

HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

Wharton County

DRAFT



Prepared For:
Wharton County
Office of Emergency Management

Wharton County
HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE

Draft

Prepared for:

Wharton County Office of Emergency Management
315 E. Elm Street
Wharton, TX 77488

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| | |
|---|------|
| Executive Summary..... | ES-1 |
| Plan Update | ES-1 |
| Mitigation Guiding Principle, Goals, and Objectives | ES-2 |
| Identified Hazard of Concern | ES-4 |
| Mitigation Actions..... | ES-4 |

PART 1 PLAN ELEMENTS AND PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES

Chapter 1. **Introduction**

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1.1 Why Prepare this Plan?..... | 1-1 |
| 1.1.1 The Big Picture | 1-1 |
| 1.1.2 Local Concerns | 1-1 |
| 1.1.3 Purposes for Planning | 1-2 |
| 1.2 Who Will Benefit from This Plan? | 1-2 |
| 1.3 Elements of This Plan | 1-2 |

Chapter 2. **Plan Update – What Has Changed**

| | |
|--|-----|
| 2.1 The Previous Plan | 2-1 |
| 2.2 Why Update? | 2-9 |
| 2.3 The Plan – What is Different? | 2-9 |
| 2.4 Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool..... | 2-9 |

Chapter 3. **Plan Methodology**

| | |
|---|------|
| 3.1 Grant Funding..... | 3-1 |
| 3.2 Establishment of the Planning Partnership | 3-1 |
| 3.3 Defining the Planning Area | 3-2 |
| 3.4 The Planning Committee | 3-4 |
| 3.5 The Steering Committee | 3-4 |
| 3.6 Coordination with Other Agencies | 3-6 |
| 3.7 Review of Existing Programs | 3-7 |
| 3.8 Public Involvement..... | 3-8 |
| 3.8.1 Stakeholders and the Steering Committee | 3-8 |
| 3.8.2 Survey/Questionnaire..... | 3-8 |
| 3.8.3 Meetings | 3-9 |
| 3.8.4 Press Releases/News Articles | 3-9 |
| 3.8.5 Internet..... | 3-9 |
| 3.9 Plan Development, Chronology, and Milestones..... | 3-10 |

Chapter 4. **Guiding Principle, Goals, and Objectives**

| | |
|---|------|
| 4.1 Guiding Principle..... | 4-1 |
| 4.2 Goals..... | 4-1 |
| 4.3 Objectives | 4-1 |
| Chapter 5. Identified Hazards of Concern and Risk Assessment Methodology | |
| 5.1 Identified Hazards of Concerns | 5-1 |
| 5.2 Climate Change | 5-2 |
| 5.3 Methodology..... | 5-2 |
| 5.4 Risk Assessment Tools | 5-3 |
| 5.4.1 Dam Failure, Earthquake, Flood, and Hurricane - HAZUS-MH | 5-3 |
| 5.4.2 Other Hazards of Concern | 5-4 |
| 5.4.3 Limitations | 5-4 |
| Chapter 6. Wharton County Profile | |
| 6.1 Historical Overview | 6-1 |
| 6.2 Major Past Hazard Events | 6-3 |
| 6.3 Climate | 6-4 |
| 6.4 Geology and Soils..... | 6-10 |
| 6.5 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 6-12 |
| 6.6 Demographics | 6-22 |
| 6.6.1 Population | 6-23 |
| 6.6.2 Age Distribution | 6-24 |
| 6.6.3 Disabled Populations | 6-25 |
| 6.6.4 Ethnic Populations | 6-25 |
| 6.7 Economy | 6-26 |
| 6.7.1 Income | 6-26 |
| 6.7.2 Employment Trends..... | 6-26 |
| 6.7.3 Occupations and Industries | 6-27 |
| 6.8 Future Trends in Development | 6-29 |
| 6.8.1 Wharton County..... | 6-29 |
| 6.8.2 City of East Bernard | 6-30 |
| 6.8.3 City of El Campo | 6-31 |
| 6.8.4 City of Wharton | 6-32 |
| 6.9 Laws and Ordinances..... | 6-33 |
| 6.9.1 Federal | 6-33 |
| 6.9.2 State and Regional | 6-35 |
| 6.9.3 Wharton County..... | 6-38 |
| 6.9.4 City of East Bernard | 6-40 |
| 6.9.5 City of El Campo | 6-42 |

| | |
|---|------|
| 6.9.6 City of Wharton | 6-45 |
| Chapter 7. Hazard Mitigation Capabilities Assessment | |
| 7.1 Wharton County | 7-1 |
| 7.1.1 Legal and Regulatory Capabilities | 7-1 |
| 7.1.2 Administrative and Technical Capabilities | 7-2 |
| 7.1.3 Financial Capabilities | 7-3 |
| 7.2 City of East Bernard | 7-3 |
| 7.2.1 Legal and Regulatory Capabilities | 7-3 |
| 7.2.2 Administrative and Technical Capabilities | 7-5 |
| 7.2.3 Financial Capabilities | 7-5 |
| 7.3 City of El Campo | 7-6 |
| 7.3.1 Legal and Regulatory Capabilities | 7-6 |
| 7.3.2 Administrative and Technical Capabilities | 7-7 |
| 7.3.3 Financial Capabilities | 7-8 |
| 7.4 City of Wharton | 7-8 |
| 7.4.1 Legal and Regulatory Capabilities | 7-9 |
| 7.4.2 Administrative and Technical Capabilities | 7-10 |
| 7.4.3 Financial Capabilities | 7-11 |
| PART 2 RISK ASSESSMENT | |
| Chapter 8. Expansive Soils | |
| 8.1 General Background | 8-1 |
| 8.2 Hazard Profile | 8-3 |
| 8.2.1 Past Events | 8-3 |
| 8.2.2 Location | 8-3 |
| 8.2.3 Frequency | 8-3 |
| 8.2.4 Severity | 8-3 |
| 8.2.5 Warning Time | 8-4 |
| 8.3 Secondary Hazards | 8-4 |
| 8.4 Climate Change Impacts | 8-4 |
| 8.5 Exposure | 8-5 |
| 8.5.1 Population | 8-5 |
| 8.5.2 Property | 8-5 |
| 8.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 8-6 |
| 8.5.4 Environment | 8-6 |
| 8.6 Vulnerability | 8-6 |
| 8.6.1 Population | 8-6 |
| 8.6.2 Property | 8-7 |

| | |
|--|------|
| 8.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 8-8 |
| 8.6.4 Environment | 8-9 |
| 8.7 Future Trends in Development | 8-9 |
| 8.8 Scenario | 8-9 |
| 8.9 Issues | 8-9 |
| Chapter 9. Dam/Levee Failure | |
| 9.1 General Background | 9-2 |
| 9.1.1 Dams | 9-2 |
| 9.1.2 Levees | 9-5 |
| 9.1.3 Causes of Dam Failure..... | 9-8 |
| 9.1.4 Causes of Levee Failure..... | 9-8 |
| 9.1.5 Regulatory Oversight | 9-9 |
| 9.2 Hazard Profile..... | 9-12 |
| 9.2.1 Past Events..... | 9-12 |
| 9.2.2 Location | 9-13 |
| 9.2.3 Frequency | 9-16 |
| 9.2.4 Severity | 9-16 |
| 9.2.5 Warning Time | 9-17 |
| 9.3 Secondary Hazards | 9-17 |
| 9.4 Climate Change Impacts..... | 9-17 |
| 9.5 Vulnerability | 9-18 |
| 9.5.1 Population | 9-19 |
| 9.5.2 Property | 9-20 |
| 9.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 9-20 |
| 9.5.4 Environment | 9-20 |
| 9.6 Exposure | 9-21 |
| 9.6.1 Population..... | 9-21 |
| 9.6.2 Property | 9-22 |
| 9.7 Future Trends in Development | 9-23 |
| 9.8 Scenario | 9-23 |
| 9.9 Issues | 9-23 |
| Chapter 10. Drought and Extreme Heat | |
| 10.1 General Background | 10-1 |
| 10.1.1 Drought..... | 10-1 |
| 10.1.2 Extreme Heat | 10-2 |
| 10.2 Hazard Profile..... | 10-3 |
| 10.2.1 Past Events..... | 10-4 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| 10.2.2 Location | 10-12 |
| 10.2.3 Frequency | 10-21 |
| 10.2.4 Severity | 10-21 |
| 10.2.5 Warning Time | 10-23 |
| 10.3 Secondary Hazards | 10-23 |
| 10.4 Climate Change Impacts | 10-24 |
| 10.5 Exposure | 10-24 |
| 10.6 Vulnerability | 10-28 |
| 10.6.1 Population | 10-28 |
| 10.6.2 Property | 10-29 |
| 10.6.3 Critical Facilities | 10-30 |
| 10.6.4 Environment | 10-30 |
| 10.6.5 Economic Impact | 10-31 |
| 10.7 Future Trends in Development | 10-31 |
| 10.8 Scenario | 10-31 |
| 10.9 Issues | 10-31 |
| Chapter 11. Earthquake | |
| 11.1 General Background | 11-1 |
| 11.1.1 How Earthquakes Happen | 11-1 |
| 11.1.2 Earthquake Classifications | 11-2 |
| 11.1.3 Ground Motion | 11-3 |
| 11.1.4 Effect of Soil Types | 11-4 |
| 11.2 Hazard Profile | 11-5 |
| 11.2.1 Past Events | 11-5 |
| 11.2.2 Location | 11-5 |
| 11.2.3 Frequency | 11-8 |
| 11.2.4 Severity | 11-8 |
| 11.2.5 Warning Time | 11-12 |
| 11.3 Secondary Hazards | 11-12 |
| 11.4 Climate Change Impacts | 11-12 |
| 11.5 Exposure | 11-12 |
| 11.5.1 Population | 11-13 |
| 11.5.2 Property | 11-13 |
| 11.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 11-13 |
| 11.5.4 Environment | 11-13 |
| 11.6 Vulnerability | 11-14 |
| 11.7 Future Trends in Development | 11-15 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| 11.8 Scenario | 11-15 |
| 11.9 Issues | 11-15 |
| Chapter 12. Flood | |
| 12.1 General Background | 12-1 |
| 12.1.1 Flood | 12-1 |
| 12.1.2 Floodplain | 12-5 |
| 12.1.3 Measuring Floods and Floodplains | 12-5 |
| 12.1.4 Floodplain Ecosystems | 12-5 |
| 12.1.5 Effects of Human Activities | 12-6 |
| 12.1.6 Community Rating System | 12-6 |
| 12.2 Hazard Profile | 12-7 |
| 12.2.1 Past Events | 12-8 |
| 12.2.2 Location | 12-11 |
| 12.2.3 Frequency | 12-17 |
| 12.2.4 Severity | 12-17 |
| 12.2.5 Warning Time | 12-22 |
| 12.3 Secondary Hazards | 12-22 |
| 12.4 Climate Change Impacts | 12-22 |
| 12.5 Exposure | 12-23 |
| 12.5.1 Population | 12-23 |
| 12.5.2 Property | 12-23 |
| 12.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 12-27 |
| 12.5.4 Environment | 12-30 |
| 12.6 Vulnerability | 12-30 |
| 12.6.1 Population | 12-30 |
| 12.6.2 Property | 12-31 |
| 12.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 12-36 |
| 12.6.4 Environment | 12-36 |
| 12.7 Future Trends in Development | 12-36 |
| 12.8 Scenario | 12-36 |
| 12.9 Issues | 12-37 |
| Chapter 13. Hurricanes and Tropical Storms | |
| 13.1 General Background | 13-1 |
| 13.1.1 Hurricanes and Tropical Storms | 13-1 |
| 13.1.2 Hurricane and Tropical Storm Classifications | 13-3 |
| 13.2 Hazard Profile | 13-3 |
| 13.2.1 Past Events | 13-3 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| 13.2.2 Location | 13-4 |
| 13.2.3 Frequency | 13-6 |
| 13.2.4 Severity | 13-7 |
| 13.2.5 Warning Time | 13-7 |
| 13.3 Secondary Events | 13-7 |
| 13.4 Climate Change Impacts | 13-7 |
| 13.5 Exposure | 13-8 |
| 13.6 Vulnerability | 13-8 |
| 13.7 Future Trends in Development | 13-12 |
| 13.8 Scenario | 13-12 |
| 13.9 Issues | 13-12 |
| Chapter 14. Lightning, Hail, & Wind | |
| 14.1 General Background | 14-1 |
| 14.1.1 Lightning | 14-3 |
| 14.1.2 Hail | 14-6 |
| 14.1.3 Wind | 14-10 |
| 14.2 Hazard Profile | 14-14 |
| 14.2.1 Past Events | 14-14 |
| 14.2.2 Location | 14-23 |
| 14.2.3 Frequency | 14-28 |
| 14.2.4 Severity | 14-28 |
| 14.2.5 Warning Time | 14-29 |
| 14.3 Secondary Hazards | 14-29 |
| 14.4 Climate Change Impacts | 14-30 |
| 14.5 Exposure | 14-30 |
| 14.5.1 Population | 14-30 |
| 14.5.2 Property | 14-30 |
| 14.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 14-31 |
| 14.5.4 Environment | 14-31 |
| 14.6 Vulnerability | 14-31 |
| 14.6.1 Population | 14-31 |
| 14.6.2 Property | 14-32 |
| 14.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 14-36 |
| 14.6.4 Environment | 14-36 |
| 14.7 Future Trends in Development | 14-37 |
| 14.8 Scenario | 14-37 |
| 14.9 Issues | 14-37 |

Chapter 15. **Tornado**

| | |
|---|-------|
| 15.1 General Background | 15-1 |
| 15.2 Hazard Profile | 15-6 |
| 15.2.1 Past Events | 15-6 |
| 15.2.2 Location | 15-8 |
| 15.2.3 Frequency | 15-12 |
| 15.2.4 Severity | 15-12 |
| 15.2.5 Warning Time | 15-12 |
| 15.3 Secondary Hazards | 15-12 |
| 15.4 Climate Change Impacts | 15-12 |
| 15.5 Exposure | 15-13 |
| 15.5.1 Population | 15-13 |
| 15.5.2 Property | 15-13 |
| 15.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 15-13 |
| 15.5.4 Environment | 15-14 |
| 15.6 Vulnerability | 15-14 |
| 15.6.1 Population | 15-14 |
| 15.6.2 Property | 15-14 |
| 15.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 15-16 |
| 15.6.4 Environment | 15-16 |
| 15.7 Future Trends in Development | 15-16 |
| 15.8 Scenario | 15-16 |
| 15.9 Issues | 15-17 |

Chapter 16. **Wildfire**

| | |
|---|-------|
| 16.1 General Background | 16-1 |
| 16.2 Hazard Profile | 16-5 |
| 16.2.1 Past Events | 16-5 |
| 16.2.2 Location | 16-11 |
| 16.2.3 Frequency | 16-21 |
| 16.2.4 Severity | 16-21 |
| 16.2.5 Warning Time | 16-22 |
| 16.3 Secondary Hazards | 16-22 |
| 16.4 Climate Change Impacts | 16-22 |
| 16.5 Exposure | 16-23 |
| 16.5.1 Population | 16-23 |
| 16.5.2 Property | 16-23 |
| 16.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 16-26 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| 16.5.4 Environment | 16-27 |
| 16.6 Vulnerability | 16-28 |
| 16.6.1 Population | 16-28 |
| 16.6.2 Property | 16-28 |
| 16.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 16-29 |
| 16.6.4 Environment | 16-29 |
| 16.7 Future Trends in Development | 16-29 |
| 16.8 Scenario | 16-30 |
| 16.9 Issues | 16-30 |

Chapter 17. **Winter Weather**

| | |
|---|-------|
| 17.1 General Background | 17-1 |
| 17.1.1 Extreme Cold | 17-2 |
| 17.2 Hazard Profile | 17-3 |
| 17.2.1 Past Events | 17-3 |
| 17.2.2 Location | 17-5 |
| 17.2.3 Frequency | 17-5 |
| 17.2.4 Severity | 17-5 |
| 17.2.5 Warning Time | 17-5 |
| 17.3 Secondary Hazards | 17-6 |
| 17.4 Climate Change Impacts | 17-6 |
| 17.5 Exposure | 17-6 |
| 17.5.1 Population | 17-6 |
| 17.5.2 Property | 17-6 |
| 17.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 17-7 |
| 17.5.4 Environment | 17-7 |
| 17.6 Vulnerability | 17-7 |
| 17.6.1 Population | 17-8 |
| 17.6.2 Property | 17-8 |
| 17.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 17-10 |
| 17.6.4 Environment | 17-10 |
| 17.7 Future Trends in Development | 17-10 |
| 17.8 Scenario | 17-10 |
| 17.9 Issues | 17-10 |

Chapter 18. **Pandemic**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------|
| 18.1 General Background | 18-1 |
| 18.2 Hazard Profile | 18-2 |
| 18.2.1 Past Events | 18-2 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| 18.2.2 Location | 18-5 |
| 18.2.3 Frequency | 18-5 |
| 18.2.4 Severity | 18-5 |
| 18.2.5 Warning Time | 18-5 |
| 18.3 Secondary Hazards | 18-6 |
| 18.4 Climate Change Impacts | 18-6 |
| 18.5 Exposure and vulnerability | 18-6 |
| 18.5.1 Population | 18-6 |
| 18.5.2 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 18-7 |
| 18.6 Future Trends in Development | 18-7 |
| 18.7 Scenario | 18-7 |
| 18.8 Issues | 18-8 |
| Chapter 19. Hazardous Materials | |
| 19.1 General Background | 19-1 |
| 19.2 Hazard Profile | 19-2 |
| 19.2.1 Past Events | 19-9 |
| 19.2.2 Location | 19-9 |
| 19.2.3 Frequency | 19-11 |
| 19.2.4 Severity | 19-11 |
| 19.2.5 Warning Time | 19-11 |
| 19.3 Secondary Hazards | 19-11 |
| 19.4 Exposure | 19-11 |
| 19.4.1 Population | 19-12 |
| 19.4.2 Property | 19-12 |
| 19.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 19-14 |
| 19.4.4 Environment | 19-14 |
| 19.5 Vulnerability | 19-14 |
| 19.5.1 Population | 19-14 |
| 19.5.2 Property | 19-15 |
| 19.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 19-16 |
| 19.5.4 Environment | 19-16 |
| 19.6 Future Trends in Development | 19-16 |
| 19.7 Scenario | 19-16 |
| 19.8 Issues | 19-16 |
| Chapter 20. Land Subsidence | |
| 20.1 General Background | 20-1 |
| 20.1.1 Texas Gulf Coast Aquifer | 20-2 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| 20.2 Hazard Profile | 20-4 |
| 20.2.1 Past Events | 20-4 |
| 20.2.2 Location | 20-8 |
| 20.2.3 Frequency | 20-9 |
| 20.2.4 Severity | 20-9 |
| 20.2.5 Warning Time | 20-9 |
| 20.3 Secondary Hazards | 20-9 |
| 20.4 Climate Change Impacts | 20-10 |
| 20.5 Exposure | 20-10 |
| 20.5.1 Population | 20-10 |
| 20.5.2 Property | 20-10 |
| 20.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 20-11 |
| 20.5.4 Environment | 20-11 |
| 20.6 Vulnerability | 20-11 |
| 20.6.1 Population | 20-11 |
| 20.6.2 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure | 20-13 |
| 20.6.3 Environment | 20-13 |
| 20.7 Future Trends in Development | 20-13 |
| 20.8 Scenario | 20-13 |
| 20.9 Issues | 20-13 |
| Chapter 21. Planning Area Risk Ranking | |
| 21.1 Probability of Occurrence | 21-1 |
| 21.2 Impact | 21-2 |
| 21.3 Risk Rating and Ranking | 21-6 |
| PART 3 MITIGATION AND PLAN MAINTENANCE STRATEGY | |
| Chapter 22. Area-Wide Mitigation Actions and Implementation | |
| 22.1 Recommended Mitigation Actions | 22-2 |
| 22.2 Benefit/Cost Review and Prioritization | 22-2 |
| Chapter 23. Plan Adoption and Maintenance | |
| 23.1 Plan Adoption | 23-1 |
| 23.2 Plan Maintenance Strategy | 23-1 |
| 23.2.1 Plan Implementation | 23-1 |
| 23.2.2 Steering Committee | 23-2 |
| 23.2.3 Plan Maintenance Schedule | 23-3 |
| 23.2.4 Annual Progress Report | 23-3 |
| 23.2.5 Plan Update | 23-4 |
| 23.2.6 Continuing Public Involvement | 23-4 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 23.2.7 Incorporation into Other Planning Mechanisms | 23-5 |
| References..... | R-1 |

