1. CITY OF GARDEN CITY

1.1 LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING TEAM

Primary Point of Contact
Jenah Thornborrow, Development Services Director
6015 N Glenwood
Garden City, ID 83714
Telephone: (208) 472-2924
e-mail Address: jthorn@gardencityidaho.org

Alternate Point of Contact
Colin Schmidt, Public Works Director
6015 N Glenwood
Garden City, ID 83714
Telephone: (208) 472-2949
e-mail Address: cschmidt@gardencityidaho.org

This annex was developed by the local hazard mitigation planning team, whose members are listed in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1. Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Team Members

Name	Title
Colin Schmidt	Public Works Director
Jenah Thornborrow	Development Services Director
Kena Champion	Development Services Administrative Assistant

1.2 JURISDICTION PROFILE

1.2.1 Location and Features

Garden City is nestled between Boise, Meridian, and Eagle lining the north and south banks of the Boise River. City elevations range from 2,550 feet to 2,698 feet, with an average of 2,620.9 feet. Garden City spans over the townships, sections, and ranges; 3N2E05 to 06, 4N1E14, 4N1E23 to 26, 4N1E36, 4N2E19, and 4N2E30 to 32.

Garden City has an average temperature of 52.0ºF and receives an average of 12.19 inches of annual precipitation since 1865. Summers are typically warm to hot and dry averaging 71.9ºF for June, July, and August since 1865. Winters are generally cold and dry with occasional snow showers averaging 32.5ºF for December, January, and February since 1865. Spring and Fall are both mild with light precipitation averaging 51.0ºF for March, April, and May and 52.3ºF for September, October, and November since 1865.

1.2.2 History

Garden City was incorporated on May 22, 1949. The history of Garden City is tied to the Boise River which runs the length of the city. Native Americans camped on the riverbanks. The higher ground, known as “Government

Working Draft

Island," was first a temporary military camp and later used by the U.S. Cavalry for pastures. The river often flooded the entire city area to the bench and deposited silt that created the rich agricultural soil.

During the 1920s, Thomas Jefferson Davis bought Government Island for agricultural use. Chinese farmed the area in small gardens, providing produce for residents and miners. Over time, the Chinese were forced out and by the 1940s just two families remained in the area. However, the legacy of the Chinese remains in the name of the city, which is derived from their gardens, and Chinden Boulevard, which was named in a contest, is derived from the "Chinese Garden."

The "Village of Garden City" was incorporated in 1949 primarily for gambling. The "original townsite" encompassed 100 acres, including the area from 32nd to 37th streets. Before 1949, the area was unincorporated Ada County land. Developers had a vision for duplex housing and filed a subdivision with 50- by 150-foot lots along Chinden and 100- by 300-foot commercial lots. The streets were numbered in different directions to distinguish the area from Boise.

Gambling proceeds made Garden City a boomtown. The next year, annexations doubled the population of the village to approximately 800. Gambling provided funding for sewer, water, and street lighting. Gambling was outlawed by the state Legislature in 1953, and Garden City was expected to go away. Boise coveted Garden City's liquor license revenues and there were several attempts at disincorporation. But in 1967, the village was chartered as a city. Much of the development of Garden City over the next few decades was a result of few land-use regulations or oversite.

In 2006 there was a large planning effort in the form of a new comprehensive plan and subsequent supportive zoning. This effort garnered considerable public support and supported a revisioning of the city.

The city has grown to incorporate roughly 4 square land miles from the Boise Bench on the south State Street on the north and Horseshoe Bend Road/ Branstetter Road on the west. The city is essentially built out but is in the process of infill development. While at one time the City had a sordid reputation, the City is becoming increasingly popular and is of the highest valued property in the valley.

1.2.3 Governing Body Format

Garden City is governed by a Mayor and four City Council members. There is a Planning and Zoning Commission, Library Board, and Design Review Committee with certain decision-making abilities. Recommending bodies include the Planning and Zoning Commission, Design Review Committee, and Parks and Waterways Committee.

The City Council is responsible for the adoption of this plan, the effected city departments are responsible for its implementation.

1.3 CURRENT TRENDS

1.3.1 Population

According to COMPASS, the population of Garden City as of April 2021 was 12,570. Since 2011, the population has grown at an average annual rate of 1.3 percent.

Working Draft

1.3.2 Development

Garden City sees a mix of commercial and residential uses. There is diversity in the residential stock of housing ranging from affordable to higher-end homes. Traditionally due to lenient zoning standards, much of the nonresidential uses were industrial, and much of the housing in the eastern portion of the city was in mobile/ manufactured home parks. The developments north of the river and west of Glenwood are newer and mostly built with commercial uses that enjoy heavy automobile use along the arterials, with residential subdivisions on slightly larger lots that reflect a suburban character with curvilinear streets and cul-de-sacs.

Garden City has an enviable location. It is adjacent to the Boise River, is linked with major transportation arterials, and is close to downtown Boise, the commercial center of the Treasure Valley. While there is very little property available for greenfield development, many properties are under-utilized and ideal for infill development. As the valley continues to spread out and vehicle commuting becomes more difficult, and as trends continue to favor more compact development with a mix of uses, Garden City will continue to become even more desirable. Considering these factors, Garden City provides a market for the redevelopment of under-utilized properties.

Garden City is seeing fewer industrial uses. As the valley grows the housing types are shifting where the city is redeveloping. Many of the properties that were previously mobile/manufactured home communities are being redeveloped. Garden City continues to see an increase in mixed-use development, particularly artisans and small businesses, and increasing residential densities.

Identifying previous and future development trends are achieved through a comprehensive review of permitting since completion of the previous plan and in anticipation of future development. Tracking previous and future growth in potential hazard areas provides an overview of increased exposure to a hazard within a community. Table 1-2 summarizes development trends in the performance period since the preparation of the previous hazard mitigation plan, as well as expected future development trends.

