDICTION	YES
JURISDICTION IN FLOOD PLAIN	YES
CONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	YES
UNCONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	YES
EARTHQUAKE FAULTS IN JURISDICTION	NO
EARTHQUAKE FAULTS NEXT TO JURISDICTION	YES
MOBILE HOME PARKS	YES
NON-REINFORCED FREEWAY BRIDGES	NO
NON-REINFORCED BRIDGES	NO
BRIDGES IN FLOOD PLAIN	YES
BRIDGES OVER OR ACROSS RIVER/STREAM	YES
ROADWAY CROSSING RIVER/STREAM	NO
NON REINFORCED BUILDINGS	YES
FREEWAY/MAJOR HIGHWAY IN JURISDICTION	YES
FREEWAY/MAJOR HIGHWAY NEXT TO JURISDICTION	YES
FOREST AREA IN JURISDICTION	NO
FOREST AREA NEXT TO JURISDICTION	NO
WITHIN THE 50 MILES SAN ONOFRE EVACUATION ZONE	YES
MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINES IN JURISDICTION	NO
MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINES NEXT TO JURISDICTION	NO
RAILROAD TRACKS IN JURISDICTION	YES
RAILROAD TRACKS NEXT TO JURISDICTION	YES
HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITIES IN JURISDICTION	NO
HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITIES NEXT TO JURISDICTION	NO
HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITIES IN JURISDICTION	NO
HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITIES NEXT TO JURISDICTION	NO

DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION OWN OR OPERATE A FACILITY

IN A FLOOD PLAIN	NO
NEAR FLOOD PLAIN	YES
NEAR RAILROAD TRACKS	NO
NEAR A DAM	NO
UPSTREAM FROM A DAM	NO
DOWNSTREAM FROM A DAM	NO
DOWNSTREAM OF A LAKE	NO
DOWNSTREAM FROM A RESERVOIR	YES
NEAR A CONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	YES
NEAR UNCONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	YES
ON AN EARTHQUAKE FAULT	NO
NEAR AN EARTHQUAKE FAULT	YES
WITHIN THE 50 MILE SAN ONOFRE EVACUATION ZONE	YES
IN A FOREST AREA	NO
NEAR A FOREST AREA	NO
NEAR A MAJOR HIGHWAY	YES
A HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY	NO
NEAR A HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY	NO
A HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITY	NO
NEAR A HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITY	NO
NON REINFORCED BUILDINGS	NO
A MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINE	NO
NEAR A MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINE	NO

DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE ANY LOCATIONS THAT:

HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY EARTHQUAKE AND NOT REPAIRED	NO
HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY FLOOD	YES
HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY FLOOD MORE THAN ONCE	NO
HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY FOREST FIRE	NO
HAVE BEEN DAMAGED BY FOREST FIRE MORE THAN ONCE	NO
HAVE BEEN IMPACTED BY A TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT	YES
HAVE BEEN IMPACTED BY A PIPELINE EVENT	NO

EMERGENCY OPERATIONS INFORMATION

DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE AN EOC	YES
IS YOUR EOC LOCATED:	
IN A FLOOD PLAIN	NO
NEAR FLOOD PLAIN	NO
NEAR RAILROAD TRACKS	NO
NEAR A DAM	NO
UPSTREAM FROM A DAM	NO
DOWNSTREAM FROM A DAM	NO
DOWNSTREAM OF A LAKE	NO
DOWNSTREAM FROM A RESERVOIR	NO
NEAR A CONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	YES
NEAR UNCONTROLLED FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL	YES
ON AN EARTHQUAKE FAULT	NO
NEAR AN EARTHQUAKE FAULT	YES
WITHIN THE 50 MILE SAN ONOFRE EVACUATION ZONE	YES
IN A FOREST AREA	NO
NEAR A FOREST AREA	NO
NEAR A MAJOR HIGHWAY	YES
A HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY	NO
NEAR A HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY	NO
A HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITY	NO
NEAR A HAZARDOUS STORAGE FACILITY	NO
NON REINFORCED BUILDINGS	NO
A MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINE	NO
NEAR A MAJOR GAS/OIL PIPELINE	NO