LIST OF TABLES

| <i>No.</i> | <i>Title</i> | <i>Page No.</i> |
|-------------|--|-----------------|
| Table ES-1. | Recommended Mitigation Actions | ES-5 |
| Table 2-1. | Hazard rISK sUMMARY in the 2016 Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update | 2-1 |
| Table 2-2. | Wharton County Project Implementation Worksheet (2016-2021 Plan Projects)..... | 2-4 |
| Table 3-1. | County and City Planning Partners | 3-1 |
| Table 3-2. | Steering Committee Members | 3-5 |
| Table 3-3. | Plan Development Milestones | 3-11 |
| Table 6-1. | Federal Disaster Declarations in Wharton County | 6-4 |
| Table 6-2. | Wharton County Temperature Summaries | 6-5 |
| Table 6-3. | Critical Facilities in the Planning Area..... | 6-13 |
| Table 6-4. | Critical Infrastructure in the Planning Area..... | 6-13 |
| Table 6-5. | Wharton County Demographic and Social Characteristics (2015-2019) | 6-22 |
| Table 6-6. | Wharton County Population | 6-23 |
| Table 6-7. | Wharton County Economic Characteristics..... | 6-26 |
| Table 6-8. | Present Land Use in Planning Area..... | 6-29 |
| Table 7-1. | Wharton County Regulatory Mitigation Capabilities Matrix | 7-1 |
| Table 7-2. | Wharton County Administrative/Technical Mitigation Capabilities Matrix | 7-2 |
| Table 7-3. | Wharton County Financial Mitigation Capabilities Matrix | 7-3 |
| Table 7-4. | City of East Bernard Regulatory Mitigation Capabilities Matrix..... | 7-4 |
| Table 7-5. | City of East Bernard Administrative/Technical Mitigation Capabilities Matrix..... | 7-5 |
| Table 7-6. | City of East Bernard Financial Mitigation Capabilities Matrix..... | 7-6 |
| Table 7-7. | City of El Campo Regulatory Mitigation Capabilities Matrix | 7-6 |
| Table 7-8. | City of El Campo Administrative/Technical Mitigation Capabilities Matrix | 7-7 |
| Table 7-9. | City of El Campo Financial Mitigation Capabilities Matrix | 7-8 |
| Table 7-10. | City of Wharton Regulatory Mitigation Capabilities Matrix..... | 7-9 |
| Table 7-11. | City of Wharton Administrative/Technical Mitigation Capabilities Matrix..... | 7-10 |
| Table 7-12. | City of Wharton Financial Mitigation Capabilities Matrix | 7-11 |
| Table 8-1 | Exposed Structures and Population | 8-6 |
| Table 8-2 | Most Vulnerable Population | 8-7 |
| Table 8-3. | Loss Estimates for Expansive Soils..... | 8-7 |
| Table 9-1. | Dam Counts and Exemptions | 9-10 |
| Table 9-2. | USACE Hazard Potential Classification | 9-16 |
| Table 9-3. | TCEQ Hazard Potential Classification | 9-17 |
| Table 9-4. | Wharton County and Participating Communities Dam Extents | 9-19 |
| Table 9-5. | Exposed Structures and Population | 9-20 |
| Table 9-6. | Vulnerable Population | 9-21 |
| Table 9-7. | Loss Estimates for Dam Event | 9-22 |
| Table 10-1. | Maximum Temperature Data Summaries..... | 10-12 |
| Table 10-2. | Historic Drought Events in Wharton County (1996-2021) | 10-20 |
| Table 10-3 | Exposed Structures and Population | 10-25 |
| Table 10-4 | Most Vulnerable Population..... | 10-28 |
| Table 10-5. | Loss Estimates for Drought Events | 10-29 |
| Table 11-1. | Mercalli Scale and Peak Ground Acceleration Comparison | 11-4 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Table 11-2. NEHRP Soil Classification System | 11-4 |
| Table 12-1. Summary of Historic Floods in Wharton County and Participating Communities (1965-2019) | 12-8 |
| Table 12-2. Acreage in the 100-Year and 500-Year Floodplain by Jurisdiction | 12-12 |
| Table 12-3. Extent Scale – Water Depth..... | 12-17 |
| Table 12-4. Present Land Use in the 100-Year Floodplain..... | 12-24 |
| Table 12-5. Present Land Use in the 500-Year Floodplain..... | 12-25 |
| Table 12-6. Structures and Population in the 100-Year Floodplain..... | 12-26 |
| Table 12-7. Structures and Population in the 500-Year Floodplain..... | 12-26 |
| Table 12-8. Value of Structures in the 100-Year Floodplain..... | 12-27 |
| Table 12-9. Value of Structures in the 500-Year Floodplain..... | 12-27 |
| Table 12-10. Critical Facilities and Infrastructure in the 100-Year Floodplain..... | 12-28 |
| Table 12-11. Critical Facilities and Infrastructure in the 500-Year Floodplain..... | 12-29 |
| Table 12-12. Loss Estimates for the 100-Year Flood Event..... | 12-31 |
| Table 12-13. Loss Estimates for the 500 Year Flood Event | 12-32 |
| Table 12-14. National Flood Insurance Program Statistics | 12-32 |
| Table 13-1. Saffir Simpson Hurricane Wind Scale..... | 13-3 |
| Table 13-2 Exposed Structures and Population | 13-8 |
| Table 13-3 Most Vulnerable Population..... | 13-9 |
| Table 13-4. Loss Estimates for Hurricane Event | 13-9 |
| Table 14-1. National Weather Service Hail Severity | 14-8 |
| Table 14-2. Historic Lightning Events in Wharton County (1996-2020) | 14-14 |
| Table 14-3. Historic Hail Events in Wharton County and Participating Communities (1960-2014) | 14-17 |
| Table 14-4. Wind Power Class and Speed..... | 14-20 |
| Table 14-5. Historic Wind-Related Events in Wharton County and Participating Communities (1950- 2014) | 14-22 |
| Table 14-6 Exposed Structures and Population | 14-31 |
| Table 14-7 Most Vulnerable Population..... | 14-32 |
| Table 14-8. Loss Estimates for Hail Events in Wharton County and Participating Communities | 14-33 |
| Table 14-9. Loss Estimates for Lightning Events in Wharton County and Participating Communities | 14-33 |
| Table 14-10. Loss Estimates for Wind Events in Wharton County and Participating Communities | 14-34 |
| Table 15-1. Enhanced Fujita Scale Damage Indicators | 15-2 |
| Table 15-2. The Fujita Scale and Enhanced Fujita Scale..... | 15-3 |
| Table 15-3. Historic Tornado Events in Wharton County (1950-2020) | 15-6 |
| Table 15-4 Exposed Structures and Population | 15-13 |
| Table 15-5 Most Vulnerable Population..... | 15-14 |
| Table 15-6. Loss Estimates for Tornado Events | 15-15 |
| Table 16-1. Fire Protection Services in Wharton County and Participating Communities | 16-2 |
| Table 16-2. Vegetation Classes in Wharton County and Participating Communities | 16-3 |
| Table 16-3. Historic Wildfire Events in Wharton County and Participating Communities (50+ ACRES) (2005-2015)..... | 16-6 |
| Table 16-4. Population Within Wildfire Risk Areas..... | 16-23 |
| Table 16-5. Exposure and Value of Structures in Very Low Wildfire Risk Areas..... | 16-24 |
| Table 16-6. Exposure and Value of Structures in Low Wildfire Risk Areas..... | 16-24 |
| Table 16-7. Exposure and Value of Structures in Moderate Wildfire Risk Areas | 16-25 |
| Table 16-8. Exposure and Value of Structures in High Wildfire Risk Areas | 16-25 |
| Table 16-9. Exposure and Value of Structures in Very High Wildfire Risk Areas | 16-26 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| Table 16-10. Land Coverage for Wharton County Per Wildfire Risk Class..... | 16-26 |
| Table 16-11. Critical Facilities and Infrastructure Per Wildfire Risk Class | 16-27 |
| Table 16-12. Annualized Loss Estimates for Wildfire Events..... | 16-29 |
| Table 17-1. Minimum Temperature Data Summaries | 17-3 |
| Table 17-2. Historic Winter Weather Events in Wharton County (1996-2021) | 17-4 |
| Table 17-3 Exposed Structures and Population | 17-7 |
| Table 17-4 Most Vulnerable Population..... | 17-8 |
| Table 17-5. Loss Estimates for Winter Storm Events..... | 17-9 |
| Table 18-1. Pandemic Severity Index (PSI)..... | 18-5 |
| Table 18-2 Most Vulnerable Population..... | 18-7 |
| Table 19-1 Exposed Structures and Population | 19-12 |
| Table 19-2 Exposed Structures and Population Within a Half-Mile Radius of Storage/Commercial Facilities..... | 19-13 |
| Table 19-3 Exposed Structures and Population Within a Half-Mile Radius of Solar Farms..... | 19-13 |
| Table 19-4 Exposed Structures and Population Within a Half-Mile Radius of Pipelines | 19-13 |
| Table 19-5 Exposed Structures and Population Within a Half-Mile Radius of Railways | 19-14 |
| Table 19-6 Most Vulnerable Population..... | 19-15 |
| Table 19-7 Loss Estimates for Hazardous Material | 19-15 |
| Table 20-1 Exposed Structures and Population | 20-11 |
| Table 20-2 Most Vulnerable Population..... | 20-12 |
| Table 20-3 Loss Estimates for Land Subsidence | 20-12 |
| Table 21-1. Hazard Probability of Occurrence | 21-2 |
| Table 21-2. Impact on People From Hazards | 21-4 |
| Table 21-3. Impact on Property From Hazards..... | 21-5 |
| Table 21-4. Impact on Economy From Hazards | 21-6 |
| Table 21-5. hazard Risk Ranking Calculations..... | 21-7 |
| Table 21-6. Hazard Risk Summary..... | 21-8 |
| Table 22-1. Mitigation Actions Developed to Address Hazards | 22-1 |
| Table 22-2. Recommended Mitigation Actions..... | 22-7 |
| Table 23-1. Incorporation of Mitigation Activities..... | 23-7 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| <i>No.</i> | <i>Title</i> | <i>Page No</i> |
|--------------|---|----------------|
| Figure 3-1. | Wharton County Planning Area and Participating Communities..... | 3-3 |
| Figure 3-2. | Sample Page from Questionnaire Distributed to the Public..... | 3-9 |
| Figure 6-1. | Location of the Wharton County Planning Area within the State of Texas | 6-1 |
| Figure 6-2. | Wharton Daily Temperature Data (May 1904 – March 2021)..... | 6-5 |
| Figure 6-3. | Annual Average Maximum Temperature (1981-2010)..... | 6-6 |
| Figure 6-4. | Annual Average Minimum Temperature (1981-2010) | 6-7 |
| Figure 6-5. | Average Monthly Precipitation (1904-2021) | 6-8 |
| Figure 6-6. | Geographic Distribution of Annual Average Precipitation (1981-2010)..... | 6-9 |
| Figure 6-7. | Natural Regions of Texas and Wharton County | 6-11 |
| Figure 6-8. | Critical Facilities in Wharton County | 6-14 |
| Figure 6-9. | Critical Infrastructure in Wharton County | 6-15 |
| Figure 6-10. | Critical Facilities in the City of East Bernard | 6-16 |
| Figure 6-11. | Critical Infrastructure in the City of East Bernard | 6-17 |
| Figure 6-12. | Critical Facilities in the City of El Campo..... | 6-18 |
| Figure 6-13. | Critical Infrastructure in the City of El Campo..... | 6-19 |
| Figure 6-14. | Critical Facilities in the City of Wharton..... | 6-20 |
| Figure 6-15. | Critical Infrastructure in the City of Wharton..... | 6-21 |
| Figure 6-16. | State of Texas and Wharton County Population Growth | 6-23 |
| Figure 6-17. | Wharton County Age Distribution | 6-24 |
| Figure 6-18. | Wharton County Ethnic Distribution | 6-25 |
| Figure 6-19. | Wharton County Unemployment Rate (1990-2021) | 6-27 |
| Figure 6-20. | Percent of Total Employment by Industry in Wharton County | 6-28 |
| Figure 6-21. | Residential Building Permits in Wharton County..... | 6-30 |
| Figure 6-22. | Population of City of East Bernard | 6-31 |
| Figure 6-23. | Population of City of El Campo..... | 6-31 |
| Figure 6-24. | Residential Building Permits in the City of El Campo | 6-32 |
| Figure 6-25. | Population of City of Wharton | 6-32 |
| Figure 6-26. | Residential Building Permits in the City of Wharton..... | 6-33 |
| Figure 8-1. | Expansive Soil Regions..... | 8-2 |
| Figure 9-1. | TCEQ Dam Definition | 9-2 |
| Figure 9-2. | Primary Purpose/Benefit of U.S. Dams..... | 9-3 |
| Figure 9-3. | Locations of Dams in Wharton County and Participating Communities | 9-4 |
| Figure 9-4. | U.S. Levee Systems..... | 9-6 |
| Figure 9-5. | Counties in Texas with Levees..... | 9-7 |
| Figure 9-6. | Texas County Population Exemptions for Dams | 9-11 |
| Figure 9-7. | Lake Travis Water Surface Elevation During the May 2015 Precipitation Event | 9-12 |
| Figure 9-8. | Wharton County and Participating Communities Dam Potential Inundation Areas and Population | 9-14 |
| Figure 9-9. | Levees in Wharton County..... | 9-15 |
| Figure 10-1. | Heat Index Table | 10-3 |
| Figure 10-2. | U.S. Drought Monitor, March 27, 2012..... | 10-5 |
| Figure 10-3. | U.S. Drought Monitor, March 17, 2015..... | 10-6 |
| Figure 10-4. | U.S. Drought Monitor, June 16, 2015 | 10-7 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| Figure 10-5. U.S. Drought Monitor, March 17, 2020..... | 10-8 |
| Figure 10-6. U.S. Drought Monitor, April 6, 2021..... | 10-9 |
| Figure 10-7. Crop Moisture Index (Week Ending April 17, 2021)..... | 10-13 |
| Figure 10-8. Palmer Z Index Short-Term Drought Conditions (March 2021)..... | 10-14 |
| Figure 10-9. Palmer Drought Index (March 2014)..... | 10-15 |
| Figure 10-10. Palmer Drought Index (May 2015)..... | 10-16 |
| Figure 10-11. Palmer Drought Index (March 2021)..... | 10-17 |
| Figure 10-12. Palmer Hydrological Drought Index Long-Term Hydrologic Conditions (March 2021) ... | 10-18 |
| Figure 10-13. 24-Month Standardized Precipitation Index (through March 2021)..... | 10-19 |
| Figure 10-14. USDA Census of Agriculture Wharton County Profile 2017..... | 10-26 |
| Figure 11-1. Texas Earthquakes (1847-2021)..... | 11-6 |
| Figure 11-2. Probabilistic Earthquake Hazard Map for the U.S. | 11-7 |
| Figure 11-3. Peak Ground Acceleration (10% Probability of Exceedance in 50-Year Map of Peak Ground Acceleration)..... | 11-10 |
| Figure 11-4. 500-Year Probability Event in Wharton County..... | 11-11 |
| Figure 12-1. Number of Flash Floods in Texas per County (1986-1999)..... | 12-4 |
| Figure 12-2. CRS Communities by Class Nationwide as of April 2021. | 12-7 |
| Figure 12-4. Colorado River Flood Stage Near the City of Wharton During Hurricane Harvey..... | 12-11 |
| Figure 12-5. Special Flood Hazard Areas in Wharton County and Participating Communities..... | 12-13 |
| Figure 12-6. Special Flood Hazard Areas in the City of East Bernard..... | 12-14 |
| Figure 12-7. Special Flood Hazard Areas in the City of El Campo..... | 12-15 |
| Figure 12-8. Special Flood Hazard Areas in the City of Wharton..... | 12-16 |
| Figure 12-9. Flood Depths in Wharton County and Participating Communities..... | 12-18 |
| Figure 12-10. Flood Depths in the City of East Bernard..... | 12-19 |
| Figure 12-11. Flood Depths in the City of El Campo..... | 12-20 |
| Figure 12-12. Flood Depths in the City of Wharton..... | 12-21 |
| Figure 12-13. Repetitive Loss Properties in Wharton County..... | 12-35 |
| Figure 13-1. Historical Hurricane Paths Affecting Wharton County..... | 13-2 |
| Figure 13-2. Historical Tropical Storms and Hurricanes Directly Affecting Wharton County..... | 13-5 |
| Figure 13-3: Estimated Return Period in Years for Hurricanes Passing Within 50 Nautical Miles of Various Locations..... | 13-6 |
| Figure 13-4. 100-Year Probabilistic Peak Wind Gusts for Wharton County..... | 13-11 |
| Figure 14-1. Thunderstorm Life Cycle..... | 14-2 |
| Figure 14-2. Average Annual National Lightning Density..... | 14-5 |
| Figure 14-3. National Hail Paths..... | 14-7 |
| Figure 14-4. Mean Number of Hail > 1.00” Days per Year Within 25 miles of a Point (1986-2015) | 14-9 |
| Figure 14-5. National Wind Zones..... | 14-11 |
| Figure 14-6. National High Wind Paths..... | 14-12 |
| Figure 14-7. National Annual High Wind Days..... | 14-13 |
| Figure 14-8. Lightning Fatalities in the U.S. (1959-2020)..... | 14-15 |
| Figure 14-9. Texas Wind Power..... | 14-21 |
| Figure 14-10. Lightning Events in Wharton County (1996-2020)..... | 14-25 |
| Figure 14-11. Hail Events in Wharton County (1955-2019)..... | 14-26 |
| Figure 14-12. Damaging Wind Events in Wharton County (1955-2019)..... | 14-27 |
| Figure 14-13. Severe Weather Probabilities in Warmer Climates..... | 14-30 |
| Figure 15-1. Annual Average Number of Tornadoes in the U.S. (2000-2019)..... | 15-4 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Figure 15-2. Total Annual Threat of Tornado Events in the U.S. (1986-2015)..... | 15-5 |
| Figure 15-3. Tornado Paths in the U.S. (1955-2019)..... | 15-9 |
| Figure 15-4. Total Tornadoes in the U.S (1950-2019)..... | 15-10 |
| Figure 15-5. Tornado Events in Wharton County (1950-2019)..... | 15-11 |
| Figure 16-1. Vegetation Types in Wharton County..... | 16-4 |
| Figure 16-2. Wildfire Ignitions in Wharton County (2005-2015) | 16-7 |
| Figure 16-3. Wildfires in the City of East Bernard (2005-2015)..... | 16-8 |
| Figure 16-4. Wildfires in the City of El Campo (2005-2015)..... | 16-9 |
| Figure 16-5. Wildfires in the City of Wharton (2005-2015)..... | 16-10 |
| Figure 16-6. Wharton County and Participating Communities Wildfire Ignition Density | 16-12 |
| Figure 16-7. Wharton County and Participating Communities Wildland Urban Interface..... | 16-13 |
| Figure 16-8. Wharton County and Participating Communities Wildland Urban Interface Response Index | 16-14 |
| Figure 16-9. Wharton County Wildfire Values Response Index and Participating Communities..... | 16-15 |
| Figure 16-10. Wharton County Wildfire Community Protection Zones and Participating Communities..... | 16-16 |
| Figure 16-11. Wharton County Wildfire Hazard Potential | 16-17 |
| Figure 16-12. City of East Bernard Wildfire Hazard Potential..... | 16-18 |
| Figure 16-13. City of El Campo Wildfire Hazard Potential | 16-19 |
| Figure 16-14. City of Wharton Wildfire Hazard Potential | 16-20 |
| Figure 16-15. Drought Level and Historical Wildfire Occurrences (Monthly) Correlation | 16-21 |
| Figure 17-1. National Weather Service Wind Chill Chart | 17-2 |
| Figure 18-1. New Cases Per Day in Texas During COVID-19 Pandemic Thus Far | 18-4 |
| Figure 18-2. New Cases Per Day in Wharton County During COVID-19 Pandemic Thus Far | 18-4 |
| Figure 19-1. Solar Farms in Wharton County..... | 19-4 |
| Figure 19-2. Pipelines in Wharton County | 19-6 |
| Figure 19-3. Railways in Wharton County | 19-8 |
| Figure 19-4. HAZMAT Facilities in Wharton County | 19-10 |
| Figure 20-1. Major Aquifers in Texas | 20-3 |
| Figure 20-2. Boling Dome | 20-4 |
| Figure 20-3. Estimates of Land Subsidence Rates in Wharton County Based on the Analysis of Remote Sensing Data | 20-6 |
| Figure 20-4. Land Subsidence Study Averages 2007 to 2010 and 2015 to 2019 | 20-8 |