Table 1-2. Recent and Expected Future Development Trends

Criterion		Response
Has your jurisdiction annexed any land since the preparation of the previous hazard mitigation plan?		Yes
If yes, give the estimated area annexed and estimated number of parcels or structures.	6.4 acres vacant at time of annexation. Anticipated to contain 24 lots.	
Is your jurisdiction expected to annex any areas during the performance period of this plan?		This is market driven
If yes, describe land areas and dominant uses.	TBD	
If yes, who currently has permitting authority over these areas?	If annexed, Garden City	
Are any areas targeted for development or major redevelopment in the next five years?		The city is seeing infill development throughout the City.
If yes, briefly describe, including whether any of the areas are in known hazard risk areas	Flood Hazard risks are anticipated to affect 74% of the City.	

Working Draft

Criterion						Response
How many permits for new construction were issued in your jurisdiction since the preparation of the previous hazard mitigation plan?		**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**
	Single Family	57	67	33	14	43
	Multi-Family	__	__	1	3	12
	Other	7	7	2	3	11
	Total	64	74	36	20	66
Provide the number of new-construction permits for each hazard area or provide a qualitative description of where development has occurred.	• Special Flood Hazard Areas: There have been 105 permits issued in the floodplain during between 2016-2020. • Landslide: 0 • High Liquefaction Areas: 0 • Tsunami Inundation Area: 0 • Wildfire Risk Areas: 0					
Describe the level of buildout in the jurisdiction, based on your jurisdiction's buildable lands inventory. If no such inventory exists, provide a qualitative description.	Garden City is predominantly infill development					

1.4 CAPABILITY ASSESSMENT

This section describes an assessment of existing capabilities for implementing hazard mitigation strategies. The introduction at the beginning of this volume of the hazard mitigation plan describes the components included in the capability assessment and their significance for hazard mitigation planning.

Findings of the capability assessment were reviewed to identify opportunities to expand, initiate or integrate capabilities to further hazard mitigation goals and objectives. Where such opportunities were identified and determined to be feasible, they are included in the action plan. The "Analysis of Mitigation Actions" table in this annex identifies these as community capacity-building mitigation actions. The findings of the assessment are presented as follows:

- An assessment of planning and regulatory capabilities is presented in Table 1-3.
- Development and permitting capabilities are presented in Table 1-4.
- An assessment of fiscal capabilities is presented in Table 1-5.
- An assessment of administrative and technical capabilities is presented in Table 1-6.
- An assessment of education and outreach capabilities is presented in Table 1-7.
- Information on National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) compliance is presented in Table 1-8.
- Classifications under various community mitigation programs are presented in Table 1-9.

Working Draft

Table 1-3. Planning and Regulatory Capability

	Local Authority	Other Jurisdiction Authority	State Mandated	Integration Opportunity ?
Codes, Ordinances, & Requirements				
Building Code	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Comment: Title 7 of Garden City Code currently adopts the 2018 International Building Code and International Residential Code. This is updated on a three year cycle following the State of Idaho's requirements . North Ada County Fire and Rescue District is responsible for implementing the fire code, which is also required to be updated on a three year cycle following the State of Idaho's requirements.				
Zoning Code	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Comment: Title 8 of Garden City Code. Title 8 is reviewed on a biannual basis.				
Subdivisions	Yes	No	Yes	No
Comment: Title 8-5 of Garden City Code. Title 8 is reviewed on a biannual basis.				
Stormwater Management	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: Garden City complies with the requirements as per EPA requirements in NPDES, and Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR) requirements				
Post-Disaster Recovery	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: Garden City participates in regional planning for mitigation, preparation and recovery through Ada County City Emergency Management (ACEM)				
Real Estate Disclosure	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: This is part of the Floodplain management are required to remain in compliance with FEMA requirements				
Growth Management	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: Garden City creates and maintains a Comprehensive Plan to manage growth. Garden City has also adopted the COMPASS CIM projections.				
Site Plan Review	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: Garden City conducts a site inspections to ensure compliance with City regulations and codes at the time of redevelopment and through code enforcement actions.				
Environmental Protection	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: Title 6 of Garden City Code Last Update 2015				
Flood Damage Prevention	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: Titles 7 and 8 of Garden City Code				
Emergency Management	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: *Police Department*				
Climate Change	No	No	No	NA
Comment:				
Other	No	No	No	NA
Comment:				
Planning Documents				
General Plan	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Is the plan equipped to provide linkage to this mitigation plan? *No*				
Comment: Garden City creates and maintains a Comprehensive Plan. Amended 2021				

Working Draft

	Local Authority	Other Jurisdiction Authority	State Mandated	Integration Opportunity ?
Capital Improvement Plan	Yes	No	No	Yes
How often is the plan updated? *Annually* ***Comment:*** Garden City has a Capital Improvement Plan that ensures infrastructure is being maintained and replaced to maintain optimal performance. The Garden City Capital Improvements List covers water and sewer infrastructure as well as parks and pathways. This plan is updated on an annual basis.				
Disaster Debris Management Plan	Yes	Yes	No	No
Comment: *Work with ACEM*				
Floodplain or Watershed Plan	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Comment: The Ada County All Hazards Mitigation Plan-update is the floodplain management plan of record for all communities within the planning area that participate in the CRS program.				
Stormwater Plan	Yes	Yes	No	No
Comment: Garden City complies with the requirements as per EPA requirements in NPDES				
Urban Water Management Plan	No	Yes	No	No
Comment:				
Habitat Conservation Plan	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Comment: Under Title 36 of the Idaho State Statues Garden City defers to Idaho Fish and Game to ensure wildlife preservations and wetland preservation areas- BREN, Boise River Enhancement Network has adopted the Boise River Enhancement Plan.				
Economic Development Plan	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Comment: Garden City has established a Comprehensive Plan, Capital Improvement, and is also incorporated in the Boise Valley Economic Plan				
Shoreline Management Plan	No	No	No	NA
Comment:				
Community Wildfire Protection Plan	No	Yes	No	Yes
Comment: *The 2017 Ada County Multi-hazard Mitigation Plan is being developed to be a qualifying CWPP for the Ada County planning area*				
Forest Management Plan	No	No	No	NA
Comment:				
Climate Action Plan	No	No	No	NA
Comment:				
Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: *Work with ACEM*				
Threat & Hazard Identification & Risk Assessment (THIRA)	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: ACEM Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, Ada County THIRA 2015				
Post-Disaster Recovery Plan	No	No	No	Yes
Comment:				
Continuity of Operations Plan	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: *Work with ACEM*				
Public Health Plan	No	Yes	No	No
Comment: *Central District Health Department Emergency Operations Plan, 2013*				