OTHER FACILITY INFORMATION

ARE THERE LOCATIONS WITHIN YOUR JURISDICTION THAT:	
COULD BE CONSIDERED A TERRORIST TARGET	NO
COULD BE CONSIDERED A BIO-HAZARD RISK	NO

Jurisdiction's Critical Facility Evaluation

In December of 2001, the County of Riverside, in cooperation with local jurisdictions and agencies, developed an Emergency Response Database. This database was created so emergency planners could use the database as a planning tool as well as quickly determine the potential impact an event may have on a community, district, or specific site. During the creation of the Emergency Response Database, contributors were asked to identify critical facilities within their jurisdictions under the following sections:

- Airports
- Community Colleges
- Dams
- Schools
  - Preschools
  - Elementary Schools
  - Middle Schools
  - High Schools
- Fire Stations
- Government Buildings
- Highways
- Hospitals
- Red Cross Shelters
- Law Enforcement Facilities
- Waste Management Sites
- Reservoirs / Water tanks

For each site, the user can identify at a minimum, the address of the site, the type of structure, and the type of occupancy and site contact information.

During the creation of this Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, it was determined that the Emergency Response Database could provide vital information for this project and it would be utilized as the source for the identification of critical facilities within hazard areas. To ensure the most up-to-date data was used, all participants involved updated the critical facilities data at the beginning of the Hazard Mitigation Plan project. The critical facility list for this jurisdiction will be reviewed and updated regularly to ensure that the vulnerability of each location is evaluated on a regular basis.

Because of the sensitive nature of the data obtained through this process, address information will not be included in the identification of critical facilities for the protection of all participants.

SUMMARIZED HAZUS RESULTS

Jurisdiction: City of Norco

Scenario: M6.7 on Elsinore Fault
Epicenter in/near Southwest of Corona

Direct Economic Loss Estimates (thous. $)	
Structural Damage	$27,062.76
Non-Structural Damage	$102,891.26
Building Damage	$129,954.03
Contents Damage	$38,700.09
Inventory Loss	$1,166.44
Relocation Cost	$668.71
Income Loss	$8,079.19
Rental Income Loss	$9,060.22
Wage Loss	$6,431.83
Total Loss	$194,060.50

Commercial Casualties for Daytime Event	
Medical Aid	14
Hospital Treatment	4
Life-Threatening Severity	1
Death	2

Commuting Casualties for Daytime Event	
Medical Aid	0
Hospital Treatment	0
Life-Threatening Severity	0
Death	0

SUMMARIZED HAZUS RESULTS

Jurisdiction: City of Norco

Scenario: M6.7 on Elsinore Fault
Epicenter in/near Southwest of Corona

Educational Casualties for Daytime Event	
Medical Aid	5
Hospital Treatment	1
Life-Threatening Severity	0
Death	0

Hotels Casualties for Daytime Event	
Medical Aid	0
Hospital Treatment	0
Life-Threatening Severity	0
Death	0

Industrial Casualties for Daytime Event	
Medical Aid	12
Hospital Treatment	3
Life-Threatening Severity	0
Death	1

Other Residential Casualties for Daytime Event	
Medical Aid	6
Hospital Treatment	1
Life-Threatening Severity	0
Death	0

SUMMARIZED HAZUS RESULTS

Jurisdiction: City of Norco

Scenario: M6.7 on Elsinore Fault
Epicenter in/near Southwest of Corona

Single Family Casualties for Daytime Event	
Medical Aid	5
Hospital Treatment	1
Life-Threatening Severity	0
Death	0

Total Casualties for Daytime Event	
Medical Aid	41
Hospital Treatment	10
Life-Threatening Severity	2
Death	3