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A. Acronyms and Definitions

Appendix B. Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool

Appendix C. Public Outreach

Appendix D. Plan Adoption Resolutions From Planning Partners

Appendix E. Example Progress Report

Acknowledgments and Contacts

Wharton County:

Andy Kirkland

Emergency Management Coordinator

Phone: (979)-532-1123

Email: andy.kirkland@co.wharton.tx.us

Scheibe Consulting:

Eric Scheibe, PE, CFM

President

Phone: (512) 263-0418

Email: escheibe@scheibeconsulting.com

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA) is federal legislation that requires proactive, pre-disaster planning as a prerequisite for some funding available under the Robert T. Stafford Act. The DMA encourages state and local authorities to work together on pre-disaster planning. The planning network called for by the DMA helps local governments articulate accurate needs for mitigation, resulting in the faster allocation of funding and more cost-effective risk reduction projects.

Hazard mitigation is the use of long- and short-term strategies to reduce or alleviate the loss of life, personal injury, and property damage that can result from a disaster. It involves strategies such as planning, policy changes, programs, projects, and other activities that can mitigate the impacts of hazards. It is impossible to predict exactly when and where disasters will occur or the extent to which they will impact an area. However, with careful planning and collaboration among public agencies, stakeholders, and citizens, it is possible to minimize the losses that disasters can cause. The responsibility for hazard mitigation lies with many, including private property owners; business and industry; and local, state, and federal government.

Wharton County and a partnership of local governments within the county have developed and maintained a hazard mitigation plan to reduce risks from natural disasters and to comply with the DMA. This plan is regularly updated every 5 years to ensure the document remains current and to comply with DMA.

PLAN UPDATE

Federal regulations require monitoring, evaluation, and updating of hazard mitigation plans. An update provides an opportunity to reevaluate recommendations, monitor the impacts of implemented actions, and evaluate whether there is a need to change the focus of mitigation strategies. A jurisdiction covered by a hazard mitigation plan that has expired is no longer in compliance with the DMA.

Wharton County and its communities participated in previous hazard mitigation plans as part of the Texas Colorado River Floodplain Coalition (TCRFC). In accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) guidelines that require individual hazard mitigation plans for each county and Texas Division of Emergency Management's 2010 "two-county maximum" policy, an update was developed to be specific to Wharton County and its participating communities: the Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton.

In accordance with update requirements, this update to *Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2016* was conducted. Specifically, this update encompasses the hazard mitigation analysis of Wharton County and its participating communities.

The development of this hazard mitigation plan update consisted of the following phases:

Phase 1: Organize and Review

A planning team was assembled to provide technical support for the plan update, consisting of Scheibe Consulting representatives, key county and city staff. The first step in developing the plan update was to re-establish a planning partnership. Planning partners participating in the update were the Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton. A Steering Committee was assembled to oversee the plan update, consisting of planning partner staff and community representatives from the planning area. Coordination with other county, state, and federal agencies involved in hazard mitigation occurred throughout the plan update process. This phase included a comprehensive review of the previous *Wharton County Hazard*

Mitigation Plan Update 2016 and existing programs that may support or enhance hazard mitigation actions.

Phase 2: Update the Risk Assessment

Risk assessment is the process of measuring the potential loss of life, personal injury, economic impact, and property damage resulting from natural hazards. This process assesses the vulnerability of people, buildings, and infrastructure to natural hazards. All facets of the risk assessment of the plan were re-visited by the planning team and updated with the best available data and technology. The work included the following:

- Hazard identification and profiling
- Assessment of the impact of hazards on physical, social, and economic assets
- Vulnerability identification
- Estimation of the cost of potential damage

Phase 3: Engage the Public

A public involvement strategy agreed upon by the Steering Committee was implemented by the planning team. All meetings were open to the public. Meetings were held to present the risk assessment as well as the draft plan. The public was encouraged to participate through a county-specific hazard mitigation survey and the county website that included information on the plan.

Phase 4: Assemble the Updated Plan

The planning team and Steering Committee assembled key information into a document to meet the DMA requirements for all planning partners.

Phase 5: Adopt/Implement the Plan

Once pre-adoption approval has been granted by the Texas Division of Emergency Management and FEMA Region VI, the final adoption phase will begin. Each planning partner will individually adopt the updated plan. The plan maintenance process includes a schedule for monitoring and evaluating the plan's progress annually and producing a plan revision every 5 years. Throughout the life of this plan, a representative of the original Steering Committee will be available to provide consistent guidance and oversight.

MITIGATION GUIDING PRINCIPLE, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

The guiding principle for the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update is as follows:

To reduce or eliminate the long-term risks to loss of life and property damage in Wharton County from the full range of disasters.

The following plan goals and objectives were determined by the Steering Committee:

- **Goal 1:** Protect public health and safety.
 - **Objective 1.1:** Advise the public about health and safety precautions to guard against injury and loss of life from hazards.
 - **Objective 1.2:** Maximize the utilization of the latest technology to provide adequate warning, communication, and mitigation of hazard events.
 - **Objective 1.3:** Reduce the damage to, and enhance protection of, dangerous areas during hazard events.

- **Objective 1.4:** Protect critical facilities and services.
- **Goal 2:** Protect existing and new properties.
 - **Objective 2.1:** Reduce repetitive losses to the National Flood Insurance Program.
 - **Objective 2.2:** Use the most cost-effective approaches to protect existing buildings and public infrastructure from hazards.
 - **Objective 2.3:** Enact and enforce regulatory measures to ensure that development will not put people in harm's way or increase threats to existing properties.
- **Goal 3:** Increase public understanding, support, and demand for hazard mitigation.
 - **Objective 3.1:** Heighten public awareness of the full range of natural hazards they face.
 - **Objective 3.2:** Educate the public on actions they can take to prevent or reduce the loss of life or property from natural hazards.
 - **Objective 3.3:** Publicize and encourage the adoption of appropriate hazard mitigation measures.
- **Goal 4:** Build and support local capacity and commitment to continuously become less vulnerable to hazards.
 - **Objective 4.1:** Build and support local partnerships to continuously become less vulnerable to hazards.
 - **Objective 4.2:** Build a cadre of committed volunteers to safeguard the community before, during, and after a disaster.
 - **Objective 4.3:** Build hazard mitigation concerns into planning and budgeting processes.
- **Goal 5:** Promote growth in a sustainable manner.
 - **Objective 5.1:** Incorporate hazard mitigation into the long-range planning and development activities.
 - **Objective 5.2:** Promote beneficial uses of hazardous areas while expanding open space and recreational opportunities.
 - **Objective 5.3:** Utilize regulatory approaches to prevent the creation of future hazards to life and property.
- **Goal 6:** Maximize the resources for investment in hazard mitigation.
 - **Objective 6.1:** Maximize the use of outside sources of funding.
 - **Objective 6.2:** Maximize the participation of property owners in protecting their properties.
 - **Objective 6.3:** Maximize insurance coverage to provide financial protection against hazard events.
 - **Objective 6.4:** Prioritize mitigation projects, based on cost-effectiveness and starting with those sites facing the greatest threat to life, health, and property.

IDENTIFIED HAZARD OF CONCERN

For this plan, the Steering Committee considered the full range of hazards that could impact the planning area and then listed hazards that present the greatest concern to the county and participating cities. The process incorporated a review of state and local hazard planning documents, as well as information on the frequency, magnitude, and costs associated with hazards that have impacted or could impact the planning area. Anecdotal information regarding natural hazards and the perceived vulnerability of the planning area's assets to hazards was also included. Based on the review, this plan addresses the following natural hazards of concern:

- Dam/Levee Failure
- Drought
- Expansive Soils
- Extreme Heat
- Earthquake
- Flood
- Hail
- Hazardous Materials
- Hurricane and Tropical Storm
- Land Subsidence
- Lightning
- Pandemic
- Tornado
- Wildfire
- Wind
- Winter Weather

MITIGATION ACTIONS

Mitigation actions presented in this plan update are activities designed to reduce or eliminate losses resulting from hazards. The update process resulted in the identification of 68 mitigation actions targeted for implementation by individual planning partners as listed in Table ES-1. The Steering Committee ranked the mitigation actions in order of priority, with 1 being the highest priority. The highest priority mitigation actions are shown in red on the table, medium priority actions are shown in yellow, and low priority actions are shown in green.