Working Draft

	Local Authority	Other Jurisdiction Authority	State Mandated	Integration Opportunity ?
Other	Yes	No	No	Yes
Comment: ACEM Ada County Flood Response Plan. Adopted: January, 2006 Ada County Mass Casualty Incident Plan. Adopted: 12/16/2010 Ada County HAZMAT Response Plan. Adopted: April 2011 Ada County Wildfire Response Plan. Adopted: May 2010				

Table 1-4. Development and Permitting Capability

Criterion	Response
Does your jurisdiction issue development permits? ***If no, who does? If yes, which department?*** Development Services	Yes
Does your jurisdiction have the ability to track permits by hazard area?	No
Does your jurisdiction have a buildable lands inventory?	No

Table 1-5. Fiscal Capability

Financial Resource	Accessible or Eligible to Use?
Community Development Block Grants	Yes
Capital Improvements Project Funding	Yes
Authority to Levy Taxes for Specific Purposes	No
User Fees for Water, Sewer, Gas or Electric Service ***If yes, specify:*** Monthly Water/sewer base rate	Yes
Incur Debt through General Obligation Bonds	Yes
Incur Debt through Special Tax Bonds	No
Incur Debt through Private Activity Bonds	No
Withhold Public Expenditures in Hazard-Prone Areas	No
State-Sponsored Grant Programs	No
Development Impact Fees for Homebuyers or Developers	No

Working Draft

Table 1-6. Administrative and Technical Capability

Staff/Personnel Resource	Available?
Planners or engineers with knowledge of land development and land management practices ***If Yes, Department /Position:*** Development Services/Garden City/ Planning Staff/ City Engineer	Yes
Engineers or professionals trained in building or infrastructure construction practices ***If Yes, Department /Position:*** Public Works/Garden City/ Water, Sewer, and Engineering Staff	Yes
Planners or engineers with an understanding of natural hazards ***If Yes, Department /Position:*** Public Works and Development Services/Garden City/ Staff	Yes
Staff with training in benefit/cost analysis ***If Yes, Department /Position:***	No
Surveyors ***If Yes, Department /Position:*** Public Works/Garden City/Engineer	Yes
Personnel skilled or trained in GIS applications ***If Yes, Department /Position:***	No
Scientist familiar with natural hazards in local area ***If Yes, Department /Position:***	No
Emergency manager ***If Yes, Department /Position:*** ACEM/Ada County/Director of ACEM	Yes
Grant writers ***If Yes, Department /Position:***	No
Other	

Table 1-7. Education and Outreach Capability

Criterion	Response
Do you have a public information officer or communications office?	Mayor
Do you have personnel skilled or trained in website development?	No
Do you have hazard mitigation information available on your website? ***If yes, briefly describe:*** gardencityidaho.org	Yes
Do you use social media for hazard mitigation education and outreach? ***If yes, briefly describe:*** ACEM website and floodplain page	Yes
Do you have any citizen boards or commissions that address issues related to hazard mitigation? ***If yes, briefly describe:***	No
Do you have any other programs in place that could be used to communicate hazard-related information? ***If yes, briefly describe:*** Social Media, emergency broadcasting, geo Notify	Yes
Do you have any established warning systems for hazard events? ***If yes, briefly describe:*** Code Red/ISAWS – residents may sign up to receive emergency notifications and critical community alerts. Both systems are IPAWS enabled and may additionally access that integrated system for public warnings.	Yes

Table 1-8. National Flood Insurance Program Compliance

Criterion	Response
What local department is responsible for floodplain management?	Development Services
Who is your floodplain administrator? (department/position)	Development Services Director
Are any certified floodplain managers on staff in your jurisdiction?	No
What is the date that your flood damage prevention ordinance was last amended?	2020
Does your floodplain management program meet or exceed minimum requirements? ***If exceeds, in what ways?***	Exceed
When was the most recent Community Assistance Visit or Community Assistance Contact?	2018 visit/ annual contact via audit
Does your jurisdiction have any outstanding NFIP compliance violations that need to be addressed? ***If so, state what they are.***	No
Are any RiskMAP projects currently underway in your jurisdiction? ***If so, state what they are.***	No
Do your flood hazard maps adequately address the flood risk within your jurisdiction? ***If no, state why.*** Flooding will not adhere to a model. There will be debris, etc. Irrigation structures are not included in model.	No
Does your floodplain management staff need any assistance or training to support its floodplain management program? ***If so, what type of assistance/training is needed?*** Ongoing	Yes
Does your jurisdiction participate in the Community Rating System (CRS)? ***If yes, is your jurisdiction interested in improving its CRS Classification?*** Yes ***If no, is your jurisdiction interested in joining the CRS program?***	Yes
How many flood insurance policies are in force in your jurisdiction?[a] ***What is the insurance in force?*** $154,376,100 ***What is the premium in force?*** $357,956	521
How many total loss claims have been filed in your jurisdiction?[a] ***What were the total payments for losses?*** $44,557	18

a. According to FEMA statistics as of March 31, 2021

Table 1-9. Community Classifications

	Participating?	Classification	Date Classified
FIPS Code	No	1600129620	N/A
DUNS #	Yes	169195369	N/A
Community Rating System	Yes	8	2013
Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule	No	10 (not participating)	N/A
Public Protection	Yes	3/8/9 (NACFR)	N/A
Storm Ready	Yes	Blue	N/A
Firewise	No	N/A	N/A

Internal Draft

1.5 INTEGRATION REVIEW

For hazard mitigation planning, "integration" means that hazard mitigation information is used in other relevant planning mechanisms, such as general planning and capital facilities planning, and that relevant information from those sources is used in hazard mitigation. This section identifies where such integration is already in place, and where there are opportunities for further integration in the future. Resources listed at the end of this annex were used to provide information on integration. The progress reporting process described in Volume 1 of the hazard mitigation plan will document the progress of hazard mitigation actions related to integration and identify new opportunities for integration.