LOCAL JURISDICTION VULNERABILITY WORKSHEET

NAME: Bob Franck AGENCY : Norco DATE: 6/30/04

	COUNTY		LOCAL JURISDICTION		
HAZARD	**SEVERITY 0 - 4**	**PROBABILITY 0 - 4**	**SEVERITY 0 - 4**	**PROBABILITY 0 - 4**	**RANKING 1 - 19**
EARTHQUAKE	4	3	4	3	3
WILDLAND FIRE	3	4	3	3	4
FLOOD	3	3	4	2	6
OTHER NATURAL HAZARDS					
DROUGHT	3	3	3	1	10
LANDSLIDES	2	3	2	1	14
INSECT INFESTATION	3	4	3	1	15
EXTREME SUMMER/WINTER WEATHER	2	4	2	1	7
SEVERE WIND EVENT	3	3	3	2	9
AGRICULTURAL					
DISEASE/CONTAMINATION	3	4	3	2	1
TERRORISM	4	2	4	1	12
OTHER MAN-MADE					
PIPELINE	2	3	2	1	16
AQUEDUCT	2	3	2	0	17
TRANSPORTATION	2	4	2	1	2
BLACKOUTS	3	4	3	2	13
HAZMAT ACCIDENTS	3	3	3	2	8
NUCLEAR ACCIDENT	4	2	4	2	19
TERRORISM	4	2	4	2	18
CIVIL UNREST	2	2	2	2	11
JAIL/PRISON EVENT	1	2	1	2	5
OTHER - PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW					

LOCAL JURISDICTION MITIGATION GOALS

Please evaluate the priority level for each listed mitigation activity identified below as it relates to your jurisdiction or facility. If you have any additional mitigation activities or recommendations, please list them at the end of this document.

Place an H (High), M (Medium), L (Low), or N/A (Not Applicable) for your priority level for each activity in the box next to the activity.

EARTHQUAKE

L	Aggressive public education campaign in light of predictions
L	Generate new literature for dissemination to:
L	◊ Government employees
L	◊ Businesses
L	◊ Hotel/motel literature
L	◊ Local radio stations for education
L	◊ Public education via utilities
L	◊ Identify/create television documentary content
H	Improve the Emergency Alert System (EAS)
H	◊ Consider integration with radio notification systems
H	◊ Upgrade alerting and warning systems for hearing impaired
H	◊ Training and maintenance
M	Procure earthquake-warning devices for critical facilities
L	Reinforce emergency response facilities
N/A	Provide training to hospital staffs
H	Require earthquake gas shutoffs on remodels/new construction
M	Evaluate re-enforcing reservoir concrete bases
L	Evaluate EOCs for seismic stability
M	Install earthquake cutoffs at reservoirs
M	Install earthquake-warning devices at critical facilities
M	Develop a dam inundation plan for new Diamond Valley Reservoir
M	Earthquake retrofitting
H	◊ Bridges/dams/pipelines
H	◊ Government buildings/schools
H	◊ Mobile home parks
L	Develop educational materials on structural reinforcement and home inspections
M	Ensure Uniform Building Code compliance
M	◊ Update to current compliance when retrofitting
L	Insurance coverage on public facilities
L	Funding for non-structural abatement (Earthquake kits, etc.)
L	Pre - identify empty commercial space for seismic re-location
L	Electrical co-generation facilities need retrofitting/reinforcement (Palm Springs, others?)
L	Mapping of liquefaction zones
L	Incorporate County geologist data into planning
L	Backup water supplies for hospitals

M	Evaluate pipeline seismic resiliency
L	Pre-positioning of temporary response structures
L	Fire sprinkler ordinance for all structures
L	Evaluate adequacy of reservoir capacity for sprinkler systems
L	Training/standardization for contractors performing retrofitting
L	Website with mitigation/contractor/retrofitting information
L	◊ Links to jurisdictions
L	◊ Alerting information
L	◊ Volunteer information
L	Evaluate depths of aquifers/wells for adequacy during quakes
L	Evaluate hazmat storage regulations near faults

COMMUNICATIONS IN DISASTER ISSUES

H	Communications Interoperability
H	Harden repeater sites
H	Continue existing interoperability project
N/A	Strengthen/harden
L	Relocate
H	Redundancy
M	Mobile repeaters

FLOODS

L	Update development policies for flood plains
L	Public education on locations of flood plains
L	Develop multi-jurisdictional working group on floodplain management
L	Develop greenbelt requirements in new developments
L	Update weather pattern/flood plain maps
L	Conduct countywide study of flood barriers/channels/gates/water dispersal systems
L	Required water flow/runoff plans for new development
L	Perform GIS mapping of flood channels, etc.
L	Install vehicular crossing gates/physical barriers for road closure
M	Maintenance of storm sewers/flood channels
L	Create map of flood channels/diversions/water systems etc
L	Require digital floor plans on new non-residential construction
M	Upgrade dirt embankments to concrete
L	Conduct countywide needs study on drainage capabilities
L	Increase number of pumping stations
L	Increase sandbag distribution capacities
L	Develop pre-planned response plan for floods
M	◊ Evacuation documentation
M	◊ Re-examine historical flooding data for potential street re-design
L	Training for city/county PIOs about flood issues
L	Warning systems - ensure accurate information provided