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|-----------------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------|---------|
| WHARTON COUNTY | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the County (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | Install larger drainage improvements throughout the county. During flood and hurricane events the streams overflow. There are areas that do not pass the required flow needed for emergency access during flood events. | 1 | SIP | G1, G2, G6 | Drainage Department | >\$100,000 | Road and Bridge Fund, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 2 | Update and adopt the Wharton County Flood Insurance Study and FIRM | Updated and adopt a new Flood Insurance Study and FIRM. This would prevent new properties from developing on the floodway. | 8 | LPR, EAP | G2 | Commissioner's Court | >\$100,000 | Road and Bridge Fund, State/Federal Grants, TWDB | 60 | Hight |
| 3 | Adopt "Higher Standard" Riverine Flood Damage Prevention Ordinances and Standards | This would result in a discount on insurance for new and existing properties and mitigate damages for both new and existing structures. | 9 | LPR | G2, G3, G6 | Drainage Department | <\$10,000 | Road and Bridge Fund | 24 | High |
| 4 | Join FEMA's CRS Program | Complete the initial steps to join FEMA's CRS program and reduce the cost of insurance for new and existing buildings. It is better to protect existing properties through the development of CRS activities. | 17 | LPR, EAP | G4, G6 | Development Department | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | County funds | 60 | Low |
| 5 | Create/Maintain a Wharton Disaster Response Team | Having a disaster response team in place that can respond quickly to a natural or man-caused event would prevent damage to existing buildings. | 10 | EAP | G1, G2, G6 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds | 60 | High |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 6 | Implement a Wharton County Flood Warning/Monitoring System | Wharton County experiences flooding at low-water crossing which can lead to injuries and even fatalities. | 2 | SIP | G1, G2 | Commissioner's Court | >\$100,000 | HGAC, State/Federal Grants | 36 | High |
| 7 | Install emergency backup generators at critical facilities | Install emergency back-up generators at critical facilities to provide backup power from hazard events. | 3 | SIP | G1, G3, G6 | Commissioner's Court | >\$100,000 | County funds, State/Federal grants | 36 | High |
| 8 | Educate the community on hazards | Educate the community on the hazards they are exposed to and how to mitigate their homes from hazards on the county website and public forums. | 15 | EAP | G1, G2, G3, G4, G5 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds | 60 | Medium |
| 9 | Drainage Master Plan Update | Develop an update the 2010 DMP needed to identify and prioritize drainage improvements County-Wide | 7 | LPR | G2, G4, G5 | Commissioner's Court | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | County funds, State/Federal grants | 60 | Medium |
| 10 | Update Subdivision Ordinance | Update development regulations to resolve loop holes in standards and improve clarity | 4 | LPR | G2, G4, G5 | Drainage Department | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | County funds | 24 | High |
| 11 | Collaborate with Regional Flood Planning Group | Coordinate with RFPG to ensure projects are identified in their plan for future grant funding | 5 | LPR, EAP | G4, G5, G6 | Drainage Department | <\$10,000 | County funds | 60 | High |
| 12 | Collaborate with local canal owners to identify funding to improve and expand existing infrastructure | Coordinate with LCRA primarily as it relates to existing canal systems that may have leaks or seepage issues. Develop a plan to resolve these problems to help reduce water loss during droughts. | 14 | SIP | G1, G2, G4, G6 | Commissioner's Court | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | County funds, State/Federal grants | 60 | Low |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 13 | Collaborate with local MUD Districts to establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | Coordinate with MUD districts on water, wastewater, and soil expansion plan. Identify projects for funding. | 6 | LPR | G3, G4, G5 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds, State/federal grants | 60 | Low |
| 14 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | Coordinate with regional partners to develop a regional plan to improve future Pandemic response. | 12 | LRP | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | County funds, State/federal grants | 60 | Medium |
| 15 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | Conduct "lessons learned" meetings related to the pandemic and compile a report. | 11 | LPR, EAP | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds | 12 | Medium |
| 16 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | This effort will include coordination and monitoring related to known subsidence issues. This may also include coordination with LCRA on known subsidence issues near the Lane City Gage. | 16 | LPR | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds | 60 | Low |
| 17 | Establish a county-wide hazardous material response team | Develop a county-wide hazard response team and coordinate a regional response plan. | 13 | LPR, EAP | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds | 60 | Medium |
| CITY OF EAST BERNARD | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Purchase Public Hazard Alert System | The city will purchase a public hazard alert system so that the city may provide warning to the citizens during a hazard event. | 8 | SIP | G1 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | Medium |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 2 | Organize outreach program for vulnerable populations | We will use several media outlets to promote accessible heating and cooling centers and education of flood and hurricane hazards to vulnerable populations. | 10 | EAP | G1, G3, G4, G6 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | Information Technology | 60 | Medium |
| 3 | Prepare and adopt a stormwater drainage plan and ordinance | Prepared and adopt a stormwater drainage plan and ordinance needed to prioritize and identify funding needed to implement the plan. | 1 | LPR | G1, G2, G3, G4, G5 | City Secretary | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | City Funds | 36 | High |
| 4 | Update emergency response plan | Form a committee to update the emergency response plan for emergency officials and personnel to use. | 7 | LPR | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City and County funds | 24 | Medium |
| 5 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | Conduct a regional drainage assessment, develop a plan, and begin implementation of identified and prioritized projects. | 2 | SIP | G1, G2, G6 | Public Works | <\$100,000 | City and County funds | 60 | High |
| 6 | Install emergency generators at critical facilities | Install emergency generators at key critical facilities to provide back-up power during/post hazardous events. | 3 | SIP | G1, G2 | Public Works | <\$100,000 | WCID Funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | Medium |
| 7 | Implementation of Zoning Ordinance | Develop a zoning ordinance to better regulate development throughout the city. Zoning will be used to manage congestion and develop in a sustainable way. | 6 | LPR | G2, G4, G5 | City Secretary | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|--|--|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 8 | Update Comprehensive Plan | Update comprehensive plan to help guide city staff on the direction forward. | 4 | LPR | G1, G2, G4, G5 | City Secretary | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | City Funds | 36 | High |
| 9 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | Develop a plan based on "lessons learned" from the pandemic. Coordinate with regional partners. | 13 | LPR | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City and County funds | 60 | Medium |
| 10 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | Develop an after-action report based on COVID-19 lessons learned. | 12 | LRP, EAP | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City and County funds | 60 | Medium |
| 11 | Collaborate with local MUD Districts to establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | Collaborate with local MUD districts on water, wastewater, and expansive soils plan. This plan is needed to identify and prioritize water, wastewater, and similar improvements. | 11 | LPR | G3, G4, G5 | City Secretary | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | WCID Funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | Medium |
| 12 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | This effort will include coordination and monitoring related to known subsidence issues. | 14 | LPR | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City and County funds | 60 | Medium |
| 13 | GIS Mapping | Develop a City-Wide GIS web map for use in maintaining City-Wide data. | 5 | LPR | G1, G2 | City Secretary | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | City Funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | Medium |
| 14 | Establish a hazardous material response team | Develop a county-wide hazard response team and coordinate a regional response plan. | 9 | LRP, EAP | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City and County funds | 60 | Medium |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|-------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| CITY OF EL CAMPO | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Provide education on water conservation techniques | Provide water conservation measures low-flow plumbing, etc., as mail inserts with utility bills and discuss with local media outlets. | 8 | EAP | G3, G4, G6 | Utility Department | <\$10,000 | Utility Revenue | 36 | High |
| 2 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | Implement drainage improvements to culverts, bridges, channels, detention facilities, and levees as needed. | 4 | SIP | G1, G2, G6 | Public Works | >\$100,000 | City funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 3 | Adopt freeboard ordinance | Adopt freeboard ordinance to reduce flood risk of structures. | 17 | LPR | G2, G3, G4, G5 | Building Department | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | High |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---|--|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 4 | Adopt IBC and IRC | Adopt the latest IBC and IRC that go to mitigated identified hazards, such as a tornado, high wind, and impact-resistant materials (windows, doors, roof bracing); dry-proofing public buildings for flooding; upgrading to higher standard insulation for extreme heat and winter storms; installing lightning rods and grounding systems on public buildings; retrofitting to low-flow plumbing and replacing landscaping with drought and fire resistant plant; stricter codes for hail and fire-resistant roofing and siding; implementing higher standards for foundations, and upgrading requirements for construction beams, breakers and foundation to mitigate impacts of earthquake and expansive soils. | 6 | LPR | G1, G2, G4, G5 | Building Department | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | High |
| 5 | GIS mapping | Use GIS mapping to overlay properties with known hazards of expansive soils, flood, and wildland interface areas. Then notify residents of at-risk structures to help residents mitigate the hazards around their property. | 7 | LPR | G1, G2 | Public Works | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | Information Technology | 36 | Medium |
| 6 | Outreach to vulnerable populations regarding extreme and adverse weather/conditions | We will use several media outlets to promote accessible heating and cooling centers and education of flood and hurricane hazards to vulnerable populations. | 9 | EAP | G1, G3, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|--|--|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------|---------|
| 7 | Implement Master Drainage Plan (7 projects) | Seven areas of the city are known to be subject to flood damage because of inadequate storm drainage. Install larger storm drainage and reduce flood damage. | 11 | SIP | G1, G2, G4, G6 | Public Works | >\$100,000 | City funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 8 | Educate community on all hazards | Educate the community on the hazards they are exposed to and how to mitigation their homes from hazards on the county website and public forums. | 12 | EAP | G1, G3, G4, G6 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 9 | Alternative notification/alert system | Develop and implement an alternative system to assist with emergency response despite the loss of power and internet for the community and staff. | 5 | LPR, EAP | G1 | Emergency Management | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | Information Technology | 36 | high |
| 10 | Establish Post Disaster Temporary Transfer Center | This activity may include identification of a Transfer Center, construction of a Transfer Center, and/or setup of a Transfer Center | 16 | LPR | G4 | Emergency Management | >\$100,000 | City Funds, State/Federal Grants, Cost Sharing | 60 | Medium |
| 11 | Establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | Develop and implement a drought and expansive soils contingency plan that addresses mitigation measures for drought, extreme heat, and expansive soils. | 14 | LPR, EAP | G1, G3, G4, G5, G6 | Utility Department | <\$10,000 | City funds, State/Federal Grants | 36 | High |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---|--|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 12 | Update Drainage master plan | Update 2004 Drainage Master Plan to help direct the City forward with regard to planning and drainage improvements | 13 | LPR | G1, G2, G3, G4, G5 | Public Works | >\$100,000 | City funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 13 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | Develop a plan based on "lessons learned" from the pandemic. Coordinate with regional partners. | 3 | LPR | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | Medium |
| 14 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | Develop an after-action report based on COVID-19 lessons learned. | 1 | LPR, EAP | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | Medium |
| 15 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | This effort will include coordination and monitoring related to known subsidence issues. | 15 | LPR | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 16 | Establish an all hazards response team | Develop a county-wide hazard response team and coordinate on a regional response plan. | 10 | LPR, EAP | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------|---------|
| 17 | Install emergency generators at critical facilities | Install emergency generators at key critical facilities to provide back-up power during/post hazardous events. | 2 | SIP | G1, G2 | Public Works | >\$100,000 | City Funds, State/Federal Grants, Cost Share | 60 | High |
| CITY OF WHARTON | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Clean and repair storm drains routinely | Citywide cleaning and repairing of storm drains. | 3 | SIP | G1, G2 | Public Works | >\$100,000 | Public Works Fund | 60 | High |
| 2 | Increase freeboard requirements for permitting structures in the floodplain | Adopt ordinance to increase freeboard requirement in the 100-year floodplain. This action will result in safer structures, and thus, fewer flood damages. | 13 | SIP | G2, G3, G4, G5, G6 | Floodplain Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 12 | High |
| 3 | Implement a comprehensive watershed ordinance for new development | This ordinance will help to reduce flood risk to new development. | 4 | LPR | G2, G5, G6 | Floodplain Management | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | Watershed Funds | 24 | High |
| 4 | Acquire, reuse, and preserve open spaces adjacent to flood-prone areas | Acquire, reuse, and preserve open spaces adjacent to flood-prone areas | 11 | LPR | G2, G4, G5, G6 | City Public Works | >\$100,000 | FMA, PDM, HMGP | 36 | High |
| 5 | Educate the community on the hazards | We will use several media outlets to promote accessible heating and cooling centers and education of flood and hurricane hazards to vulnerable populations. | 15 | EAP | G1, G3, G5, G6 | Planning Dept. | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 36 | Medium |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|--|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 6 | Minimize the impact of flooding by installing berms and levees where appropriate | Coordinate with the USACE and other entities to implement levee improvements, etc. | 1 | SIP | G1, G2, G4, G6 | Floodplain Administrator | >\$100,000 | City Funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 7 | Develop flood-reduction / stream restoration/channelization projects to ensure adequate drainage/diversion of stormwater | Projects may include channel improvements to Caney Creek, Peach Creek, Baughman Slough, the Colorado River, and/or other minor channels throughout the City limits and ETJ. | 5 | SIP | G1, G2, G4, G6 | Planning Dept. | >\$100,000 | City Funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 8 | Establish a reserve fund for emergency and public mitigation measures | Coordinate with City Council to establish this fund. | 7 | LPR, EAP | G2, G3, G4, G5, G6 | Planning Dept. | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | high |
| 9 | Strengthen and harden at-risk critical facilities | This effort will focus on Water Treatment, Wastewater Treatment, electric, water supply, and other similar facilities | 2 | LPR | G1, G6 | Emergency Management | >\$100,000 | City Funds | 48 | High |
| 10 | Acquisition and relocation, elevation, and “demo-rebuild” of flood-prone structures | This will focus on flood-prone structures specifically identified during Hurricane Harvey Flood | 12 | SIP, NSP | G2, G5, G6 | Emergency Management | >\$100,000 | FMA, PDM, HMGP | 60 | High |
| 11 | Install emergency backup generators at critical facilities | Install emergency backup generators at critical facilities | 8 | SIP, NSP | G1, G2, G6 | Emergency Management | >\$100,000 | HMGP, City Funds | 60 | High |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|--------------------|---------|
| 12 | Use impact fees to help fund public hazard mitigation projects related to land development | Use impact fees to help fund public hazard mitigation projects related to land development | 17 | LPR | G1, G2, G3, G4, G5 | Floodplain Administrator | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | Medium |
| 13 | Implement warning systems | Coordinate with County and LCRA to implement a County-Wide Flood Warning System of gauges. | 9 | LPR, EAP | G1 | Planning Dept. | >\$100,000 | Grant Funds, HGAC, and Coordination with County | 60 | High |
| 14 | Establish/implement drought/expansive soil contingency plan | Develop and implement a drought and expansive soils contingency plan that addresses mitigation measures for drought, extreme heat, and expansive soils. | 20 | LPR | G3, G4, G5 | Planning Dept. | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Low |
| 15 | Update/implement Drainage Master Plan | Update DMP to identify flood reduction projects, funding sources, and prioritization | 14 | LPR | G1, G2, G3, G4, G5 | Planning Dept. | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 16 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | Implement drainage improvements throughout the City, including culvert improvements, levees, dams, channel widening, storm sewer, and detention facilities. | 6 | SIP | G1, G2, G6 | Planning Dept. | >\$100,000 | City Funds | 60 | High |
| 17 | Develop plan to improve Pandemic response | Develop a plan based on "lessons learned" from the pandemic. Coordinate with regional partners. | 16 | LPR | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |

TABLE ES-1. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---|--|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 18 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | Develop an after-action report based on COVID-19 lessons learned. | 18 | LPR, EAP | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 19 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | This effort will include coordination and monitoring related to known subsidence issues. | 19 | LPR | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 20 | Establish a hazardous material response team | Develop a county-wide hazard response team and coordinate a regional response plan. | 10 | LPR, EAP | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | High |

Notes:

| | | | |
|----------|-------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|
| COVID-19 | Coronavirus Disease 2019 | IBC | International Building Code |
| CRS | Community Rating System | IRC | International Residential Code |
| DMP | Drainage Master Plan | LCRA | Lower Colorado River Authority |
| EAP | Education and Awareness Program | LRP | Local Plans and Regulations |
| ETJ | Extraterritorial Jurisdiction | MUD | Municipal Utility District |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency | NSP | Natural Systems Protection |
| FIRM | Flood Insurance Rate Map | SIP | Structure and Infrastructure Project |
| GIS | Geographic Information System | | |

PART 1

PLAN ELEMENTS AND PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES

Chapter 1.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 WHY PREPARE THIS PLAN?

1.1.1 The Big Picture

Hazard mitigation is the way to alleviate the loss of life, personal injury, and property damage that can result from a disaster through long- and short-term strategies. Hazard mitigation involves strategies such as planning, policy changes, programs, projects, and other activities that can mitigate the impacts of hazards. The responsibility for hazard mitigation lies with many, including private property owners; business and industry; and local, state, and federal government.

The federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA) (Public Law 106-390) required state and local governments to develop hazard mitigation plans as a condition for federal disaster grant assistance. Prior to 2000, federal disaster funding focused on disaster relief and recovery, with limited funding for hazard mitigation planning. The DMA increased the emphasis on planning for disasters before they occur.

The DMA encourages state and local authorities to work together on pre-disaster planning. It promotes “sustainable hazard mitigation,” which includes the sound management of natural resources and the recognition that hazards and mitigation must be understood in the largest possible social and economic context. The planning network called for by the DMA helps local governments articulate accurate needs for mitigation, resulting in the faster allocation of funding and more cost-effective risk reduction projects.

1.1.2 Local Concerns

This hazard mitigation plan considers local concerns when evaluating natural hazards and developing mitigation actions. Several factors specific to Wharton County initiated this planning effort:

Wharton County is exposed to hazards that have caused past damage.

Limited local resources make it difficult to be pre-emptive in reducing risk. Eligibility for federal financial assistance is paramount to promote successful hazard mitigation in the area.

Wharton County and its partners participating in this plan want to be proactive in preparing for the probable impacts from natural hazards.

Wharton County and its communities participated in previous hazard mitigation plans as part of the Texas Colorado River Floodplain Coalition (TCRFC), which included 15 counties (including Wharton) and 63 jurisdictions. In accordance with recent Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) guidance individual hazard mitigation plans must be prepared for each county. In addition, the Texas Division of Emergency Management (TDEM) implemented a “two-county maximum” policy in 2010 on submittals of local plans. Therefore, a plan update was developed in 2011 specifically for Wharton County and its participating communities: the cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton. This plan was updated in 2016 to comply with FEMA update requirements.

FEMA approval of the previous hazard mitigation plan will expire in 2021. If this plan is not updated, Wharton County would not have a FEMA-approved mitigation plan in place, limiting county access to emergency funds after a disaster declaration.

1.1.3 Purposes for Planning

This hazard mitigation plan update identifies resources, information, and strategies for reducing risk from natural hazards. Elements and strategies in the plan were selected because they meet a program requirement and because they best meet the needs of the planning partners and their citizens. One of the benefits of multi-jurisdictional planning is the ability to pool resources and eliminate redundant activities within a planning area that has uniform risk exposure and vulnerabilities. FEMA encourages multi-jurisdictional planning under its guidance for the DMA. This plan will help guide and coordinate mitigation activities throughout the planning area.

This plan update was developed to meet the following objectives:

Meet or exceed requirements of the DMA.

Enable all planning partners to continue using federal grant funding to reduce risk through mitigation.

Meet the needs of each planning partner as well as state and federal requirements.

Create a risk assessment that focuses on Wharton County hazards of concern.

Create a single planning document that integrates all planning partners into a framework that supports partnerships within the county, and puts all partners on the same planning cycle for future updates.

Coordinate existing plans and programs so that high-priority actions and projects to mitigate possible disaster impacts are funded and implemented.

1.2 WHO WILL BENEFIT FROM THIS PLAN?

All citizens and businesses of Wharton County are the ultimate beneficiaries of this hazard mitigation plan update. The plan reduces the risk for those who live in, work in, and visit the county and participating cities. It provides a viable planning framework for all foreseeable natural hazards that may impact the county and participating cities. Participation in development of the plan by key stakeholders helped ensure that outcomes will be mutually beneficial. The resources and background information in the plan are applicable countywide. The plan's goals and recommendations can lay the groundwork for the development and implementation of local mitigation activities and partnerships.

1.3 ELEMENTS OF THIS PLAN

This plan includes all federally required elements of a disaster mitigation plan:

Countywide elements:

- A description of the planning process
- The public involvement strategy
- A list of goals and objectives
- A countywide hazard risk assessment
- Countywide mitigation actions
- A plan maintenance strategy

Jurisdiction-specific elements for each participating jurisdiction:

- A description of the participation requirements established by the Steering Committee
- Jurisdiction-specific mitigation actions

The following appendices include information or explanations to support the main content of the plan:

- Appendix A: A glossary of acronyms and definitions.
- Appendix B: The FEMA Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool.
- Appendix C: Public outreach information, including the hazard mitigation survey and summary, and documentation of public meetings.
- Appendix D: Plan adoption resolutions from planning partners.
- Appendix E: A template for progress reports to be completed as this plan is implemented.
- All planning partners will adopt this Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update in its entirety.

Chapter 2. PLAN UPDATE – WHAT HAS CHANGED

2.1 THE PREVIOUS PLAN

Wharton County and its communities participated in previous hazard mitigation plans as part of the TCRFC. The TCRFC is a non-profit, 501(c)(3) organization formed in June 2001 by the cities and counties of the Lower Colorado River Authority (LCRA) in response to flood devastation requiring more coordinated damage prevention efforts. A 2016-2021 update to a previous plan was published in October 2016 entitled *Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2016*. In compliance with FEMA guidelines, this document is the update to the *Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2016*. This plan was updated specifically for Wharton County and the participating communities; City of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton.

The 2016 update ranked 13 hazards from high (H) to low (L), or not applicable (N/A) for Wharton County and the participating Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton. Table 2-1 list the hazards and their ranking. These 13 hazards were evaluated in the TCRFC plan.

| TABLE 2-1. HAZARD RISK SUMMARY IN THE 2016 WHARTON COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-------|------|--------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|------|----------------|
| Jurisdiction | Dam/Levee Failure | Drought | Earthquake | Expansive Soils | Extreme Heat | Flood | Hail | Hurricane/Tropical Storm | Lightning | Tornado | Wildfire | Wind | Winter Weather |
| Wharton County | N/A | M | L | M | M | M | M | H | L | M | M | L | L |
| City of East Bernard | N/A | H | N/A | M | H | M | M | H | L | M | L | L | L |
| City of El Campo | N/A | H | N/A | M | H | M | M | H | L | M | L | L | L |
| City of Wharton | N/A | H | N/A | M | H | M | M | H | L | M | L | L | L |

The *Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2016* identified goals, objectives, and mitigation actions for these hazards. The overall goal of the 2016-2021 plan was:

To reduce or eliminate the long-term risks to loss of life and property damage in Wharton County from the full range of natural disasters.

Six goals were identified for mitigating the hazards, with one or more objectives defined for each goal. These goals and their associated objectives are as follows:

- **Goal 1:** Protect public health and safety.
 - **Objective 1.1:** Advise the public about health and safety precautions to guard against injury and loss of life from hazards.

- **Objective 1.2:** Maximize the utilization of the latest technology to provide adequate warning, communication, and mitigation of hazard events.
- **Objective 1.3:** Reduce the damage to, and enhance protection of, dangerous areas during hazard events.
- **Objective 1.4:** Protect critical facilities and services.
- **Goal 2:** Protect existing and new properties.
 - **Objective 2.1:** Reduce repetitive losses to the National Flood Insurance Program.
 - **Objective 2.2:** Use the most cost-effective approaches to protect existing buildings and public infrastructure from hazards.
 - **Objective 2.3:** Enact and enforce regulatory measures to ensure that development will not put people in harm's way or increase threats to existing properties.
- **Goal 3:** Increase public understanding, support and demand for hazard mitigation.
 - **Objective 3.1:** Heighten public awareness of the full range of natural and man-made hazards they face.
 - **Objective 3.2:** Educate the public on actions they can take to prevent or reduce the loss of life or property from all hazards.
 - **Objective 3.3:** Publicize and encourage the adoption of appropriate hazard mitigation measures.
- **Goal 4:** Build and support local capacity and commitment to continuously become less vulnerable to hazards.
 - **Objective 4.1:** Build and support local partnerships to continuously become less vulnerable to hazards.
 - **Objective 4.2:** Build a cadre of committed volunteers to safeguard the community before, during, and after a disaster.
 - **Objective 4.3:** Build hazard mitigation concerns into planning and budgeting processes.
- **Goal 5:** Promote growth in a sustainable manner.
 - **Objective 5.1:** Incorporate hazard mitigation into the long-range planning and development activities.
 - **Objective 5.2:** Promote beneficial uses of hazardous areas while expanding open space and recreational opportunities.
 - **Objective 5.3:** Utilize regulatory approaches to prevent creation of future hazards to life and property.
- **Goal 6:** Maximize the resources for investment in hazard mitigation.
 - **Objective 6.1:** Maximize the use of outside sources of funding.
 - **Objective 6.2:** Maximize participation of property owners in protecting their properties.
 - **Objective 6.3:** Maximize insurance coverage to provide financial protection against hazard events.

- **Objective 6.4:** Prioritize mitigation projects, based on cost-effectiveness and starting with those sites facing the greatest threat to life, health, and property.

The *Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2016* then identified one or more mitigation actions to accomplish each objective. The current status of each of these actions identified in the plan is shown in Table 2-2. Within Table 2-2, an asterisk (*) denotes actions that encompass actions carried forward from the 2011-2016 Plan.