1.5.1 Existing Integration

Some level of integration has already been established between local hazard mitigation planning and the following other local plans and programs:

- **Comprehensive Plan**—Goal 5: Focus on the River, Goal 7: Connect the City; Goal 8: Maintain a Safe City; Goal 9: Develop a Sustainable City; Goal 10: Plan for the Future Goal 11: Serve the City and the future Land Use Map integrate the goals and recommendation of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- **Comprehensive Plan**—Parks and Waterway Plan and Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- **Master Parks and Pathways Plan**—The Master Parks and Waterways Plan seeks to preserve floodplain as a high priority for park land acquisition. Utilizing parks for drainage is also addressed in the plan.

1.5.2 Opportunities for Future Integration

The capability assessment presented in this annex indicates opportunities to integrate this mitigation plan with other jurisdictional planning/regulatory capabilities. Capabilities were identified as integration opportunities if they can support or enhance the actions identified in this plan or be supported or enhanced by components of this plan. The capability assessment identified the following plans and programs that do not currently integrate hazard mitigation information but provide opportunities to do so in the future:

- **Zoning Code**—The City is conducting a comprehensive update to its zoning code. Additional mitigation and abatement measures may be considered for incorporation into the code.
- **Capital Improvement Projects**—Capital improvement project proposals may take into consideration hazard mitigation potential as a means of evaluating project prioritization.

Taking action to integrate each of these programs with the hazard mitigation plan was considered as a mitigation action to include in the action plan presented in this annex.

1.6 RISK ASSESSMENT

1.6.1 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History

Table 1-10 lists past occurrences of natural hazards for which specific damage was recorded in this jurisdiction Other hazard events that broadly affected the entire planning area, including this jurisdiction, are listed in the risk assessments in Volume 1 of this hazard mitigation plan.

Working Draft

Table 1-10. Past Natural Hazard Events

Type of Event	FEMA Disaster #	Date	Damage Assessment
COVID-19 Pandemic	DR-4534	January 20, 2020, and continuing	$7,223,399 noted for State of Idaho. This caused medical illnesses, loss of life, economic impacts due to loss of work.
Weather- Heat	N/A	Summer 2021	18 days of over 100 degrees reaching to 107 on July 6, 2021.
Weather- Rain	N/A	August 1, 2021	
Weather- Heat	N/A	Summer 2020	11 days of over 100 degrees reaching to 105 on July 30, 2020.
Earthquake	N/A	March 31, 2020	6.5 magnitude near Stanley, Idaho Personal property damages.
Weather- Heat	N/A	Summer 2018	11 days of over 100 degrees reaching to 110 on August 10, 2018.
Weather- Heat		Summer 2017	8 days of over 100 degrees.
Flooding	DR-4342	March 29-June 15, 2017	$3,341,756 noted for all areas affected. Garden City specifically had flooding resulting in some minor damages to the private property. There were scouring of greenbelt paths, removal of a bridge, and considerable resources to monitoring, emergency prevention (sandbagging, etc.)
Weather- Snow	N/A	December 2016- March 2017	Local emergency declarations. 39" of snow Regionally, millions in claims related to structural damages.
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	August 22, 2013	
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	August 6, 2012	
Flood	N/A	May 8, 2012	$540,000 (including ACHD and Ada County)
Water Main Break at Remington Street	N/A	April 1, 2012	$500,000
Weather- Wind	N/A	March 29, 2009	$33,000
Weather- Hail	N/A	August 6, 2009	
Weather- Hail	N/A	May 20, 2008	
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	September 4, 2007	
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	June 29, 2006	
Weather- Hail	N/A	June 13, 2006	
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	May 19, 2004	

Type of Event	FEMA Disaster #	Date	Damage Assessment
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	August 31, 2004	
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	August 21, 2004	
Weather- Hail	N/A	June 29, 2004	
Weather- Hail	N/A	May 18, 2004	
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	January 30, 2004	
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	May 30, 2003	
Weather- Heat	N/A	Summer 2003	20 days of over 100 degrees
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	July 26, 2002	
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	July 22, 2002	
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	July 14, 2002	
Weather- Thunderstorm	N/A	February 7, 2002	
Weather- Hail	N/A	May 16, 2000	
	N/A	September 1998	$38,000
Weather- Storm	N/A	April 1998	$20,000
Flood	N/A	September 1997	$57,000
Flood	N/A	March 7, 1997	$50,000,000
Flood	N/A	January 1997	$65,000,000
Weather-Lightning	N/A	July 1995	$5,000
Weather-Storm	N/A	April 27, 1995	$50,000
Weather-Snow	N/A	November 1992	$9,800.00
Weather-Wind	N/A	October 1992	$6,250.00
Flood	N/A	August 1992	$4,545
Drought	N/A	1987-1992	$500,000,000
Weather-Storm	N/A	January 1988	$8,700
Weather-Wind	N/A	July 1987	$10,000
Flooding	N/A	February 1986	$20,000
Weather- Snow	N/A	Winter 1985-1986	39.5” of snow
Earthquake	N/A	October 1983	$4,000,000
Flood	N/A	June 1983	$147,000
Weather- Snow	N/A	Winter 1983-1984	37.4” of snow
Weather- Wind	N/A	June 1981	$50,000
Weather-Wind	N/A	March 1981	$36,000
Flood	N/A	January 1979	$50,000
Weather- Rain Flooding	DR-186	December 31, 1964	
Flood	DR-120	February 14, 1963	
Flood	DR-116	June 26, 1961	
Flood	DR-76	May 27, 1957	
Flood	DR-55	April 21, 1956	
Weather- Snow	N/A	Winter 1948-1949	45.4” of snow
Weather- Snow	N/A	Winter 1929-1930	48.8” of snow

Not for Sale

Type of Event	FEMA Disaster #	Date	Damage Assessment
Weather- Snow	N/A	Winter 1916-1917	50" of snow

1.6.2 Hazard Risk Ranking

Table 1-11 presents a local ranking of all hazards of concern for which this hazard mitigation plan provides complete risk assessments. As described in detail in Volume 1, the ranking process involves an assessment of the likelihood of occurrence for each hazard, along with its potential impacts on people, property, and the economy. Mitigation actions target hazards with high and medium rankings.