L	◊ Publicize flood plain information (website?)
L	◊ Install warning/water level signage
L	◊ Enhanced public information
L	◊ Road closure compliance
L	◊ Shelter locations
L	◊ Pre-event communications
L	Look at County requirements for neighborhood access
L	◊ Secondary means of ingress/egress
M	Vegetation restoration programs
M	Ensure critical facilities are hardened/backed up
L	Hardening water towers
L	Terrorism Surveillance - cameras at reservoirs/dams
M	Riverbed maintenance
M	Evaluate existing lift stations for adequacy
L	Acquisition of property for on-site retention
M	Evaluate regulations on roof drainage mechanisms
M	Erosion-resistant plants
L	Traffic light protection
M	Upkeep of diversionary devices
M	Install more turn-off valves on pipelines
M	Backup generation facilities
M	Identify swift water rescue capabilities across County

WILDFIRES

H	Aggressive weed abatement program
M	◊ Networking of agencies for weed abatement
M	Develop strategic plan for forest management
M	Public education on wildfire defense
M	Encourage citizen surveillance and reporting
L	Identify hydrants with equipment ownership information
M	Enhanced fire fighting equipment
L	Fire spotter program/red flag program
L	◊ Expand to other utilities
L	Research on insect/pest mitigation technologies
L	Volunteer home inspection program
L	Public education program
L	◊ Weather reporting/alerting
M	◊ Building protection
L	◊ Respiration
L	Pre-identify shelters/recovery centers/other resources
L	Roofing materials/defensive spacing regulations
L	Community task forces for planning and education
L	Fuel/dead tree removal
L	Strategic pre-placement of fire fighting equipment
L	Establish FEMA coordination processes based on ICS

L	Brush clearings around repeaters
M	Research new technologies for identifying/tracking fires
M	Procure/deploy backup communications equipments
L	"Red Tag" homes in advance of event
L	Provide fire-resistant gel to homeowners
L	Involve insurance agencies in mitigation programs
L	Clear out abandoned vehicles from oases
H	Code enforcement
H	Codes prohibiting fireworks
H	Fuel modification/removal
L	Evaluate building codes
M	Maintaining catch basins

OTHER HAZARDS

N/A	Improve pipeline maintenance
M	Wetlands mosquito mitigation (West Nile Virus)
M	Insect control study
M	Increase County Vector Control capacities
L	General public drought awareness
L	◊ Lawn watering rotation
M	Develop County drought plan
M	Mitigation of landslide-prone areas
L	Develop winter storm sheltering plan
N/A	Ease permitting process for building transmission lines
L	Evaluate restrictions on dust/dirt/generating activities during wind seasons
N/A	Rotational crop planning/soil stabilization
N/A	Enhance agricultural checkpoint enforcement
N/A	Agriculture - funding of detection programs
L	Communications of pipeline maps (based on need to know)
H	Improved notification plan on runaway trains
M	Improve/maintain blackout notification plan.
M	Support business continuity planning for utility outages
H	Terrorism training/equipment for first responders
H	◊ Terrorism planning/coordination
M	◊ Staffing for terrorism mitigation
L	Create a SONGS regional planning group
L	◊ Include dirty bomb planning
L	Cooling stations - MOUs in place
L	Fire Ant eradication program
L	White Fly infestation abatement/eradication program
M	Develop plan for supplemental water sources
L	Public education on low water landscaping
N/A	Salton Sea desalinization
N/A	Establish agriculture security standards (focus on water supply)
M	ID mutual aid agreements

M	Vulnerability assessment on fiber-optic cable
N/A	Upgrade valves on California aqueduct
L	Public education
L	◊ Bi-lingual signs
L	◊ Blackout information
M	Notification system for rail traffic - container contents
H	Control and release of terrorism intelligence
N/A	Develop prison evacuation plan (shelter in place?)