**TABLE 2-2.
WHARTON COUNTY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHEET (2016-2021 PLAN PROJECTS)**

| Action No. | Title | Project Status | | | | Funding | | | | Comments |
|----------------|---|----------------|---------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| | | Ongoing | Delayed | Completed | Deleted | Budgeted | Apply for Grant | Grant Received | Target Completion | |
| WHARTON COUNTY | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1* | Install bridge and culvert drainage improvements throughout the County | X | | | | X | X | X | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 1. |
| 2* | Update and adopt a new Wharton County Flood Insurance Study and FIRM | | X | | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 2. |
| 3* | Adopt “Higher Standard” Riverine Flood Damage Prevention Ordinances and Standards | | X | | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 3. |
| 4 | Create and Implement Drought and Expansive Soils Plan | X | | | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 13. |
| 5* | Establish Countywide Bench Mark Network | | | | X | | | | | |
| 6* | Provide support to the TCRFC and San Bernard River in flood reduction projects | X | | | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 11. |
| 7* | Join FEMA’s CRS program | | X | | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 4. |
| 8* | Create a Wharton Disaster Response Team | | | X | | X | | | | |
| 9* | Implement a Wharton County Flood Warning System | X | | | | X | X | X | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 6. |
| 10* | Become an NWS Storm Ready community | | | | X | | | | | |
| 11* | Install emergency back-up generators at critical facilities | X | | | | X | X | X | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 7. |
| 12 | Map expansive soils in unincorporated county | | | | X | | | | | |
| 13* | Purchase NOAA All Hazard Radios | | | | X | | | | | |
| 14 | Provide training for CFM and CEM | | | | X | | | | | |

TABLE 2-2.
WHARTON COUNTY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHEET (2016-2021 PLAN PROJECTS)

| Action No. | Title | Project Status | | | | Funding | | | | Comments |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------|---------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| | | Ongoing | Delayed | Completed | Deleted | Budgeted | Apply for Grant | Grant Received | Target Completion | |
| 15 | Educate homeowners on hazards | X | | | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 8. |
| CITY OF EAST BERNARD | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Create water conservation education materials | | | | X | | | | | |
| 2 | Purchase NOAA All Hazard Radios | | X | | | | X | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 1. |
| 3 | Organize outreach program for vulnerable populations | X | | | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 2. |
| 4 | Prepare and adopt a stormwater drainage plan and ordinance | X | | | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 3. |
| 5 | Update emergency response plan | X | | | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 4. |
| 6 | Educate homeowners on mitigating hazards around their home | | | | X | | | | | |
| 7* | Improve drainage throughout city | X | | | | X | X | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 5. |
| 8* | Drought and Expansive Soils Contingency Plan | | X | | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 11. |
| 9* | Install emergency generators at critical facilities | X | | | | X | X | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 6. |
| 10 | Identify and map areas that are at high risk of expansive soils | | | | X | | | | | |
| CITY OF EL CAMPO | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Drought and expansive soils contingency plan | | | X | | X | | | | |
| 2 | Provide education on water conservation techniques | X | | | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 1. |
| 3 | Construct regional detention ponds | X | | | | X | X | X | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 2. |

**TABLE 2-2.
WHARTON COUNTY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHEET (2016-2021 PLAN PROJECTS)**

| Action No. | Title | Project Status | | | | Funding | | | | Comments |
|------------------------|---|----------------|---------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| | | Ongoing | Delayed | Completed | Deleted | Budgeted | Apply for Grant | Grant Received | Target Completion | |
| 4 | Adopt freeboard ordinance | X | | X | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 3. Currently, freeboard requirements are incorporated into the city design standards. In the process of formally adopting an ordinance. |
| 5 | Adopt IBC and IRC | | | X | | | | | | |
| 6 | Install Blackboard Connect City-to- Resident Notification System | | | | X | | | | | |
| 7 | GIS mapping | X | | | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 5. In the process of conducting GIS mapping. |
| 8 | Outreach to vulnerable populations and cooling centers | X | | | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 6. |
| 9* | Install larger storm drainage on Pecan Street | | | X | | X | | | | |
| 10* | Install larger storm drainage at Town and Country Drive | X | | | | X | X | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 2. |
| 11* | Implement Master Drainage Plan (7 projects) | X | | | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 7. |
| 12 | Educate homeowners on the hazards | X | | | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 8. |
| CITY OF WHARTON | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1* | Clean and repair storm drains routinely | X | | | | X | X | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 1. |
| 2* | Increase freeboard requirements for permitting structures in the floodplain | X | | | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 2. |
| 3* | Implement a comprehensive watershed ordinance for new development | X | | | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 3. |
| 4* | Acquire, reuse and preserve open spaces adjacent to flood-prone areas | X | | | | X | | X | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 4. |
| 5* | Zero Discharge Policy | | | X | | X | | | | |

**TABLE 2-2.
WHARTON COUNTY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHEET (2016-2021 PLAN PROJECTS)**

| Action No. | Title | Project Status | | | | Funding | | | | Comments |
|------------|--|----------------|---------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|--|
| | | Ongoing | Delayed | Completed | Deleted | Budgeted | Apply for Grant | Grant Received | Target Completion | |
| 6 | Purchase NOAA All Hazard Radios | | | | X | | | | | |
| 7 | Educate homeowners on the hazards | X | | | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 5. |
| 8* | Minimize the impact of flooding by installing berms and levees where appropriate | X | | | | X | | X | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 6. |
| 9 | Design flood-use stream restoration/ channelization projects to ensure adequate drainage/diversion of stormwater | X | | | | X | X | X | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 7. |
| 10* | Establish a reserve fund for emergency and public mitigation measures | X | | | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 8. |
| 11* | Strengthen and harden at-risk critical facilities | X | | X | | X | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 9. The city has structurally protected water and wastewater facilities and is in the process of collaborating with USACE on the construction of levee improvements to protect the city. |
| 12* | Acquisition and relocation, elevation and “demo-rebuild” of flood-prone structures | X | | X | | X | | X | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 10. The city has completed this task in some areas, but still collaborating with USACE on acquisition and improvements related to the levee. |
| 13* | Install emergency back-up generators at critical facilities | X | | | | | | X | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 11. |
| 14* | Use impact fees to help fund public hazard mitigation projects related to land development | X | | | | | | | | Incorporated into Mitigation Action 12. |

Notes:

| | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|-------|---|
| CEM | Certified Emergency Manager | IBC | International Building Code |
| CFM | Certified Floodplain Manager | IRC | International Residential Code |
| CRS | Community Rating System | NOAA | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency | NWS | National Weather Service |
| FIRM | Flood Insurance Rate Map | TCRFC | Texas Colorado River Floodplain Coalition |

TABLE 2-2.
WHARTON COUNTY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHEET (2016-2021 PLAN PROJECTS)

| Action No. | Title | Project Status | | | | Funding | | | | Comments |
|------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|----------|
| | | Ongoing | Delayed | Completed | Deleted | Budgeted | Apply for Grant | Grant Received | Target Completion | |
| GIS | Geographic Information System | | | | | | | | | |

2.2 WHY UPDATE?

Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR) stipulates that hazard mitigation plans must present a schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the plan. As mentioned previously, Wharton County participated in a mitigation planning process in 2016 as part of the TCRFC and will expire in 2021. This update process provides an opportunity to reevaluate recommendations, monitor the impacts of actions that have been accomplished, and evaluate whether there is a need to change the focus of mitigation strategies. A jurisdiction covered by a plan that has expired is not able to pursue elements of federal funding under the Robert T. Stafford Act for which a current hazard mitigation plan is a prerequisite.

2.3 THE PLAN – WHAT IS DIFFERENT?

The current plan update conducted by Scheibe Consulting, LLC focused on Wharton County and its participating communities using the best and most current data and technology available. All participating municipalities were fully involved in the preparation of this plan update. The updated plan includes a more robust hazard analysis. Mitigation actions were reviewed and amended to include only those that would move the community towards a higher degree of resiliency while being feasible, practical, and implementable given current finances. Federal and state funds for projects have become difficult to obtain. The update recommends 68 mitigation actions:

- 17 countywide actions
- 14 actions specifically for the City of East Bernard
- 17 actions specifically for the City of El Campo
- 20 actions specifically for the City of Wharton

Actions from the previous plan were carried forward into the mitigation actions if they were identified as delayed or in progress. These actions are indicated in Table 2-2.

2.4 LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

The Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool demonstrates how the Local Mitigation Plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR §201.6 and offers states and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the community.

The Regulation Checklist provides a summary of FEMA's evaluation of whether the plan has addressed all requirements.

The Plan Assessment identifies the plan's strengths as well as documents areas for future improvement.

The Multi-Jurisdiction Summary Sheet is an optional worksheet that can be used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of each element of the plan (Planning Process; Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation; and Plan Adoption).

The FEMA Mitigation Planner must reference the Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide when completing the Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool. The Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool is included in this hazard mitigation plan as Appendix B.

Chapter 3.

PLAN METHODOLOGY

3.1 GRANT FUNDING

The current Hazard Mitigation Plan will expire in 2026. Therefore, the local community-initiated steps to begin the next update in 2021. The local communities, consisting of the City of Wharton, City of El Campo, City of East Bernard, and Wharton County all elected to enter into an interlocal agreement and have Wharton County act as the lead entity for this Hazard Mitigation Plan Update. Wharton County then selected Scheibe Consulting, LLC to assist with the development and implementation of the plan update. No grant funding was obtained for this Hazard Mitigation Plan update, and thus all funding for this update came from the local participating communities. Each participating member contributed both monetarily and through in-kind contributions.

3.2 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

Wharton County opened this planning effort to all eligible local governments in the county. The planning partners covered under this plan are shown in Table 3-1.

| TABLE 3-1. COUNTY AND CITY PLANNING PARTNERS | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Point of Contact | Title |
| Wharton County | Andy Kirkland | Emergency Management Coordinator |
| City of East Bernard | Audrey Searce | Emergency Management Coordinator |
| City of El Campo | Lori Hollingsworth | Emergency Management Coordinator |
| City of Wharton | Gwyneth Teves | Community Development Director |

Each jurisdiction wishing to join the planning partnership was asked to commit to the process and have a clear understanding of expectations. These include:

- Each partner will support and participate in the Steering Committee meetings overseeing the development of the plan update. Support includes making decisions regarding plan development and scope on behalf of the partnership.
- Each partner will provide support as needed for the public involvement strategy developed by the Steering Committee in the form of mailing lists, possible meeting space, and media outreach such as newsletters, newspapers, or direct-mailed brochures.
- Each partner will participate in plan update development activities such as:
 - Steering Committee meetings
 - Public meetings or open houses
 - Workshops and planning partner training sessions
 - Public review and comment periods prior to adoption

Attendance will be tracked at these activities, and attendance records will document participation for each planning partner. All participating communities are expected to attend and actively participate in all meetings and activities.


- Each partner will be expected to review the risk assessment and identify hazards and vulnerabilities specific to its jurisdiction. Contract resources will provide jurisdiction-specific mapping and technical consultation to aid in this task, but the determination of risk and vulnerability ranking will be up to each partner.
- Each partner will be expected to review the mitigation recommendations chosen for the overall county and evaluate whether they will meet the needs of its jurisdiction. Projects within each jurisdiction consistent with the overall plan recommendations will need to be identified, prioritized, and reviewed to identify their benefits and costs.
- Each partner will be required to sponsor at least one public meeting to present the draft plan at least two weeks prior to adoption.
- Each partner will be required to formally adopt the plan.
- Each partner will agree to the plan implementation and maintenance protocol.

Failure to meet these criteria may result in a partner being dropped from the partnership by the Steering Committee, and thus losing eligibility under the scope of this plan.

3.3 DEFINING THE PLANNING AREA

The planning area was defined to consist of all of Wharton County. All partners to this plan have jurisdictional authority within this planning area. Planning partners include the Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton (see Figure 3-1).

Figure 3-1. Wharton County Planning Area and Participating Communities



3.4 THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

A small planning committee was formed at the beginning of the hazard mitigation update process. This committee consisted of representatives from each of the planning partners. Planning committee members are denoted by an asterisk (*) in Table 3-2. This committee agreed to meet bi-weekly from March through the completion of the hazard mitigation plan update. The planning committee aided in data collection throughout the process and helped to identify stakeholders in the planning area who were invited to participate in the steering committee. The following stakeholders were identified by the planning committee and invited to take part in the steering committee:

- Colorado County
- Jackson County
- Matagorda County
- Fort Bend County
- Brazoria County
- City of Kendleton
- City of Beasley
- Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC)
- Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)
- Lower Colorado River Authority (LCRA)
- Wharton County Precinct 1
- Wharton County Precinct 2
- Wharton County Precinct 3
- Wharton County Precinct 4
- Boling Municipal Utility District (MUD)
- Hungerford MUD
- Isaacson MUD
- Water Control and Improvement District (WCID) 1
- WCID 2
- Coastal Bend Ground Water Conservation District
- Wharton County Emergency Service District (ESD) 1
- Wharton County ESD 2
- Wharton County ESD 3
- Boling Independent School District (ISD)
- East Bernard ISD
- El Campo ISD
- Hallettsville ISD
- Louise ISD
- Wharton ISD
- Wharton County Junior College
- Wharton County Electric Cooperative
- Lost Lagoon

3.5 THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Hazard mitigation planning enhances collaboration and support among diverse parties whose interests can be affected by hazard losses. A Steering Committee was formed to oversee all phases of the plan update. The identified stakeholders consisted of neighboring communities, local and regional agencies, businesses, academia, and other private and nonprofit interest. The following stakeholders were identified and invited to take part in the hazard mitigation update process. The members of this committee included key planning partner staff, citizens, and other stakeholders from the planning area. Table 3-2 lists the committee members.

**TABLE 3-2.
STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

| Name | Title | Jurisdiction/Entity |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Andy Kirkland | Emergency Management Coordinator | Wharton County |
| Debbie Cenko* | Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator | Wharton County |
| Krystal Hasselmeier * | Assistant to the Community Development Director | City of Wharton |
| Gwyneth Teves * | Community Development Director | City of Wharton |
| Audrey Searce * | Emergency Management Coordinator | City of East Bernard |
| Lori Hollingsworth * | Emergency Management Coordinator | City of El Campo |
| Kevin Thompson* | Director of Public Works | City of El Campo |
| Steve Johnson | Emergency Management Coordinator | City of Wharton |
| Joseph Pace | City Manager | City of Wharton |
| Brandi Jimenez | Assistant to the City Manager | City of Wharton |
| Stephan Gage | Principal Planner, Transportation | H-GAC |
| Ryan Simper | Area Engineer | TxDOT |
| Mario Chapa | Business Continuity Program Manager | LCRA |
| Rodney Grimmer | Hazard Mitigation Planner | Fort Bend County HS&EM |
| Frank Garza | Regional Planner | Fort Bend County HS&EM |
| Richard Zahn | Commissioner Precinct 1 | Wharton County |
| Jessica Moreno | Admin. Assistant Precinct 1 | Wharton County |
| W.D. Bud Graves | Commissioner Precinct 2 | Wharton County |
| Casey Lewis | Admin. Assistant Precinct 4 | Wharton County |
| Fred Ivy | President | Hungerford MUD |
| Philip Gaudette | Elementary Principal | East Bernard ISD |
| David Janecek | Junior High Principal | East Bernard ISD |
| Shelly Schulz | Communication Specialist | Wharton County Electric Cooperative |
| Kenna Lucas | Owner | Lost Lagoon – El Campo |

The Steering Committee agreed to meet three times or as needed throughout the plan’s development. Scheibe Consulting, LLC facilitated each Steering Committee meeting, which addressed a set of objectives based on the work plan established for the plan update. The Steering Committee met two times from June 2021 through July 2021. Meeting agendas, notes, and attendance logs can be found in Appendix C of this document.

The planning team made a presentation at the first Steering Committee meeting on June 22, 2021, to introduce the mitigation planning process as well as the risk assessment findings. The Steering

Committee, planning partners, and the public were encouraged to participate in the plan update process. Meeting minutes can be found in Appendix C of this document.

3.6 COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

Opportunities for involvement in the planning process must be provided to neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation, agencies with authority to regulate development, businesses, academia, and other private and non-profit interests (44 CFR, Section 201.6(b)(2)). This task was accomplished by the planning team as follows:

- **Steering Committee Involvement**

Agency representatives were invited to participate on the Steering Committee. Scheibe Consulting served as the primary lead/point of contact for stakeholder and community outreach. The planning team took a proactive approach in inviting and seating the Steering Committee for the development of this hazard mitigation plan. The County invited and requested the active participation of a variety of stakeholder interests to form the Wharton County HMP Steering Committee. The Steering Committee Members that were invited by the County are identified in section 3.4, and those who participated as stakeholders in the Wharton County mitigation plan are listed in Table 3-2.

The County utilized personal communication including telephone and email outreach to inform and invite the participation of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee Members were encouraged to attend and actively participate in meetings as well as to review the draft plan and provide questions and comments. Public notices were posted in and around the County offices and the community notifying them of the planning process, upcoming meeting dates, and inviting community participation. Attendance and participation were encouraged.

In addition, Scheibe Consulting also undertook stakeholder/community outreach activities in support of Wharton County. An informational email was sent in the early weeks of the planning process advising various stakeholders and special interest groups about the planning process and inviting interested members to attend the committee meetings. The County coordinated the response to all questions and comments. Any changes to the plan as part of this stakeholder outreach were coordinated thru the County.

- **Agency Notification**

The Texas Division of Emergency Management (TDEM) was invited to participate in the plan development process from the beginning. TDEM was notified of any issues which arose during the hazard mitigation update process.

- **Pre-Adoption Review**

Agency representatives on the Steering Committee and TDEM were provided an opportunity to review and comment on this plan, primarily through the City of Wharton Emergency Management Department Website. The complete draft plan was sent to TDEM for a pre-adoption review to ensure program compliance.

This update process was led by Scheibe Consulting. The process was under the direction of a Texas licensed professional engineer and certified floodplain manager, Eric Scheibe, President of Scheibe Consulting. The Scheibe Consulting team updated the hazard mitigation plan and guided the steering committee throughout the update process.

3.7 REVIEW OF EXISTING PROGRAMS

Hazard mitigation planning must include review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information (44 CFR, Section 201.6(b)(3)). Chapter 6 of this plan provides a review of laws and ordinances in effect within the planning area that can affect hazard mitigation actions. In addition, the following programs can affect mitigation within the planning area:

- Wharton County
 - Master Subdivision Policy
 - Flood Damage Prevention Order
 - Drainage Fee Ordinance
 - Floodplain Map
 - Basic Emergency Operations Plan
 - Wharton County Office of Emergency Management
 - Wharton County Commissioners' Court
 - Wharton County Economic Development Corporation
- City of East Bernard
 - Comprehensive Plan
 - Code of Ordinances
 - City of East Bernard Emergency Management
- City of El Campo
 - City of El Campo Office of Emergency Management
 - Comprehensive Plan Update 2017
 - Code of Ordinances
 - Office of Municipal Service
 - Emergency Medical Services
 - Code Enforcement
 - Citizen Committees, Boards, and Commissions
- City of Wharton
 - Code of Ordinances
 - Planning Commission
 - Economic Development Corporation
 - Floodplain Management
 - Volunteer Fire Department
 - Code Enforcement

- City of Wharton Office of Emergency Management

An assessment of all planning partners' regulatory, technical, and financial capabilities to implement hazard mitigation actions is presented in Chapter 7. Many of these relevant plans, studies, and regulations are cited in the capability assessment.