Table 1-11. Hazard Risk Ranking

Rank	Hazard	Risk Ranking Score	Risk Category
1	Flood	48	High
2	Extreme Weather	24	Medium
3	Dam/Canal Failure	18	Medium
4	Earthquake	16	Medium
5	Wildfire	12	Low
6	Drought	9	Low
7	Landslide	3	Low

1.6.3 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities

Volume 1 of this hazard mitigation plan provides complete risk assessments for each identified hazard of concern. This section provides information on a few key vulnerabilities for this jurisdiction. Available jurisdiction-specific risk maps of the hazards are provided at the end of this annex.

Repetitive Loss Properties

Repetitive loss records are as follows:

- Number of FEMA-identified Repetitive-Loss Properties: 1
- Number of FEMA-identified Severe-Repetitive-Loss Properties: N/A
- Number of Repetitive-Loss Properties or Severe-Repetitive-Loss Properties that have been mitigated: N/A

Other Noted Vulnerabilities

The following jurisdiction-specific issues have been identified based on a review of the results of the risk assessment, public involvement strategy, and other available resources:

- Flood - With an estimated 74% of Garden City located in the 100-year floodplain, flooding from the Lower Boise River is the city's highest risk because of the probability of anticipated flooding. Many structures were constructed before being designated in the floodplain and are lower than the anticipated base flood elevation. Aging and compact water and sewer infrastructure could increase water or sewer failure or contamination during flooding. This hazard forms safety and health concerns during and after the flood. There may be a loss of water, sewer, electrical, or gas services. Garden City has vital evacuation routes through the city with a small police department. The police department will have to manage the city's evacuation and much of the surrounding municipalities' evacuation moving through

Working Draft

Garden City. Being a small city with limited resources may result in a prolonged recovery period, especially for the vulnerable populations east of Glenwood Street.

- Flood - Settlers Canal is at a higher elevation than the city. If the canal is not adequately maintained, it could pose a flood threat. This threat is not identified in the FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA).

- Flooding - The ITD system through Garden City, for the most part, does not have a drainage system. The ACHD drainage system is undersized. ACHD and ITD roadway drainage could cause flooding in Garden City if the drainage system is lacking, undersized, or not maintained. Since 2002 there have been 7 flash floods in Ada County, with an identified $10,000 of damages. The impervious nature of urbanization exacerbates this risk. It is anticipated that the one repetitive loss of property in Garden City is due to inadequate street drainage.

- Air Quality, Wildfire - While the direct risk of wildfires is low, the air quality associated with the wildfires in other areas of Idaho and nearby states creates an air quality concerns for Garden City. From 2017-2021 there have been 199 days of impacted air quality of moderate/yellow category (AQI 51+) or above due to wildfires.

- Air Quality, Inversion - The air quality associated with the inversion is a vulnerability for Garden City. The inversion is generally during the winter months when low cloud formations and fog create dense air and traps air pollutants on the valley floor. From 2017-2021 there have been 234 days of impacted air quality of moderate/yellow category (AQI 51+) or above due to the inversion.

- Weather, Snow - There is a correlation between the heavy snow years and the flood years; there is also a direct vulnerability associated with each snow event. There are increased accidents and increased strain on the utility systems used to heat. In heavy snow years, the region has inadequate snow removal capabilities that limit access to goods, services, employment, and medical or emergency services.

- Weather, Heat - 7 of the top 10 hottest summers in the Boise-wide area have been in the last 20 years (up to and including 2021). High heat can affect the air quality, and ancillary conditions result in health concerns. The heat can reduce outdoor activities resulting in economic impacts on private industries. Over strain on the utilities, particularly electricity and water, during these heat events is a vulnerability. Over-taxation of the electrical system can cause failure. Over-taxation on water systems could result in adverse effects on potable water.

- All Hazards - Access to power is imperative in weather events for life safety and needed in all hazardous events. There is an increased need for electrical resiliency. Recent growth trends have resulted in more people utilizing the electrical system. Additionally, there may be an increased need in addition to the growing population. For example, with the cost of gasoline prices increasing and the availability of electric cars, it is anticipated that there may be a shift in energy sources for vehicles. From May 4, 2017, to April 29, 2022, in Garden City, there have been 1,386 electrical power outages resulting in 703,490.4 customer hours of outages (the number of customers affected by each outage X the hours of each outage). An estimated 43% of the outages were identified as events related to conflicts from infrastructure being above ground. The events include outages related to weather events such as lightning or that cause ice loading or wind/ vegetation damage, animals or other foreign objects like balloons or kites, vandalism, and vehicular collisions. Events that are not considered to be due to the system being above ground might include planned maintenance, operator error, underground facility damage, corrosion, contamination, mechanical fail, improper installation, hardware fail, or unknown causes. Downed power lines increase the risk of electrocution.

Working Draft

- All Hazards - The evacuation routes are limited due to infrastructure and geography. Many of the roadways, especially the eastern portion of the city where there is an area of persistent poverty, are not designed to facilitate movement except for those in automobiles. Not all residents have access to personal vehicles. Moreover, Chinden, the principal evacuation route, is inadequate for non-vehicular mobility purposes. Chinden does not accommodate bike lanes, has few and unsafe crossings, irregular sidewalks, and uncontrolled access points. Additionally, many residents or businesses utilize Boise in their addressing. This could be confusing during an emergency response.

Mitigation actions addressing these issues were prioritized for consideration in the action plan presented in this annex.

1.7 STATUS OF PREVIOUS PLAN ACTIONS

Table 1-12 summarizes the actions that were recommended in the previous version of the hazard mitigation plan and their implementation status at the time this update was prepared.