LOCAL JURISDICTION PROPOSED MITIGATION ACTION AND STRATEGY PROPOSAL

Jurisdiction: City of Norco
Contact: Robert Franck
Phone: (951) 737-8097 Ext. 2222

MITIGATION STRATEGY INFORMATION

Proposal Name:

Santa Ana River Bottom Interface Zone Fuel Management

Proposal Location:

The northern boundary of the city from the Hamner Ave bridge east to the city limit.

Proposal Type

Place an "X" by the type of mitigation strategy (one or more may apply)

	Flood and mud flow mitigation
X	Fire mitigation
	Elevation or acquisition of repetitively damaged structures or structures in high hazard areas
	Mitigation Planning (i.e. update building codes, planning develop guidelines, etc.)
	Development and implementation of mitigation education programs
	Development or improvement of warning systems
	Additional Hazard identification and analysis in support of the local hazard mitigation plan
	Drinking and/or irrigation water mitigation
	Earthquake mitigation
	Agriculture - crop related mitigation
	Agriculture - animal related mitigation
	Flood inundation/Dam failure
	Weather/Temperature event mitigation

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED MITIGATION STRATEGY

Proposal/Event History

List any previous disaster related events (dates, costs, etc)

During the past 20 years there have been regularly recurring wildfire events in the Santa Ana River bottom north of the City of Norco. These events have required the mobilization and commitment of large firefighting forces and have resulted in the destruction and/or damage to many homes in the subject area. The most recent destructive event was on January 6, 2002 when a Santa Ana Wind driven arson fire destroyed two homes and damaged six others.

Narrative:

Give a detailed description of the need for the proposal, any history related to the proposal. List the activities necessary for its completion in the narrative section below.

An aggressive fuel management program is needed in order to maintain a reasonable defense zone against the transmission of fire from the river bottom into the City. The Army Corps of Engineers “Bluff Stabilization Proposal” provided a mineral soil buffer of approximately 100 feet from the river bottom vegetation and the base of the Norco Bluffs. Maintenance of this mineral soil buffer will provide for a dramatically reduced communication of fire from the river bottom onto the homes situated along the Norco Bluffs between the Hamner Ave bridge and the northeast border of the city.

Does your jurisdiction have primary responsibility for the proposal? If not, what agency does?

Yes	X	No		Responsible Agency:

FUNDING INFORMATION

Place an "X" by the proposed source of funding for this proposal

X	Unfunded proposal - funds are not available for the proposal at this time
	Local jurisdiction General Fund
	Local jurisdiction Special Fund (road tax, assessment fees, etc.)
	Non-FEMA Hazard Mitigation Funds
X	Local Hazard Mitigation Grant Funds - Future Request
	Hazard Mitigation Funds

YES	Has your jurisdiction evaluated this mitigation strategy to determine it's cost benefits? (i.e. has the cost of the mitigation proposal been determined to be beneficial in relationship to the potential damage or loss using the attached Cost/Benefit Analysis Sheet or another internal method)

LOCAL JURISDICTION DEVELOPMENT TRENDS QUESTIONNAIRE

JURISDICTION: **Norco**		DOES YOUR AGENCY HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LAND USE AND/OR DEVELOPMENT ISSUES WITHIN YOUR JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES? YES __X__ NO _____	
Current Population in Jurisdiction or Served	**26,000**	Projected Population in Jurisdiction or Served - in 2010	**30,000**
Current Sq Miles in Jurisdiction or Served	**14.7**	Projected Sq Miles in Jurisdiction or Served - in 2010	**14.7**
Does Your Jurisdiction have any ordinances or regulations dealing with disaster mitigation, disaster preparation, or disaster response?	**YES**	If yes, please list ordinance or regulation number.	
What is the number one land issue your agency will face in the next five years			
Approximate Number of Homes/Apts/etc.	**7,000**	Projected Number of Homes/Apts/etc.- in 2010	**8,000**
Approximate Total Residential Value		Projected Residential Total Value - in 2010	
Approximate Number of Commercial Businesses	**800**	Projected Number of Commercial Businesses - in 2010	**850**
Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in flood hazard zones	**1**	Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in flood hazard zones - in 2010	**1**
Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in earthquake hazard zones	**1**	Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in earthquake hazard zones - in 2010	**1**
Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in wildland fire hazard zones	**10**	Approximate Percentage of Homes/Apts/etc in wildland fire hazard zones - in 2010	**11**
Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in flood hazard zones	**1**	Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in flood hazard zones - in 2010	**1**
Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in earthquake hazard zones	**1**	Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in earthquake hazard zones - in 2010	**1**
Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in wildland fire hazard zones	**.5**	Approximate Percentage of Commercial Businesses in wildland fire hazard zones - in 2010	**.5**
Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in flood hazard zones	**0**	Projected Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in flood hazard zones - in 2010	**0**
Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in earthquake hazard zones	**0**	Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in earthquake hazard zones - in 2010	**0**
Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in wildland fire hazard zones.	**0**	Number of Critical Facilities in your Jurisdiction that are in wildland fire hazard zones - in 2010	**0**
Does your jurisdiction plan on participating in the County's on-going plan maintenance program every two years as described in Part I of the plan?	**YES**	If not, how will your jurisdiction do plan maintenance?	
Will a copy of this plan be available for the various planning groups within your jurisdiction for use in future planning and budgeting purposes? YES			