The review of existing programs and the assessment of capabilities help to identify the plans, regulations, personnel, and funding mechanisms available to the county and planning partners to impact and mitigate the effects of natural hazards. The review also helps identify opportunities for the planning partners to strengthen their abilities to proactively mitigate natural hazards in the community through the expansion of existing departments and programs; completion of applicable plans; adoption of necessary regulations or ordinances; creation and hiring of new departments and staff; or mutual aid agreements and memorandums of understanding with neighboring communities. The planning partners reviewed the findings of the capabilities assessment to ensure all information was accurate and used this to help identify mitigation actions.

3.8 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Broad public participation in the planning process helps ensure that diverse points of view about the planning area's needs are considered and addressed. The public must have opportunities to comment on disaster mitigation plans during the drafting stages and prior to plan approval (44 CFR, Section 201.6(b)(1)). The strategy for involving the public in this plan emphasized the following elements:

Include members of the public on the Steering Committee

Use a community survey/questionnaire to evaluate whether the public's perception of risk and support of hazard mitigation has changed since the initial planning process

Attempt to reach as many planning area citizens as possible using multiple media

Identify and involve planning area stakeholders

Solicit public feedback at each stage of plan implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

3.8.1 Stakeholders and the Steering Committee

Stakeholders are the individuals, agencies, and jurisdictions that have a vested interest in the recommendations of the hazard mitigation plan, including planning partners. The effort to include stakeholders in this process included stakeholder participation on the Steering Committee. Stakeholders were encouraged to attend and participate in all committee meetings.

3.8.2 Survey/Questionnaire

A hazard mitigation plan questionnaire (see Figure 3-2) was developed to gauge household preparedness for natural hazards; the level of knowledge of tools and techniques that assist in reducing risk and loss from natural hazards; and the perceived impact of natural hazards on Wharton County residents and businesses. This online questionnaire was designed to help identify areas vulnerable to one or more natural hazards. The answers to these 33 questions as well as any comments submitted helped guide the Steering Committee in prioritizing hazards of impact and in selecting goals, objectives, and mitigation strategies. A total of 89 questionnaires were completed during the course of this planning process with the English translation receiving 87 responses and the Spanish translation receiving 1. A summary of the survey responses can be found in Appendix C.

Figure 3-2. Sample Page from Questionnaire Distributed to the Public

Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021

A partnership of local governments and other stakeholders in Wharton County are working together to create a Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan. The original plan was prepared by the Texas Colorado River Floodplain Coalition (TCRFC) for Wharton County and the participating communities: City of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton. The updated plan will reevaluate the hazards identified in Wharton County. The plan is developed in response to Federal programs that enable the partnership to use pre- and post-disaster financial assistance to reduce the exposure of County residents to risks associated with hazards.

In order to identify and plan for future natural disasters, we need your assistance. The questionnaire is designed to help us gauge the level of knowledge local citizens already have about disaster issues and to identify areas vulnerable to various types of disasters. The information you provide will help us coordinate activities to reduce the risk of injury or property damage in the future.

The survey consists of 33 questions plus an opportunity for any additional comments at the end. The survey should take less than 5 minutes to complete and is anonymous.

The Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Steering Committee thanks you for taking the time to participate in the information gathering process.

OK

0 of 34 answered

3.8.3 Meetings

Two Steering Committee meetings were held during the planning process as well as bi-weekly meetings with the planning committee. Steering Committee Meetings were held in the City of Wharton on June 22, 2021, and July 26, 2021.

The meeting format allowed attendees to access handouts, maps, and other resources and ask questions during the meetings. Additionally, project staff and county personnel remained after the meeting to have direct conversations with interested attendees. Details regarding the planning and information generated for the risk assessment were shared with attendees via a PowerPoint presentation.

3.8.4 Press Releases/News Articles

Press releases were distributed over the course of the plan's development as key milestones were achieved and prior to each public meeting. Scheibe Consulting coordinated public outreach with the committee members to engage the public and solicit survey participation and comments regarding the plan draft.

3.8.5 Internet

The participating communities posted information regarding the update process, a link to the community survey, and an informational brochure on their community websites as well as on social media outlets such as Facebook. The community was encouraged to take part in the hazard mitigation process through

multiple posts and was encouraged to reach out to Scheibe Consulting or planning partners with any concerns or questions throughout the planning process.

The draft plan was posted on the Wharton County website on September XX, 2021, the City of East Bernard website on September XX, 2021, the City of El Campo website on September XX, 2021, and the City of Wharton website on September XX, 2021 to allow the public to review the plan as described in Chapter 3.7.5.

3.9 PLAN DEVELOPMENT, CHRONOLOGY, AND MILESTONES

Table 3-3 summarizes important milestones in the development of the plan update.

**TABLE 3-3.
PLAN DEVELOPMENT MILESTONES**

| Date | Event | Description | Attendance |
|-------------|---|--|---|
| 2021 | | | |
| 2/22 | Contract signed | Notice to proceed given to Scheibe Consulting, LLC | N/A |
| 3/05 | Planning Committee | First Planning Committee meeting | N/A |
| 05/31 | Public Outreach | Community Survey/Community Brochure distributed via multiple outlets | N/A |
| 6/22 | Steering Committee/ Stakeholder Meeting #1 | Presentation on plan process given, review hazard identification and risk assessment, community survey, intro to mitigation strategies | Wharton County; Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton |
| 7/26 | Steering Committee Meeting #2 | Addition of Land Subsidence, Survey Results, Identifying Mitigation Actions | Wharton County; Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton |
| 8/27 | Draft Plan | Internal review draft provided to Steering Committee | N/A |
| Ongoing | Public Outreach | News articles and website posting | N/A |
| 09/07 | Public Comment Period | The initial public comment period for the draft plan opens. Draft plan posted on plan website and in hard copy at the courthouse and at East Bernard City Hall, El Campo City Hall, and Wharton City Hall with press release notifying the public of plan availability | N/A |
| XX/XX | Wharton County Public Meeting | Draft plan was presented and reviewed | Wharton County; City of El Campo |
| XX/XX | City of El Campo Public Meeting | Draft plan was presented and reviewed | Wharton County; City of El Campo |
| XX/XX | City of East Bernard Public Meeting | Draft plan was presented and reviewed | Wharton County; City of East Bernard |
| XX/XX | City of Wharton Public Meeting | Draft plan was presented and reviewed | Wharton County; City of Wharton |
| XX/XX | Plan Review | Final draft plan submitted to Texas Division of Emergency Management for review | N/A |
| XX/XX | Public Outreach | Final public meeting on draft plan | N/A |
| XX/XX | Plan Approval Pending Adoption | Plan approval pending adoption by FEMA | N/A |
| XX/XX | Adoption | Adoption window of final plan opens | N/A |
| XX/XX | Plan Approval | Final plan approved by FEMA | N/A |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency | | |
| N/A | Not Applicable | | |

Chapter 4.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

Hazard mitigation plans must identify goals for reducing long-term vulnerabilities to identified hazards (44 CFR Section 201.6(c)(3)(i)). The Steering Committee established a guiding principle, a set of goals, and measurable objectives for this plan, based on data from the preliminary risk assessment and the results of the public involvement strategy. The guiding principle, goals, objectives, and actions in this plan all support each other. Goals were selected to support the guiding principle. Objectives were selected that met multiple goals.

4.1 GUIDING PRINCIPLE

A guiding principle focuses on the range of objectives and actions to be considered. This is not a goal because it does not describe a hazard mitigation outcome, and it is broader than a hazard-specific objective. The guiding principle for the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update is as follows:

To reduce or eliminate the long-term risks to loss of life and property damage in Wharton County from the full range of natural disasters.

4.2 GOALS

The following are the mitigation goals for this plan:

- **Goal 1:** Protect public health and safety.
- **Goal 2:** Protect existing and new properties.
- **Goal 3:** Increase public understanding, support, and demand for hazard mitigation.
- **Goal 4:** Build and support local capacity and commitment to continuously become less vulnerable to hazards.
- **Goal 5:** Promote growth in a sustainable manner.
- **Goal 6:** Maximize the resources for investment in hazard mitigation.

4.3 OBJECTIVES

The objectives are used to help establish priorities and support the agreed-upon goals. The objectives are as follows:

- Objectives in support of Goal 1:
 - **Objective 1.1:** Advise the public about health and safety precautions to guard against injury and loss of life from hazards.
 - **Objective 1.2:** Maximize the utilization of the latest technology to provide adequate warning, communication, and mitigation of hazard events.
 - **Objective 1.3:** Reduce the damage to, and enhance protection of, dangerous areas during hazard events.
 - **Objective 1.4:** Protect critical facilities and services.

- Objectives in support of Goal 2:
 - **Objective 2.1:** Reduce repetitive losses to the National Flood Insurance Program.
 - **Objective 2.2:** Use the most cost-effective approaches to protect existing buildings and public infrastructure from hazards.
 - **Objective 2.3:** Enact and enforce regulatory measures to ensure that development will not put people in harm's way or increase threats to existing properties.
- Objectives in support of Goal 3:
 - **Objective 3.1:** Heighten public awareness of the full range of natural hazards they face.
 - **Objective 3.2:** Educate the public on actions they can take to prevent or reduce the loss of life or property from all natural hazards.
 - **Objective 3.3:** Publicize and encourage the adoption of appropriate hazard mitigation measures.
- Objectives in support of Goal 4:
 - **Objective 4.1:** Build and support local partnerships to continuously become less vulnerable to hazards.
 - **Objective 4.2:** Build a cadre of committed volunteers to safeguard the community before, during, and after a disaster.
 - **Objective 4.3:** Build hazard mitigation concerns into planning and budgeting processes.
- Objective in support of Goal 5:
 - **Objective 5.1:** Incorporate hazard mitigation into the long-range planning and development activities.
 - **Objective 5.2:** Promote beneficial uses of hazardous areas while expanding open space and recreational opportunities.
 - **Objective 5.3:** Utilize regulatory approaches to prevent creation of future hazards to life and property.
- Objectives in support of Goal 6:
 - **Objective 6.1:** Maximize the use of outside sources of funding.
 - **Objective 6.2:** Maximize participation of property owners in protecting their properties.
 - **Objective 6.3:** Maximize insurance coverage to provide financial protection against hazard events.
 - **Objective 6.4:** Prioritize mitigation projects, based on cost-effectiveness and starting with those sites facing the greatest threat to life, health and property.

Chapter 5.

IDENTIFIED HAZARDS OF CONCERN AND RISK ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Risk assessment is the process of measuring the potential loss of life, personal injury, economic injury, and property damage resulting from natural hazards. It allows emergency management personnel to establish early response priorities by identifying potential hazards and vulnerable assets. The process focuses on the following elements:

- **Hazard identification** - Use all available information to determine what types of disasters may affect a jurisdiction, how often they can occur, and their potential severity.
- **Vulnerability identification** - Determine the impact of natural hazard events on the people, property, environment, economy, and lands of the region.
- **Cost evaluation** - Estimate the cost of potential damage or cost that can be avoided by mitigation.

The risk assessment for this hazard mitigation plan update evaluates the risk of natural hazards prevalent in the planning area and meets the requirements of the DMA (44 CFR, Section 201.6(c)(2)).

5.1 IDENTIFIED HAZARDS OF CONCERNS

For this plan, the Steering Committee considered the full range of hazards that could impact the planning area and then listed hazards that present the greatest concern. The process incorporated a review of state and local hazard planning documents, as well as information on the frequency, magnitude, and costs associated with hazards that have impacted or could impact the planning area. Anecdotal information regarding hazards and the perceived vulnerability of the planning area's assets to them was also used. Table 2-1 lists the hazards identified in the previous TCRFC plan and the hazard ranking. Based on the review, this plan addresses the following hazards of concern:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| • Dam/Levee Failure | • Hurricane and Tropical Storm |
| • Drought | • Land Subsidence |
| • Expansive Soils | • Lightning |
| • Extreme Heat | • Pandemic |
| • Earthquake | • Tornado |
| • Flood | • Wildfire |
| • Hazardous Materials | • Wind |
| • Hail | • Winter Weather |

Several of these hazards were profiled together because of their common occurrence or damage assessments, such as drought and extreme heat, lightning, hail, and wind. Coastal erosion was profiled in the *State of Texas Hazard Mitigation Plan*; however, coastal erosion was not profiled in this plan because of Wharton County's inland location.

5.2 CLIMATE CHANGE

Climate includes patterns of temperature, precipitation, humidity, wind, and seasons. Climate plays a fundamental role in shaping natural ecosystems, and the human economies and cultures that depend on them. The term “climate change” refers to changes over a long period of time. It is generally perceived that climate change will have a measurable impact on the occurrence and severity of natural hazards around the world. Impacts include the following:

- Snow cover losses will continue, and declining snowpack will affect snow-dependent water supplies and streamflow levels around the world.
- The risk of drought and the frequency, intensity, and duration of heatwaves are expected to increase.
- More extreme precipitation is likely, increasing the risk of flooding.
- The world’s average temperature is expected to increase.

Climate change will affect communities in a variety of ways. Impacts could include an increased risk for extreme events such as drought, storms, flooding, and wildfires; more heat-related stress; and the spread of existing or new vector-borne disease into a community. In many cases, communities are already facing these problems to some degree. Climate change influences the frequency, intensity, extent, or magnitude of the problems.

This hazard mitigation plan update addresses climate change as a secondary impact for each identified hazard of concern. Each chapter addressing one of the hazards of concern includes a section with a qualitative discussion on the probable impacts of climate change for that hazard. While many models are being developed to assess the potential impacts of climate change, none are currently available to support hazard mitigation planning. As these models are developed in the future, this risk assessment may be enhanced to better measure these impacts.

5.3 METHODOLOGY

The risk assessments in Chapter 8 through Chapter 20 describe the risks associated with each identified hazard of concern. Each chapter describes the hazard, the planning area’s vulnerabilities, and probable event scenarios. The following steps were used to define the risk of each hazard:

- **Identify and profile each hazard** - The following information is given for each hazard:
 - Geographic areas most affected by the hazard
 - Event frequency estimates
 - Severity estimates
 - Warning time likely to be available for response
- **Determine exposure to each hazard** - Exposure was evaluated by overlaying hazard maps, when available, with an inventory of structures, facilities, and systems to identify which of them would be exposed to each hazard. When hazard mapping was not available, a more qualitative discussion of exposure is presented.
- **Assess the vulnerability of exposed facilities** - The vulnerability of exposed structures and infrastructure was evaluated by interpreting the probability of occurrence of each event and assessing structures, facilities, and systems that are exposed to each hazard. Tools such as geographic

information system (GIS) and FEMA's hazard modeling program called Hazards United States Multi-Hazard, or HAZUS-MH, were used to perform this assessment for the earthquake, dam/levee failure, flood, and hurricane hazards. Outputs similar to those from HAZUS-MH were generated for other hazards, using maps generated by the HAZUS-MH program as well as a variety of other government and private sources.

5.4 RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLS

5.4.1 Dam Failure, Earthquake, Flood, and Hurricane - HAZUS-MH

Overview

In 1997, FEMA developed the standardized HAZUS-MH model to estimate losses caused by earthquakes and identify areas that face the highest risk and potential for loss. HAZUS-MH was later expanded into a multi-hazard methodology, HAZUS-MH, with new models for estimating potential losses from dam failures, hurricanes, and floods.

HAZUS-MH is a GIS-based software program used to support risk assessments, mitigation planning, and emergency planning and response. It provides a wide range of inventory data, such as demographics, building stock, critical facility, transportation, and utility lifeline, and multiple models to estimate potential losses from natural disasters. The program maps and displays hazard data and the results of damage and economic loss estimates for buildings and infrastructure. Its advantages include the following:

- Provides a consistent methodology for assessing risk across geographic and political entities.
- Provides a way to save data so that it can readily be updated as population, inventory, and other factors change, and as mitigation planning efforts evolve.
- Facilitates the review of mitigation plans because it helps to ensure that FEMA methodologies are incorporated.
- Supports grant applications by calculating benefits using FEMA definitions and terminology.
- Produces hazard data and loss estimates that can be used when communicating with local stakeholders.
- Is administered by the local government and can be used to manage and update a hazard mitigation plan throughout its implementation.

Levels of Detail for Evaluation

HAZUS-MH provides default data for inventory, vulnerability, and hazards; this default data can be supplemented with local data to provide a more refined analysis. The model can carry out three levels of analysis, depending on the format and level of detail of information about the planning area:

- **Level 1** – All of the information needed to produce an estimate of losses is included in the software's default data. These data are derived from national databases and describe in general terms the characteristic parameters of the planning area.
- **Level 2** – More accurate estimates of losses require more detailed information about the planning area. To produce Level 2 estimates of losses, detailed information is required about local geology,

hydrology, hydraulics, and building inventory, as well as data about utilities and critical facilities. This information is needed in a GIS format.

- **Level 3** – This level of analysis generates the most accurate estimate of losses. It requires detailed engineering and geotechnical information to customize it for the planning area.

Application for This Plan

This risk assessment was conducted using HAZUS-MH and GIS-based analysis methodology. The default HAZUS-MH inventory database for Wharton County was updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs. This enabled a HAZUS-MH Level 2 analysis to be performed on some of the profiled hazards.

The following methods were used to assess specific hazards for this plan:

- **Dam/Levee Failure** - Dam failure inundation mapping for the planning area was not available in a format usable with HAZUS-MH. Therefore, dam failure inundation maps were not used for performing HAZUS-MH risk analysis.
- **Earthquake** – No earthquake scenarios were selected for this plan since an earthquake event for the planning area is rare according to the 2013 State of Texas Hazard Mitigation Plan. Only a minimum Level 1 HAZUS-MH analysis was profiled using the 500-Year Probability Event scenario.
- **Flood** - A Level 2 flood analysis was performed using HAZUS-MH.
- **Hurricane** -. The probabilistic option in the HAZUS-MH hurricane module was used for the analysis of this hazard.

5.4.2 Other Hazards of Concern

For hazards of concern that are not directly modeled in HAZUS-MH, annualized losses were estimated using GIS-based analysis, historical data analysis, and statistical risk assessment methodology. Event frequency, severity indicators, expert opinions, and historical knowledge of the region was used for this assessment. The primary data source was the updated HAZUS-MH inventory data updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs and augmented with state and federal data sets. Additional data sources for specific hazards were also used and cited within their respective sections.

5.4.3 Limitations

Loss estimates, exposure assessments, and hazard-specific vulnerability evaluations rely on the best available data and methodologies. Uncertainties are inherent in any loss estimation methodology and arise in part from incomplete scientific knowledge concerning natural hazards and their effects on the built environment. Uncertainties also result from the following:

- Approximations and simplifications necessary to conduct a study
- Incomplete or outdated inventory, demographic, or economic parameter data
- The unique nature, geographic extent, and severity of each hazard
- Mitigation measures already employed
- The amount of advance notice residents have to prepare for a specific hazard event

These factors can affect loss estimates by a factor of two or more. Therefore, potential exposure and loss estimates are approximate and not deterministic. The results do not predict precise results and should be used only to understand the relative risk for planning purposes and not engineering. Over the long term, Wharton County and its planning partners will collect additional data to assist in estimating potential losses associated with other hazards.

Chapter 6.