Table 1-12. Status of Previous Plan Actions

Action Item from Previous Plan	Completed	Removed; No Longer Feasible	Carried Over to Plan Update: Check if Yes	Carried Over to Plan Update: Action # in Update
Action GC-1—Green Infrastructure Flood Mitigation—Garden City needs a plan that identify strategic locations for alternate flood mitigation efforts, with an emphasis on green infrastructure to reduce floodplain and anticipated Base Flood Elevations. An example of such an effort may be identifying a location for an engineered parkland that is utilized to provide additional floodplain capacity and groundwater recharge.	_	_	X	GC-7
Comment: *In Process. Garden City has entered into an agreement with USACE for a GI study*				
Action GC-2—Levees Analysis Levee Analysis—There are a number of unaccredited levees in Garden City. Garden City needs an inventory of levees to determine condition and viability of the levees in Garden City and their hydraulic significance. If any of the levees could be hydrologically significant; include a cost estimate and a cost benefit analysis of accrediting or provisionally accrediting each levee, and the sustainability of required maintenance.	_	_	X	GC8
Comment: *In Process. Garden City has entered into an agreement with USACE for a GI study*				
Action GC-3—Water and Sewer Pipe replacement	_	_	X	GC-9
Comment: *Public Works continues with sewer and water pipe replacements.*				
Action GC-4—Maintain good standing under the National Flood Insurance Program by implementing programs that meet or exceed the minimum NFIP requirements. Such programs include but are not limited to: enforcing an adopted flood damage prevention ordinance, participating in floodplain mapping updates, and providing public assistance and information on floodplain requirements and impacts.			✓	GC-4
Comment: *Ongoing. The City adopted a FEMA approved flood hazard ordinance with higher regulatory standards and revised special flood hazard area maps (SFHA) June of 2020. The city continues to provide public assistance and information on its website, in the Garden City Library, and on requested basis through the Development Services Department. The city intends on continuing to adopt any necessary amendments to the flood hazard code, updated SFHA maps, and provide assistance.*				

Do Not Use / Draft

Action Item from Previous Plan	Completed	Removed; No Longer Feasible	Carried Over to Plan Update: Check if Yes	Carried Over to Plan Update: Action # in Update
Action GC-5—Continue to maintain/enhance the City's classification under the Community Rating System (CRS)			X	GC-10
Comment: *Ongoing. The city had a five-year cycle visit March of 2022. The materials provided at the cycle visit include additional activities the code adopted in 2020 includes enhanced higher regulatory standards. Following, the city requested a reduction in the classification during this visit. The results have not been received at this time. Regardless if there is a reduction in the classification the city will endeavor to maintain it's classification under the CRS.*				
Action GC-6—Where appropriate, support retrofitting, purchase, or relocation of structures located in hazard-prone areas to protect structures from future damage, with properties with exposure to repetitive losses as a priority.			✓	GC-1
Action GC-7—Integrate Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan into the Garden City Comprehensive Plan.	✓			GC-2
Comment: *Adopted by reference in the Comprehensive Plan on July 22, 2019. This will be updated to carry over.*				
Action GC-8—Establish emergency preparedness inventory with inspection and replacement plan			X	GC-11
Comment: *On going. Equipment is inventoried. The backup generators have monthly testing and inspection. Further replacement plans will be needed as the equipment ages.*				
Action GC-9—Maintain Capital Improvement Plan for capital facilities/infrastructure within the City.			X	GC-12
Comment: *On going. The City maintains a CIP for capital infrastructure within the City. This plan is updated annually.*				
Action GC-10—Consider appropriate higher regulatory standards that prevent or reduce risk to the built environment from the known hazards of concern	X			
Comment: *Garden City has adopted higher regulatory standards through the flood hazard ordinance in June of 2020.*				
Action GC-11—Support County-wide initiatives			X	*GC-13*
Comment: *On going.*				
Action GC-12—Continuing of Operations Plan			X	GC-14
Action GC-13—EOP Emergency Operations Plan			X	GC-15
Comment: *Adopted RES1013-16 on June 27, 2016. Annual Reviews are required.*				
Action GC-14—Recovery Plan	_	X		
Comment: *A recovery plan is likely largely based on the funding that is available after a disaster. Funding often is very specific. The city intends on maintaining a fund balance.*				
Action GC-15—Garden City Parks security camera installation	_	_	X	GC-16
Comment: *The parks security cameras have been installed. Additional cameras will be installed as funding allows. There are trees and vegetation that are removed along the banks of the Boise River. Additional cameras may be appropriate along the river.*				
Action GC-16—Streetlight replacement/conversion to alternative energy streetlights	_	_	X	GC-17
Action GC-17—Acquisition of vulnerable property for use as parks.	_	_	X	GC-7
Comment: *The city has been in contact with Ada County requesting that Lady Bird Park be relocated to be adjacent to the river so that it can be constructed to provide flood conveyance and potentially naturally functioning open space.*				

Working Draft

Action Item from Previous Plan	Completed	Removed; No Longer Feasible	Carried Over to Plan Update: Check if Yes	Carried Over to Plan Update: Action # in Update
Action GC-18—Purchase of stand-by generator for City Hall and Operations Center	_	_	X	GC-6
Action GC-19—Obtain portable generators for use in Ada County during power outages and other emergency situations.	_	_	X	GC-6
Comment: *There is one portable generator for this use.*				
Action GC-20—Whenever possible, coordinate with local experts and employ natural environmental processes in mitigation activities that increase ecosystem resilience and reduce the impacts of flooding on the built environment.	_	_	X	GC-18
Comment: *On Going. Garden City has developed partnerships with Boise River Enhancement Network (BREN) to identify native and appropriate plantings. This list is made available to the public. The City Code requires the use of native and appropriate plantings within 25' of the greenbelt.*				

1.8 HAZARD MITIGATION ACTION PLAN

Table 1-13 lists the identified actions, which make up the hazard mitigation action plan for this jurisdiction. Table 1-14 identifies the priority for each action. Table 1-15 summarizes the mitigation actions by hazard of concern and mitigation type.