Supplement for all CA Local Government Jurisdictions participating in Multi-Jurisdictional, Local Hazard Mitigation Plans

Each separate jurisdiction participating in a Multi-Jurisdictional Plan, must a formally adopt the Multi-Jurisdictional Plan as their own LHMP. Even though a jurisdiction is "participating" in a multi-jurisdictional plan, EACH JURISDICTION must ensure that certain requirements of the Multi-Jurisdictional Plan have been met. Failure to do so MAY delay review and or approval of the multi-jurisdictional plan.

While each multi-jurisdictional plan must be a "stand alone" document upon completion, each jurisdiction must be aware of the information and requirements, unique to each participant, that must be provided in order for the multi-jurisdictional plan to be complete. The advantage for each local government in participating in a multi-jurisdictional plan is, among many, that most information and data (i.e. information, data, maps), may be shared by all participating jurisdictions.

The following "mini" Plan Review Crosswalk **should be completed by each participating jurisdiction** to document how and where information needed by the multi-jurisdictional planning effort, but specific to each participating jurisdiction, has been included.

Participating Jurisdiction: **Norco**	**Title/Lead Jurisdiction of Multi-Jurisdictional Plan: Riverside County OES**	**Date of Completion: September 9, 2004**
Local Point of Contact: **Bob Franck**	**Address:** **P.O. Box 428** **Norco, CA 91760**	
Title: **Emergency Services Coordinator**		
Agency: **City of Norco**		
Phone Number: (909) 737-8097	**E-Mail: bfranck@ci.norco.ca.us**	

State Reviewer:	**Title:**	**Date:**

FEMA Reviewer:	**Title:**	**Date:**

Jurisdiction's NFIP Status*			
Y	**N**	**N/A**	**CRS Class**

*** Notes: [Y] – Participating [N] - Not Participating [N/A] - Not Mapped**

SCORING SYSTEM: One of the following scores will be assigned to each of the following LHMP requirements.

N – Needs Improvement: The jurisdiction's portion of the multi-jurisdiction's plan does not meet the minimum for a plan requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The jurisdiction's portion of the multi-jurisdiction's plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite(s) (Check Applicable Box)	NOT MET	MET
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5) **AND**		
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation: §201.6(a)(3)		

Planning Process	N	S
Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b) and §201.6(c)(1)	**N/A**	**in MJP**
Local Capabilities Assessment §201.4(c)(ii) and §201.6(c)(1) (State Requirement)		

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment §201.6(c)(2)(iii)	N	S
Identifying Hazards (if applicable): §201.6(c)(2)(i)		
Profiling Hazards (if applicable): §201.6(c)(2)(i)		
Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)		
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)		
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)		
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)		

Mitigation Strategy	N	S
Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions: §201.6(c)(3)(iv)		

Plan Maintenance Process	N	S
Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan: §201.6(c)(4)(i)	**N/A**	
Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms: §201.6(c)(4)(ii)		
Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)	**N/A**	

Additional State Requirements*	N	S
See Planning Process, Local Capabilities Assessment	**N/A**	
Insert State Requirement here	**N/A**	