WHARTON COUNTY PROFILE

Wharton County covers 1,094 square miles, of which 10 square miles is water and the rest is land. It is located in southeast Central Texas (Figure 6-1). The San Bernard River forms the northeastern border and the Colorado River bisects the county from northwest to southeast. The creeks in the county are Mustang Creek, West Bernard Creek, Blue Creek, Jones Creek, Peach Creek, and Caney Creek. The City of El Campo is the largest city and the City of Wharton is the county seat. As of the 2010 U.S. Census, Wharton County had a population of 41,280. The county has one hospital, El Campo Memorial Hospital in the City of El Campo. The main land uses in Wharton County are cattle ranching, and cotton and rice production. Wharton County is only 35 miles from the Gulf of Mexico and minutes away from Houston.

Figure 6-1. Location of the Wharton County Planning Area within the State of Texas



6.1 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Wharton County, named for brothers William and John Wharton, was established in 1846. It was created from parts of Matagorda, Jackson, and Colorado Counties. The majority of this section was summarized from the Handbook of Texas Online (Hudgins 2010).

The Anglo-American colonization began when 31 of Stephen F. Austin's "Old Three Hundred" families received titles to land in present Wharton County. They located along the Colorado and San Bernard Rivers for access to building materials and stream transportation, but most built their homes along Peach and Caney Creeks, as the Colorado River was prone to flooding. The settlers were mostly from southern states and their homesteads were copies of those they had left. The later settlements were located on the open prairies in the county's western areas, where European immigrants operated small family farms. Many individuals from the future Wharton County participated in the Texas Revolution.

Dispersed settlement in the county continued during the Republic of Texas period from 1836 to 1846. Aside from occasional farm settlements, the area was a near wilderness. Wharton County was established after Texas statehood and the Mexican War in 1846. The act that formed Wharton County established the county seat to be named Wharton, located on the northeast bank of the Colorado River.

The first county courthouse was built in 1848 but was so poorly constructed that it was replaced in 1852. Wharton County resembled parts of the Deep South; one plantation was over 4,500 acres and the county had 16,784 acres of land under cultivation. Prior to the Civil War, the largest plantation and sugar mill in Texas were located in Wharton County. Completion of the Buffalo Bayou, Brazos, and Colorado Railway extensions across the northwest corner of the county by 1860 improved commodity prices, though roads to the railroad line remained poor. Residents joined the Confederate War effort as part of Terry's Texas Rangers, the Home Guards, or the Wharton Rifles. No fighting occurred in Wharton County, but the Civil War destroyed the county's plantation economy. Plantations were converted into cattle ranges and many residents left for Mexico. The resulting commercial and agricultural depression was heightened by a national depression in 1873.

Cattle raising replaced the plantation system as Wharton County's major industry after the Civil War. Abel Head Pierce acquired vast acreage on the west side of the Colorado River, with a cattle empire that stretched over three counties, encompassing 500,000 acres, of which 30,000 were in Wharton County. After his death in 1900, his nephew, A. P. Borden, facilitated the first major importation of Brahms to the United States (specifically Wharton County) in 1906. Wharton County became the second largest cattle-producing area in the state. Japanese families came to the area and began rice farming on land just opposite the Town of Wharton on the west bank of the Colorado River. Irrigation from three canal systems built from the Colorado River around 1900 helped farmers diversify and turn to rice as a dependable cash crop. By 1930, Wharton County was a leader in Texas for rice production. During World War I, Wharton County contributed men to the armed forces and organized home guards.

One of the world's largest sulfur deposits, the Boling Dome, was discovered in 1923. Drilling for oil began in 1904 southwest of the Town of El Campo, but the first productive oil well was drilled east of the Colorado River in the Boling Field in 1925. Between 1925 and 1973 over 230 million barrels of crude oil were produced in the county. Several natural gas transmission plants were built around 1944 boosting pressure and sending natural gas north from the area fields.

Farm tenancy in the county peaked in 1930 when a majority of the farms were operated by tenant families. During the Great Depression in the 1930s, public works projects upgraded county and federal facilities. During World War II, federal funds were used to establish community centers for servicemen at Wharton and El Campo; the 47th Battalion of the Texas State Guard had its headquarters in Wharton County.

From 1960 to 1970 Wharton County's population declined, but between 1970 and 1982 it increased in the urban areas. In 1970, the county was the leading Texas rice producer and third among Texas counties in beef cattle production. In the 1980s, 94% of the county land was in farms and ranches, and 64% of farmland was under cultivation. County-wide ranching continued, and the county was second in the state in sorghum production. Scientifically managed farms and ranches replaced the county's earlier plantation system.

6.2 MAJOR PAST HAZARD EVENTS

Federal disaster declarations are typically issued for hazard events that cause more damage than state and local governments can handle without assistance from the federal government. However, no specific dollar loss threshold has been established for these declarations. A federal disaster declaration puts federal recovery programs into motion to help disaster victims, businesses, and public entities. Some of the programs are matched by state programs. The planning area has experienced 25 events between 1990 and March of 2021 for which federal disaster declarations were issued. These events are listed in Table 6-1.

A review of these events helps identify targets for risk reduction and ways to increase a community's capability to avoid large-scale events in the future. Still, many natural hazard events do not trigger federal disaster declaration protocol but have significant impacts on their communities. These events are also important to consider in establishing recurrence intervals for hazards of concern. More detailed event tables can be found in the individual hazard profile sections.

TABLE 6-1.
FEDERAL DISASTER DECLARATIONS IN WHARTON COUNTY

| Disaster Declaration | Description | Incident Date |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| DR-4586 | Severe Winter Storms | 2/11/21 – 2/21/21 |
| EM-3554 | Severe Winter Storm | 2/11/21 – 2/21/21 |
| EM-3540 | Tropical Storms Marco and Laura | 8/23/20 – 8/27/20 |
| EM-3530 | Hurricane Hanna | 7/25/20 – 7/31/20 |
| DR-4485 | COVID-19 Pandemic | 1/20/20 – Ongoing |
| EM-3458 | COVID-19 | 1/20/20 - Ongoing |
| DR-4332 | Hurricane Harney | 8/23/2017 - 9/15/2017 |
| DR-4269 | Severe Storms and Flooding | 4/17/2016 - 4/30/2016 |
| DR-4223 | Severe Storms, Straight-line Winds, Tornadoes, and Flooding | 5/4/2015 - 6/22/2015 |
| DR-1791 | Hurricane Ike | 9/7/2008 - 10/2/2008 |
| EM-3294 | Hurricane Ike | 9/7/2008 - 9/26/2008 |
| EM-3290 | Hurricane Gustav | 8/27/2008 - 9/7/2008 |
| EM-3277 | Hurricane Dean | 8/17/2007 - 9/5/2007 |
| DR-1624 | Extreme Wildfire Threat | 11/27/2005 - 5/14/2006 |
| DR-1606 | Hurricane Rita | 9/23/2005 - 10/14/2005 |
| EM-3261 | Hurricane Rita | 9/20/2005 - 10/14/2005 |
| EM-3216 | Hurricane Katrina Evacuation | 8/29/2005 - 10/1/2005 |
| DR-1434 | Tropical Storm Fay | 9/6/2002 - 9/30/2002 |
| EM-3142 | Extreme Fire Hazards | 8/1/1999 - 12/10/1999 |
| DR-1257 | Flooding | 10/17/1998 - 11/15/1998 |
| DR-1239 | Tropical Storm Charley | 8/22/1998 - 8/31/1998 |
| DR-1041 | Severe Thunderstorms and Flooding | 10/14/1994 - 11/8/1994 |
| EM-3113 | Extreme Fire Hazard | 8/30/1993 - 11/15/1993 |
| DR-930 | Severe Thunderstorms | 12/20/1991 - 1/14/1992 |
| DR-863 | Severe Storms, Tornadoes, and Flooding | 4/15/1990 - 5/29/1990 |
| Notes: Federal disaster declarations are coded as follows: DR = Major Disaster Declaration; EM = Emergency Declaration From OpenFEMA Dataset | | |


6.3 CLIMATE

Wharton County is hot and humid in the summer and cool in winter. Average temperatures range from 92.8°F in the summer to 43.3°F in the winter. NOAA weather station climate data consists of information collected from May 1904 to September 2011 by Pierce 1 E (USC00417020) weather station augmented with data from October 2011 to March 2021 from El Campo (USC00412786) weather station. Table 6-2 contains temperature summaries for the stations. Figure 6-2 graphs the daily temperature averages and extremes from May 1, 1904, through March 31, 2021. Figure 6-3 and Figure 6-4 show the geographic

distribution of annual average minimum and annual average maximum temperatures in Wharton County compared to the State of Texas from 1981 to 2010.


| TABLE 6-2. WHARTON COUNTY TEMPERATURE SUMMARIES | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Winter ^a Average Minimum Temperature | 43.3°F |
| Winter ^a Mean Temperature | 54.5°F |
| Summer ^a Average Maximum Temperature | 92.8°F |
| Summer ^a Mean Temperature | 82.2°F |
| Maximum Temperature (and Date) | 112°F (September 5, 2000) |
| Minimum Temperature (and Date) | 4°F (January 31, 1949) |
| Average Annual Number of Days >90°F ^a | 108.3 |
| Average Annual Number of Days <32°F ^a | 18.9 |
| Notes: Winter: December, January, February; Summer: June, July, August From NOAA Weather Station Climate Data (May 1904 – March 2021) | |

Figure 6-2. Wharton Daily Temperature Data (May 1904 – March 2021)




Note: From NOAA Weather Station Climate Data (May 1904 – March 2021)

Figure 6-3. Annual Average Maximum Temperature (1981-2010)



Notes: From USDA/PRISM CLIMATE GROUP

Figure 6-4. Annual Average Minimum Temperature (1981-2010)




Note: From USDA/PRISM CLIMATE GROUP

Rainfall is uniformly distributed throughout the year, reaching a slight peak in May and September. Snowfalls are infrequent. Precipitation is highest in September. The average annual precipitation is 40.48 inches based on NOAA weather station data. Severe thunderstorms occur mostly in the spring. Data from the National Lightning Detection Network ranked Texas first in the nation (excluding Alaska and Hawaii) with respect to the number of cloud-to-ground lightning flashes in 2020.


Figure 6-5 shows the average monthly precipitation in Wharton County. Figure 6-6 shows the geographic distribution of annual average precipitation in Wharton County compared to the State of Texas.

Figure 6-5. Average Monthly Precipitation (1904-2021)



Note: From NOAA Weather Station

Figure 6-6. Geographic Distribution of Annual Average Precipitation (1981-2010)



Note: From USDA/PRISM CLIMATE GROUP


6.4 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Texas is broadly divided into four regions by physical geography features such as landforms, climate, and vegetation. Wharton County is in southeast Central Texas. It lies in the Gulf Prairies Land Resource Area of the Coastal Plains Natural Region. Figure 6-7 shows the Texas natural regions with Wharton County highlighted.

The major natural drainage ways in the county are the San Bernard River and the Colorado River, which carry water from the creeks. Most of the county is nearly level to gently sloping. The western part of the county has slopes of a five-foot fall in one mile, and the eastern part of the county has slopes of a two-foot fall in one mile. Thus, runoff moves very slowly off the soil and most runoff is carried in constructed ditches to the rivers.

The predominant soil types in Wharton County are alluvial alluvium, coastal clay, loam, and sand. Natural resources of the county include salt domes, sand and gravel, oil, gas, and sulfur; all have been tapped for commercial and industrial use (Hudgins 2010).

Figure 6-7. Natural Regions of Texas and Wharton County



Note: From Texas Parks & Wildlife

6.5 CRITICAL FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Critical facilities and infrastructure are essential to the health and welfare of the population. These assets become especially important after a hazard event. As defined for this hazard mitigation plan update, critical facilities include but are not limited to the following:

Essential services facilities:

- Public safety facilities (police stations, fire and rescue stations, emergency vehicle and equipment storage, and, emergency operation centers)
- Emergency medical facilities (hospitals, ambulance service centers, urgent care centers having emergency treatment functions, and non-ambulatory surgical structures but excluding clinics, doctors' offices, and non-urgent care medical structures that do not provide these functions)
- Designated emergency shelters
- Communications (main hubs for telephone, broadcasting equipment for cable systems, satellite dish systems, cellular systems, television, radio, and other emergency warning systems, but excluding towers, poles, lines, cables, and conduits)
- Public utility plant facilities for generation and distribution (hubs, treatment plants, substations and pumping stations for water, power and gas, but not including towers, poles, power lines, buried pipelines, transmission lines, distribution lines, and service lines)
- Air transportation lifelines (airports [municipal and larger], helicopter pads and structures serving emergency functions, and associated infrastructure [aviation control towers, air traffic control centers, and emergency equipment aircraft hangars])

Hazardous materials facilities:

- Chemical and pharmaceutical plants
- Laboratories containing highly volatile, flammable, explosive, toxic, or water-reactive materials
- Refineries
- Hazardous waste storage and disposal sites
- Aboveground gasoline or propane storage or sales centers

At-risk population facilities:

- Elderly care centers (nursing homes)
- Congregate care serving 12 or more individuals (daycare and assisted living)
- Public and private schools (pre-schools, K-12 schools, before-school and after-school care serving 12 or more children)

Facilities vital to restoring normal services:

- Essential government operations (public records, courts, jails, building permitting and inspection services, community administration and management, maintenance and equipment centers)
- Essential structures for public colleges and universities (dormitories, offices, and classrooms only)


Table 6-3 and Table 6-4 summarize the critical facilities and infrastructure in each municipality and unincorporated county areas. This information was obtained from HAZUS-MH and GIS.

| TABLE 6-3. CRITICAL FACILITIES IN THE PLANNING AREA | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Facility Type | City of East Bernard | City of El Campo | City of Wharton | Unincorporated or Other | Wharton County Total |
| Fire Stations | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 8 |
| Police Stations | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Medical and Health | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Emergency Operations Center | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| School | 4 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 24 |
| Hazardous Materials | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 18 |
| Government Functions | 4 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 12 |
| Total | 12 | 20 | 19 | 19 | 70 |

| TABLE 6-4. CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE PLANNING AREA | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Facility Type | City of East Bernard | City of El Campo | City of Wharton | Unincorporated or Other | Wharton County Total |
| Communication | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Power Facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Potable Water/ Wastewater Facility | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 9 |
| Dam Location | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 |
| Airport Facility | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Airport Runway | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Other Transportation | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Bridge | 1 | 32 | 34 | 290 | 357 |
| Total | 5 | 36 | 37 | 316 | 394 |


Figures 6-8 through Figure 6-15 show the location of critical facilities and infrastructure in the county and participating cities. Due to the sensitivity of this information, a detailed list of facilities is not provided. The list is on file with each planning partner. Critical facilities and infrastructure were analyzed in HAZUS-MH to help rank risk and identify mitigation actions. The risk assessment for each hazard discusses critical facilities and infrastructure with regard to that hazard.

Figure 6-8. Critical Facilities in Wharton County




Note: From HAZUS-MH

Figure 6-9. Critical Infrastructure in Wharton County




Note: From HAZUS-MH and GIS

Figure 6-10. Critical Facilities in the City of East Bernard




Note: From HAZUS-MH and GIS

Figure 6-11. Critical Infrastructure in the City of East Bernard




Note: From HAZUS-MH and GIS

Figure 6-12. Critical Facilities in the City of El Campo




Note: From HAZUS-MH and GIS

Figure 6-13. Critical Infrastructure in the City of El Campo




Note: From HAZUS-MH and GIS

Figure 6-14. Critical Facilities in the City of Wharton



Note: From HAZUS-MH and GIS

Figure 6-15. Critical Infrastructure in the City of Wharton



Note: From HAZUS-MH and GIS

6.6 DEMOGRAPHICS

Information on current and historic population levels and future population projections is needed for making informed decisions about future planning. Population directly relates to land needs such as housing, industry, stores, public facilities and services, and transportation. Population changes are useful socio-economic indicators, as a growing population generally indicates a growing economy, and a decreasing population signifies economic decline.

Some populations are at greater risk from hazard events because of decreased resources or physical abilities. Elderly people, for example, may be more likely to require additional assistance. Research has shown that people living near or below the poverty line, the elderly (especially older single men), the disabled, women, children, ethnic minorities, and renters all experience, to some degree, more severe effects from disasters than the general population. These vulnerable populations may vary from the general population in risk perception; living conditions; access to information before, during, and after a hazard event; capabilities during an event; and access to resources for post-disaster recovery. Indicators of vulnerability, such as disability, age, poverty, and minority race and ethnicity, often overlap spatially and often in the geographically most vulnerable locations. Detailed spatial analysis to locate areas where there are higher concentrations of vulnerable community members would assist the county and participating cities in extending focused public outreach and education to these most vulnerable citizens. Select U.S. Census demographic and social characteristics estimates for 2015 through 2019 in Wharton County are shown in Table 6-5.

| TABLE 6-5. WHARTON COUNTY DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS (2015-2019) | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | Wharton County | City of East Bernard | City of El Campo | City of Wharton |
| Gender/Age (% of Total Population) | | | | |
| Male | 49.1 | 47.5 | 47.3 | 49.6 |
| Female | 50.9 | 52.5 | 52.7 | 50.4 |
| Under 5 years | 6.8 | 6.4 | 8.0 | 7.0 |
| 65 years and over | 16.6 | 16.0 | 15.7 | 18.5 |
| Race/Ethnicity (% of Total Population) | | | | |
| White | 80.6 | 93.6 | 83.9 | 63.9 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Asian | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Black or African American | 14.3 | 1.4 | 9.2 | 30.0 |
| More Than One Race | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) ¹ | 41.4 | 30.1 | 56.0 | 37.1 |
| Education (% of Total Population) | | | | |
| High School Graduate or Higher (25 years and over) | 78.3 | 89.5 | 73.3 | 72.7 |
| Notes: ¹ The U.S. Census Bureau considers the Hispanic/Latino designation an ethnicity, not a race. The population self-identified as "Hispanic/Latino" is also represented within the categories in the "Race" demographic. From U.S. Census Bureau | | | | |


6.6.1 Population

The U.S. Census Bureau estimated a population of 41,556 for Wharton County as of July 2019. Table 6-6 shows planning area population data from 1990 through 2019. The total Wharton County population increased 3.1% from 1990 to 2000, 0.2% from 2000 to 2010, and 0.7% from 2010 to 2019; thus, the population has continued to grow since 1990 at a varying rate. The Cities of El Campo and Wharton are the county's principal population centers.

| TABLE 6-6. | | | | |
|---|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| WHARTON COUNTY POPULATION | | | | |
| | Total Population | | | |
| | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 2019 |
| City of East Bernard | - | 2,306 | 2,272 | 2,342 |
| City of El Campo | 10,932 | 11,569 | 11,602 | 11,539 |
| City of Wharton | 9,140 | 9,529 | 8,832 | 8,637 |
| Unincorporated Areas ^a | 19,883 | 17,787 | 18,574 | 19,038 |
| Wharton County Total | 39,955 | 41,191 | 41,280 | 41,556 |
| Notes: | | | | |
| a. Includes non-participating communities | | | | |
| From U.S. Census Bureau | | | | |

Figure 6-16 shows 10-year population changes in Wharton County and the State of Texas from 1990 to 2010 and the 9-year change from 2010 to 2019. Between 1990 and 2019, the State of Texas' population grew by 70.7% (about 2.4% per year) while Wharton County's population increased by 4% (0.14% per year).