Table 1-13. Hazard Mitigation Action Plan Matrix

Benefits New or Existing Assets	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline[a]
Action GC-1—Where appropriate, support retrofitting, purchase or relocation of structures located in hazard areas, prioritizing those that have experienced repetitive losses and/or are located in high- or medium-risk hazard areas						
Hazards Mitigated: Flood						
Existing	1,3,8,10	Planning	USACE, Public Works, ACEM	High	BRIC, FMA	Ongoing
Action GC-2—Integrate the hazard mitigation plan into other plans, ordinances and programs that dictate land use decisions in the community as drafted or amended.						
Hazards Mitigated: ALL						
New & Existing	1,2,4,5,6,8,9,10	Planning	All City Departments, Planning Partners	Low	Local	Ongoing

Benefits New or Existing Assets	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline[a]
Action GC-3—Actively participate in the plan maintenance protocols outlined in Volume 1 of this hazard mitigation plan. *Hazards Mitigated:* ALL						
New & Existing	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	All City Departments	All Planning Partners	Low	Local	Short-term Ongoing
Action GC-4—Continue to maintain good standing and compliance under the NFIP through implementation of floodplain management programs that, at a minimum, meet the NFIP requirements: • Enforce the flood damage prevention ordinance. • Participate in floodplain identification and mapping updates. • Provide public assistance/information on floodplain requirements and impacts. *Hazards Mitigated:* Flood						
New & Existing	1,4,5,6,8	Development Services	ACEM, FCD10, Environmental Division	Low	Local	Short-term Ongoing
Action GC-5— Coordinate with community stakeholders in both the public and private sectors to identify and pursue adaptive capacity strategies that could improve community resilience in relation to severe or changing weather conditions**.** *Hazards Mitigated:* ALL						
New & Existing	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	All Departments	Planning Partners, BSU, NOAA	Low	HMGP, Local	Short-term Ongoing
Action GC-6—Purchase generators for critical facilities and infrastructure that lack adequate backup power including: • City Hall • Operations Center • Obtain portable generators. • Obtain a fuel truck that can fuel the generators at the police department, public works, wells, lift stations, and city hall. *Hazards Mitigated:* All						
New & Existing	1, 9,10	Public Works	ACEM, Public Works, Private, Ada County	Medium	HMGP, BRIC, Local	Short-term
Action GC-7— Green Infrastructure Flood Mitigation—Garden City needs a plan that identify strategic locations for alternate flood mitigation efforts, with an emphasis on green infrastructure to reduce floodplain and anticipated Base Flood Elevations. An example of such an effort may be identifying a location for an engineered parkland that is utilized to provide additional floodplain capacity and groundwater recharge. *Hazards Mitigated:* Flood						
New & Existing	1,2,3,4,6,9	Development Services	Public Works, USACE, IDWR	High	HMGP, BRIC, FMA, USACE	Long-term
Action GC-8— Levees Analysis Levee Analysis—There are a number of unaccredited levees in Garden City. Garden City needs an inventory of levees to determine condition and viability of the levees in Garden City and their hydraulic significance. If any of the levees could be hydrologically significant; include a cost estimate and a cost benefit analysis of accrediting or provisionally accrediting each levee, and the sustainability of required maintenance. *Hazards Mitigated:* Flood						
New & Existing	1,2,3,4,6,9,10	Development Services	USACE, FEMA	High	FMA, USACE	Long-term

WORKING DRAFT

Benefits New or Existing Assets	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline[a]
Action GC-9— Water and Sewer Pipe replacement						
Hazards Mitigated: All						
New & Existing	1,3,4,6,9,10	Public Works	-	High	HMGP, BRIC, FMA, Local, Urban Renewal	Long-term Ongoing
Action GC-10— Continue to maintain/enhance the City's classification under the Community Rating System (CRS)						
Hazards Mitigated: Flood						
New & Existing	8,9	Development Services	FEMA, FCD10, ACEM, ACHD	Low	Local	Ongoing
Action GC-11— Maintain emergency preparedness inventory inspections and establish a replacement plan.						
Hazards Mitigated: All						
New & Existing	1,9,10	Public Works	Police Department	Low	Local	Ongoing
Action GC-12— Maintain Capital Improvement Plan for capital facilities/infrastructure within the city.						
Hazards Mitigated: All						
New & Existing	1,3,6,7,8,9,10	Treasurer's Office	Public Works, Police, Development Services	Low	Local	Ongoing
Action GC-13— Support County-wide initiatives.						
Hazards Mitigated: All						
New & Existing	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	All City Departments	Planning Partners	Low	Local	Ongoing
Action GC-14— Continuing of Operations Plan						
Hazards Mitigated: All						
Existing	1,9,10	Mayor's Office	All departments, Planning Partners	Low	Local	Short-term Ongoing
Action GC-15— Annually review the EOP Emergency Operations Plan.						
Hazards Mitigated: All						
Existing	1,7,8,9,10	Police Department	Public Works, Mayor's Office, Treasure's Office, Development Services, Planning Partners	Low	Local, HMGP	Ongoing
Action GC-16— Garden City parks and river security camera installation.						
Hazards Mitigated: Flood, Weather						
New & Existing	1,3,10	Public Works	Police Department, Development Services, IDL, IDWR, USACE	Medium	Local	Short-term Ongoing

Benefits New or Existing Assets	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline[a]
Action GC-17— Streetlight replacement/conversion to alternative energy streetlights.						
Hazards Mitigated: All						
New & Existing	1,3,4,7,9	Public Works	Idaho Power, ACHD	High	HMPG, BRIC, FMA, Urban Renewal	Long-term Ongoing
Action GC-18—Coordinate with stakeholders, local experts to establish a plan and policies for wetland, habitat, and stream protection and restoration for conveyance, resiliency, and habitat.						
Hazards Mitigated: All						
New & Existing	1,2,4,6,9,10	Development Services	ACHD, IDWR, BREN, USACE, US Fish and Wildlife, BSU	Medium	HMPG	Ongoing
Action GC-19—Develop a roadway drainage plan that includes elevating the street above the 100-year floodplain for Chinden Boulevard, a major evacuation route for the city and valley.						
Hazards Mitigated: Flood, Canal, Weather (flash flood)						
New & Existing	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10	ITD	Garden City, ACHD	High	BRIC, ITD	Long-term
Action GC-20—Develop a system drainage plan for all of city to address undersized drainage for street network.						
Hazards Mitigated: Flood, Canal, Weather (flash flood)						
New & Existing	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10	ACHD	ITD, ACHD	High	BRIC, ACHD	Long-term
Action GC-21—Remedy the repetitive loss property.						
Hazards Mitigated: Flood						
Existing	3,9	Development Services	ACHD	High	HMGP, BRIC, FMA	Long-term
Action GC-22—Placement of free Wi-Fi in public locations such as parks to provide access to internet and emergency messaging.						
Hazards Mitigated: All						
New & Existing	7,8,9	Library		Medium	BRIC	Short-term
Action GC-23—Undergrounding of powerlines to make the electrical grid more resilient by minimizing damages from weather events. This assists also in the allowance of street trees which then reduces the urban stormwater runoff, can be cooling in extreme weather, and provide assistance for better air quality. The undergrounding of utilities should be strategically targeted to lines that include critical facilities, are directly adjacent to vehicular travel ways, or include a number of tall adjacent trees.						
Hazards Mitigated: Weather, Wildfire, Drought						
New & Existing	1,3,4,9,10	Development Services	Idaho Power, ACHD, ITD	High	HMGP, PDM, FMA	Long-term
Action GC-24— Improve open space preservation practices that target floodplain capacity and will ensure optimal points under the CRS 420 activity.						
Hazards Mitigated: Flood						
New & Existing	9	Development Services	Public Works, River Club Golf Course	Low	Local	Short-term Ongoing