SUPPLEMENT STATUS

SUPPLEMENT HAS REQUIREMENTS THAT "NEED IMPROVEMENT"	

SUPPLEMENT REQUIREMENTS ARE ALL "SATISFACTORY"	

*States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE (MJP) MULTI JURISDICTIONAL PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS SCORING SYSTEM [M] MET [NM] NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) [N]--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT OR [S]--SATISFACTORY	
PREREQUISITE (S)	NOTE: The prerequisite, or prerequisites in the case of multi-jurisdictional plans, may be reviewed before, but must be met before the plan can receive final FEMA approved.			
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption	Requirement §201.6(c)(5): ***Element B & C:*** For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan must provide supporting documentation that it has been formally adopted by EACH participating jurisdiction.		[M] [NM]	
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation	**Requirement §201.6(a)(3):** Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process. ***Element A***. Where in the MJP is this jurisdiction's participation, in the MJP development, documented?	**Part I, Section 2 Page 3-7**	**M**	
PLANNING PROCESS				
Documentation of the Planning Process	***Requirement*** - IFR §201.6(b): In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process **shall** include:	N/A - Should be included in the MJP		
Local Capabilities Assessment	***Requirement*** – Section §201.4(c)(3) (ii) of the Federal Register Interim Final Rule 44 CFR Parts 201 and 206 states, "[The State mitigation strategy shall include] a general description and analysis of the effectiveness of local mitigation policies, programs, and capabilities.	See Elements A-D below.	**M**	

Local Capabilities Assessment	*Element* A: Does the plan provide a description of the human, technical and financial resources available within this jurisdiction to engage in a mitigation planning process and to develop a local hazard mitigation plan? (These resources are described in Section 2.2 of the OES LHMP Development Guide).	Part II, Norco Section	**N**	***Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.***
Local Capabilities Assessment	*Element* B: Does the plan list local mitigation funding sources (taxes, fees, assessments or fines) which affect or promote mitigation within the reporting jurisdiction?	Part II, Norco Section	**N**	***Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.***
Local Capabilities Assessment	*Element* C: Does the plan list local ordinances which affect or promote disaster mitigation, preparedness, response or recovery within the reporting jurisdiction?	PART II Norco Section, Supplemental Questionnaire	**S**	***Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.***
Local Capabilities Assessment	*Element* D: Does the plan describe the details of ongoing mitigation projects and programs within the reporting jurisdiction?	Part II, Norco Section	**S**	***Note: This information is required to complete the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.***

RISK ASSESSMENT				
Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment	Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment must assess **each jurisdiction's** risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area. It should be noted that the Vulnerability Assessments are almost always unique to each jurisdiction (EXAMPLE: For a county based MJP, a school district's vulnerability to a hazard is different than the city that it is in, and the city will have different vulnerabilities than that of the overall planning area (county).	Part I Flooding Pages 41 – 53 Earthquakes Pages 54 – 66 Weather Pages 67 – 76 Landslides Pages 77 – 80 Hazmat incidents Pages 94 – 101 Transportation Incidents Pages 102 – 110 Rail line emergencies Pages 102 – 110 Blackout Pages 115 – 118 Toxic pollution Pages 119 – 124 Terrorism Pages 135 – 139 Part II, Norco Section	**S**	
	Were unique Hazards & Hazard Profiles Included from this jurisdiction?	**Yes** Yes, Part II, Norco Section	**S**	
	Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)	Part 1, Pages 19-139	**S**	
	Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)	Part 1, Pages 19-139	**S**	*Note: This information must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.*
	Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)	Part 1, Pages 19-139	**S**	*Note: This information must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.*

	Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)	Part 1, Pages 24-27 & PART II Norco Supplemental Questionnaire	**S**	*Note: This information must be covered. However, a "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.*
MITIGATION STRATEGY				
Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): For multi-jurisdictional plans, there must be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan. (That is, Does the plan include at least one identifiable action item for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?)	Yes, Part II, Norco Section	**N**	
PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS				
Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms	Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms.	Part I, Page 143	**S**	
	Has this jurisdiction included a process by which the local government will incorporate the requirements in other plans, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate?	Part I, Page 143	**S**	
ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS	See Planning Process – Local Capabilities Assessment for an additional State & Local Planning Requirement.	Part I, Page 143	**S**	