Benefits New or Existing Assets	Objectives Met	Lead Agency	Support Agency	Estimated Cost	Sources of Funding	Timeline[a]
Action GC-25—Obtain and maintain 90 days of chemicals for potable water in case of a well outage.						
Hazards Mitigated: All						
New & Existing	1,3,4,9,10	Public Works		Medium	BRIC	Short-term Ongoing

a. Short-term = Completion within 5 years; Long-term = Completion within 10 years; Ongoing= Continuing new or existing program with no completion date

Acronyms used here are defined at the beginning of this volume.

Action GC-26—Implement IT technologies that facilitate the ability to work remotely.
All
1,7,10
IT
All departments
Medium-High
HMGP, BRIC
Short-term, ongoing

Action GC-27—Implement IT technologies that ensure access to the system in case of loss of electricity or a server.
All
1,7,10
IT
All departments
Medium-High
HMGP, BRIC
Short-term, ongoing

Action GC-28—Work with stakeholders to establish a regional plan for public outreach and education that can be utilized for CRS credit for the 330 Program for Public Information PPI activity. The outreach must include information related to hazard risks and critical information dissemination.
All
1,4,7,8,9
Development Services
-
Medium
Local
Short-term, ongoing

Action GC-29—Work with the Post Office to encourage the use of a Garden City specific address within Garden City.
All
1,6,9
Development Services
-
Low
Local
Short-term, ongoing

Commented [JT1]: Needs added to the table

Working Draft

Table 1-14. Mitigation Action Priority

Action #	# of Objectives Met	Benefits	Costs	Do Benefits Equal or Exceed Cost?	Is Project Grant-Eligible?	Can Project Be Funded Under Existing Programs/ Budgets?	Implementation Priority[a]	Grant Pursuit Priority[a]
1	4	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Low	High
2	8	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
3	10	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
4	5	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
5	7	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	High	Medium
6	3	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
7	6	Medium	High	No	Yes	No	Low	Medium
8	7	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
9	6	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
10	10	Low	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
11	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
12	7	Low	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
13	10	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
14	3	High	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
15	5	High	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	High	Low
16	3	Low	Medium	No	No	No	Medium	Medium
17	5	Low	High	No	Yes	No	Low	Medium
18	6	Medium	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
19	9	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Low	High
20	9	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Low	High
21	2	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Low	High
22	3	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium	High
23	5	High	High	Yes	Yes	No	Low	High
24	1	Low	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low
25	5	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	Maybe	High	Medium
26	3	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Medium	Medium
27	3	High	Medium	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Medium	Medium
28	5	Medium	Medium	Yes	No	Maybe	Medium	Medium
29	3	Medium	Low	Yes	No	Yes	High	Low

a. See the introduction to this volume for explanation of priorities.

Table 1-15. Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Hazard Type	Action Addressing Hazard, by Mitigation Type[a]							
	Prevention	Property Protection	Public Education & Awareness	Natural Resource Protection	Emergency Services	Structural Projects	Climate Resilience	Community Capacity Building
High-Risk Hazards								
Flood	2,3,4,10,12, 13,18	1,4,11,13,21	2,4,10,13,18	7,13, 16,18	2,6,13,14, 15, 17,25,29	7,8,9,13,16, 19,20,23	4,5,7,13	2,3,4,10,13, 24
Medium-Risk Hazards								
Extreme Weather	2, 3, 5,12,13	1, 5,11,13	2, 5 ,13	5,13	2, 5,6,13,14, 15, 17,25,29	5,9,13,19,20 ,23	5,13,17,23	2,3,13
Dam/Canal Failure	2, 3,12,13	1,11,13	2, 13	13	2,6,13,14, 15, 17,25,29	9,13,19,20	5,13	2,3,5,13
Earthquake	2, 3,12,13	1,11,13	2, 13	13	2,6,13,14, 15, 17, 25,29	9,13	5,13	2,3,13
Low-Risk Hazards								
Wildfire	2, 3,12,13	1,11,13	2,13	13	2,6,13,14, 15, 17,25,29	9,13,23	5,13	2,3,13,
Drought	2, 3,12,13	1,11,13	2,13,	13	2,6,13,14, 15, 17, 25,29	9,13	5,13, 17	2,3,13,
Landslide	2, 3,12,13	1,11,13	2,13	13	2,6,13,14, 15, 17, 25,29	9,13	5,13	2,3,13,

a. See the introduction to this volume for explanation of mitigation types.

1.9 PUBLIC OUTREACH

Table 1-16 lists public outreach activities for this jurisdiction.

Table 1-16. Local Public Outreach

Local Outreach Activity	Date	Number of People Involved
No outreach scheduled at this time, further outreach to be determined with the adoption process.		

1.10 INFORMATION SOURCES USED FOR THIS ANNEX

The following technical reports, plans, and regulatory mechanisms were reviewed to provide information for this annex.

- **2017 Ada County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan** – The previous HMP was reviewed to update this annex.

Working Draft

- **Garden City Municipal Code**—The municipal code was reviewed for the full capability assessment and for identifying opportunities for action plan integration.
- **Garden City Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance**—The flood damage prevention ordinance was reviewed for compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program.

The following outside resources and references were reviewed:

- **Hazard Mitigation Plan Annex Development Toolkit**—The toolkit was used to support the identification of past hazard events and noted vulnerabilities, the risk ranking, and the development of the mitigation action plan.

Working Draft