Figure 6-16. State of Texas and Wharton County Population Growth



Note: From U.S. Census Bureau


6.6.2 Age Distribution

As a group, the elderly are more apt to lack the physical and economic resources necessary for response to hazard events and are more likely to suffer health-related consequences making recovery slower. They are more likely to be vision, hearing, or mobility impaired, and more likely to experience mental impairment or dementia. Additionally, the elderly are more likely to live in assisted-living facilities where emergency preparedness occurs at the discretion of facility operators. These facilities are typically identified as “critical facilities” by emergency managers because they require extra notice to implement evacuation. Elderly residents living in their own homes may have more difficulty evacuating their homes and could be stranded in dangerous situations. This population group is more likely to need special medical attention, which may not be readily available during natural disasters due to isolation caused by the event. Specific planning attention for the elderly is an important consideration given the current aging of the national population.

Children under 14 are particularly vulnerable to disaster events because of their young age and dependence on others for basic necessities. Very young children may additionally be vulnerable to injury or sickness; this vulnerability can be worsened during a natural disaster because they may not understand the measures that need to be taken to protect themselves from hazards.

The overall age distribution for the planning area is illustrated in Figure 6-17. Based on U.S. Census data estimates, in 2019 16.6% of the planning area’s population is 65 or older. U.S. Census data does not provide information regarding disabilities in the planning area’s over-65 population. U.S. Census estimates for 2019 indicate that 21.3% of Wharton County families have children under 18 and are below the poverty line.

Figure 6-17. Wharton County Age Distribution



Note: From U.S. Census Bureau


6.6.3 Disabled Populations

In 2019 the U.S. Census Bureau estimates that 40.3 million non-institutionalized Americans with disabilities live in the U.S, approximately 12.6%. People with disabilities are more likely to have difficulty responding to hazard events than the general population. Local government is the first level of response to assist these individuals, and coordination of efforts to meet their access and functional needs is paramount to life safety efforts. Emergency managers need to distinguish between functional and medical needs in order to plan for incidents that require evacuation and sheltering. Knowing the percentage of the population with a disability will allow emergency management personnel and first responders to have personnel available who can provide services needed by those with access and functional needs. According to 2019 U.S. Census Bureau estimates, 14.6% of the population in the planning area lives with some form of disability.

6.6.4 Ethnic Populations

Research shows that minorities are less likely to be involved in pre-disaster planning and experience higher mortality rates during a disaster event. Post-disaster recovery can be less effective for ethnic populations and is often characterized by cultural insensitivity. Since higher proportions of ethnic minorities live below the poverty line than the majority white population, poverty can compound vulnerability. According to the 2019 U.S. Census estimates, the ethnic composition of Wharton County is predominantly white, at about 80.6%. The largest minority population is Hispanic or Latino at 41.4%. Figure 6-18 shows the population distribution by race and ethnicity in Wharton County. The values shown in Figure 6-18 exceed 100% because according to the U.S. Census, Hispanic or Latino is listed as an ethnicity, not a race. Therefore, the Hispanic or Latino designation encompasses several races.

Figure 6-18. Wharton County Ethnic Distribution



Note: From U.S. Census Bureau

Wharton County has a 9.9% foreign-born population. Other than English, the most commonly spoken language in Wharton County is Spanish. An estimated 9.4% of the residents speak English “less than very well.”

6.7 ECONOMY

Select 2019 economic characteristics estimated for Wharton County by the U.S. Census Bureau are shown in Table 6-7.

| TABLE 6-7. WHARTON COUNTY ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | Wharton County | City of East Bernard | City of El Campo | City of Wharton |
| Families Below Poverty Level | 14.3% | 7.2% | 16.9% | 17.8% |
| Individuals Below Poverty Level | 17.6% | 11.3% | 20.8% | 20.1% |
| Median Home Value (Owner Occupied) | \$128,100 | \$165,900 | \$146,000 | \$92,700 |
| Median Household Income | \$48,310 | \$62,200 | \$49,182 | \$39,079 |
| Per Capita Income | \$25,298 | \$28,965 | \$27,783 | \$19,369 |
| Population >16 Years Old in Labor Force | 59.7% | 62.1% | 62.0% | 50.3% |
| Population Employed | 56.7% | 60.7% | 59.9% | 49.5% |
| Note: From U.S. Census Bureau | | | | |

6.7.1 Income


In the United States, individual households are expected to use private resources to some extent to prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters. This means that households living in poverty are automatically disadvantaged when confronting hazards. Additionally, the poor typically occupy more poorly built and inadequately maintained housing. Mobile or modular homes, for example, are more susceptible to damage in earthquakes and floods than other types of housing. In urban areas, the poor often reside in older houses and apartment complexes, which are more likely to be made of un-reinforced masonry, a building type that is particularly susceptible to damage during earthquakes. Furthermore, residents below the poverty level are less likely to have insurance to compensate for losses incurred from natural disasters. This means that residents below the poverty level have a great deal to lose during an event and are the least prepared to deal with potential losses. The events following Hurricane Katrina in 2005 illustrated that personal household economics significantly impact people's decisions on evacuation. Individuals who cannot afford gas for their cars will likely decide not to evacuate.

Based on U.S. Census Bureau estimates, per capita income in the planning area in 2019 was \$25,298 and the median household income was \$48,310. It is estimated that 14.4% of households receive an income between \$100,000 and \$149,999 per year and 7.6% are above \$150,000 annually. Families with incomes below the poverty level in 2019 made up 14.3% of all families and 17.6 % of the total population in Wharton County.

6.7.2 Employment Trends

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in March of 2021, Wharton County's unemployment rate was 7.1%, compared to a statewide rate of 6.9%. Figure 6-19 shows Wharton County's unemployment trends from 1990 through, March 2021. Wharton County's unemployment rate was lowest in 2019 at 3.4% and peaked in 2011 at 9.6%.

Figure 6-19. Wharton County Unemployment Rate (1990-2021)




Notes: Shaded areas indicate U.S. recessions, From U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

According to the 2019 U.S. Census Bureau estimates, 59.7 of Wharton County's population 16 years and older are in the labor force, including 65.7% of women and 81.8% of men.

6.7.3 Occupations and Industries

According to 2019 U.S. Census data estimates, the planning area's economy is strongly based in the education services, health care and social assistance industries (23.1% of total employment), followed by retail trade (12.5%), and then agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining industry group (11.1%). Figure 6-20 shows the distribution of industry types in Wharton County, based on the share of total employment.

Figure 6-20. Percent of Total Employment by Industry in Wharton County



Note: From U.S. Census Bureau

6.8 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

The municipal planning partners have adopted plans that govern land-use decisions and policymaking in their jurisdictions. Decisions on land use will be governed by these programs. This plan will work together with these programs to support wise land use in the future by providing vital information on the risk associated with natural hazards in the planning area.

It is the goal that all municipal planning partners will incorporate this hazard mitigation plan update in their comprehensive plans (if applicable) by reference. This will help ensure that future development trends can be established with the benefits of the information on risk and vulnerability to natural hazards identified in this plan. The participating communities have not formally tracked the impacts of changes in development over the last five years and how these changes in development were influenced by the risk associated with natural hazards in the county or the communities. As part of this hazard mitigation plan update, Wharton County and the cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton are now equipped with the knowledge and the tools to track and implement changes to the plan during their annual reviews and 5-year updates to reflect development changes. However, it should be noted that the mitigation actions developed and prioritized through the mitigation action ranking process reflect the current development conditions and applicable policies.

6.8.1 Wharton County

Wharton County consists primarily of agricultural land. Developed land accounts for only 5.1 % of the county. Table 6-8 lists the present land use in Wharton County.


| TABLE 6-8. PRESENT LAND USE IN PLANNING AREA | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Present Use Classification | Area (acres) | % of Total Land Area |
| Agriculture | 570,198 | 81.4 |
| Developed, Open Space | 26,949 | 3.8 |
| Developed, High Intensity | 648 | 0.1 |
| Developed, Medium Intensity | 2,029 | 0.3 |
| Developed, Low Intensity | 6,060 | 0.9 |
| Forest Land | 51,226 | 7.3 |
| Grassland/Prairie | 10,383 | 1.5 |
| Water/Wetland | 32,897 | 4.7 |
| Total | 700,390 | 100 |
| Note: From U.S. Geological Survey: National Land Cover Database | | |

As described in Chapter 6.6.1, the population of Wharton County increased by 4% from 1990 to 2019. Most of the population in the county lives in unincorporated areas, while the cities of El Campo and Wharton are also large population centers.

Housing units in Wharton County are mainly single-family detached homes; however, there are approximately 2,299 mobile homes in the county.

The number of residential building permits reported in Wharton County over the past 10 years represents an upward trend, spiking in 2013 (145 permits). Wharton County would be impacted by an increase in vulnerability since additional residential building permits have been issued since 2010. Records on Wharton County building permits include all permits issued within the county. Figure 6-21 shows the reported residential building permits in Wharton County between 2010 and 2019.

Figure 6-21. Residential Building Permits in Wharton County




Note: From Texas Real Estate Research Center at Texas A&M University

6.8.2 City of East Bernard

According to 2019 U.S. Census data, the population of the City of East Bernard increased approximately 1.5% from 2000 to 2019, as shown in Figure 6-22. Building permits for the City of East Bernard are managed by Wharton County – see section 6.8.1 for historical building permit trends in Wharton County. According to the U.S. Census Bureau estimates for 2015-2019, 997 homes in the City of East Bernard are single-family housing units and 65 are mobile homes.

Figure 6-22. Population of City of East Bernard




Note: From U.S. Census Bureau

6.8.3 City of El Campo


According to 2019 U.S. Census estimates, the population of the City of El Campo decreased approximately 0.25% from 2000 to 2019, as shown in Figure 6-23. The number of residential building permits reported in the City of El Campo fluctuated between 2010 and 2019, hitting a high of 82 permits in 2013, as shown in Figure 6-24. New residential building permits issued since 2010 will result in an increased vulnerability within the City of El Campo. According to the 2019 American Community Survey 5-year estimates, 4,615 homes in the City of El Campo are single-family homes and 281 are mobile homes.

Figure 6-23. Population of City of El Campo



Note: From U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 6-24. Residential Building Permits in the City of El Campo




Note: From City-Data.Com: El Campo

6.8.4 City of Wharton


According to 2019 U.S. Census estimates, the population of the City of Wharton decreased approximately 9.4% from 2000 to 2019, as shown in Figure 6-25. The number of residential building permits reported in the City of Wharton trended positively over the last 10 years, spiking in 2019 (28 permits) and began to increase from a low in 2015 as shown in Figure 6-26. The City of Wharton will be impacted and vulnerability will be increased as a result of the residential building permits issued since 2010. According to the 2019 U.S. Census estimates, 3,968 homes in the City of Wharton are single-family homes and 353 are mobile homes.

Figure 6-25. Population of City of Wharton



Note: From U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 6-26. Residential Building Permits in the City of Wharton



Note: From City-Data.Com: Wharton

6.9 LAWS AND ORDINANCES

Existing laws, ordinances, and plans at the federal, state, and local level can support or impact hazard mitigation actions identified in this plan. Hazard mitigation plans are required to include review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information as part of the planning process (44 CFR, Section 201.6(b)(3)). Pertinent federal, state, and local laws are described below. These laws, programs, documents, and departments were reviewed to identify the plans, regulations, personnel, and funding mechanisms available to the county and planning partners to impact and mitigate the effects of natural hazards. The county and cities have the capacity to expand their hazard mitigation capabilities through the training of existing staff, cross-training staff across program areas, and hiring of additional staff, as well as acquiring additional funding through the attainment of grant funds, raising of taxes, and levying of new taxes.

6.9.1 Federal

Disaster Mitigation Act

The DMA is the current federal legislation addressing hazard mitigation planning. It emphasizes planning for disasters before they occur. It specifically addresses planning at the local level, requiring plans to be in place before Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) funds are available to communities. This plan is designed to meet the requirements of DMA, improving the planning partners' eligibility for future hazard mitigation funds.

Endangered Species Act

The federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) was enacted in 1973 to conserve species facing depletion or extinction and the ecosystems that support them. The act sets forth a process for determining which species are threatened and endangered and requires the conservation of the critical habitat in which those species live. The ESA provides broad protection for species of fish, wildlife, and plants that are listed as threatened or endangered. Provisions are made for listing species, as well as for recovery plans and the designation of critical habitat for listed species. The ESA outlines procedures for federal agencies to follow when taking actions that may jeopardize listed species and contains exceptions and exemptions. It

is the enabling legislation for the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. Criminal and civil penalties are provided for violations of the ESA and the Convention.

Federal agencies must seek to conserve endangered and threatened species and use their authorities in furtherance of the ESA's purposes. The ESA defines three fundamental terms:

- **Endangered** means that a species of fish, animal, or plant is “in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.” (For salmon and other vertebrate species, this may include subspecies and distinct population segments.)
- **Threatened** means that a species “is likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future.” Regulations may be less restrictive for threatened species than for endangered species.
- **Critical habitat** means “specific geographical areas that are...essential for the conservation and management of a listed species, whether occupied by the species or not.”

Five sections of the ESA are of critical importance to understanding the act:

- **Section 4: Listing of a Species**—NOAA's Fisheries Service is responsible for listing marine species; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is responsible for listing terrestrial and freshwater aquatic species. The agencies may initiate reviews for listings, or citizens may petition for them. A listing must be made “solely on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available.” After a listing has been proposed, agencies receive comments and conduct further scientific reviews for 12 to 18 months, after which they must decide if the listing is warranted. Economic impacts cannot be considered in this decision, but it may include an evaluation of the adequacy of local and state protections. Critical habitat for the species may be designated at the time of listing.
- **Section 7: Consultation**—Federal agencies must ensure that any action they authorize, fund, or carry out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed or proposed species or adversely modify its critical habitat. This includes private and public actions that require a federal permit. Once a final listing is made, non-federal actions are subject to the same review, termed a “consultation.” If the listing agency finds that an action will “take” a species, it must propose mitigations or “reasonable and prudent” alternatives to the action; if the proponent rejects these, the action cannot proceed.
- **Section 9: Prohibition of Take**—It is unlawful to “take” an endangered species, including killing or injuring it or modifying its habitat in a way that interferes with essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering.
- **Section 10: Permitted Take**—Through voluntary agreements with the federal government that provide protections to an endangered species, a non-federal applicant may commit a take that would otherwise be prohibited as long as it is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity (such as developing land or building a road). These agreements often take the form of a “Habitat Conservation Plan.”
- **Section 11: Citizen Lawsuits**—Civil actions initiated by any citizen can require the listing agency to enforce the ESA's prohibition of taking or to meet the requirements of the consultation process.

Clean Water Act

The federal Clean Water Act (CWA) employs regulatory and non-regulatory tools to reduce direct pollutant discharges into waterways, finance municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and manage polluted runoff. These tools are employed to achieve the broader goal of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's surface waters so that they can support “the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water.”

The evolution of CWA programs over the last decade has included a shift from a program-by-program, source-by-source, and pollutant-by-pollutant approach to more holistic watershed-based strategies. Under the watershed approach, equal emphasis is placed on protecting healthy waters and restoring impaired ones. A full array of issues are addressed, not just those subject to CWA regulatory authority. The involvement of stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of strategies for achieving and maintaining water quality and other environmental goals is a hallmark of this approach.

National Flood Insurance Program

The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) provides federally backed flood insurance in exchange for communities enacting floodplain regulations. Participation and good standing under NFIP are prerequisites to grant funding eligibility under the Robert T. Stafford Act. Wharton County and the Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton participate in the NFIP and have adopted regulations that meet the NFIP requirements. At the time of the preparation of this plan, Wharton County and the Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton were in good standing with NFIP requirements.

6.9.2 State and Regional

Texas Division of Emergency Management

The TDEM is a division within the Texas Department of Public Safety and has its roots in the civil defense programs established during World War II. It became a separate organization through the Texas Civil Protection Act of 1951, which established the Division of Defense and Disaster Relief in the Governor's Office to handle civil defense and disaster response programs. The division was collocated with the Department of Public Safety (DPS) in 1963. The division was renamed the Division of Disaster Emergency Services in 1973. After several more name changes, it was designated an operating division of the Texas Department of Public Safety in 2005. Legislation passed during the 81st session of the Texas Legislature in 2009 formally changed the name to TDEM. TDEM operates according to the Texas Disaster Act of 1975 (Chapter 418 of the Texas Government Code).

TDEM is "charged with carrying out a comprehensive all-hazard emergency management program for the state and for assisting cities, counties, and state agencies in planning and implementing their emergency management programs. A comprehensive emergency management program includes pre- and post-disaster mitigation of known hazards to reduce their impact; preparedness activities, such as emergency planning, training, and exercises; provisions for effective response to emergency situations; and recovery programs for major disasters."

Texas Water Development Board

The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) was created in 1957 but its history dates back to a 1904 constitutional amendment authorizing the first public development of water resources. The TWDB mission is "to provide leadership, information, education, and support for planning, financial assistance, and outreach for the conservation and responsible development of water for Texas." TWDB provides water planning, data collection and dissemination, financial assistance, and technical assistance services.

TWDB financial assistance programs are funded through state-backed bonds, a combination of state bond proceeds and federal grant funds, or limited appropriated funds. Since 1957, the Texas State Legislature and voters approved constitutional amendments authorizing TWDB to issue up to \$10.93 billion in Texas Water Development Bonds. To date, TWDB has sold nearly \$3.95 billion of these bonds to finance the construction of water- and wastewater-related projects. In 1987, TWDB added the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) to its portfolio of financial assistance programs. Low-interest loans from the

CWSRF finance costs associated with the planning, design, construction, expansion, or improvement of wastewater treatment facilities, wastewater recycling and reuse facilities, collection systems, stormwater pollution control projects, and nonpoint source pollution control projects. Funded in part by federal grant money, CWSRF provides loans at interest rates lower than the market can offer to any eligible applicant. CWSRF offers 20-year loans using either a traditional long-term, fixed-rate or a short-term, variable-rate construction period loan that converts to a long-term, fixed-rate loan on project completion.

Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board

The Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB) is the state agency that administers Texas' soil and water conservation law and coordinates conservation and nonpoint source water pollution abatement programs. The TSSWCB was created in 1939 by the Texas Legislature to organize the state into 216 soil and water conservation districts (SWCD) and to serve as a centralized agency for communicating with the Texas Legislature as well as other state and federal entities. The TSSWCB is the lead state agency for the planning, management, and abatement of agricultural and silvicultural (forestry) nonpoint source water pollution, and administers the Water Supply Enhancement Program. Each SWCD is an independent political subdivision of state government. Local SWCDs are actively involved throughout the state in soil and water conservation activities such as the operation and maintenance of flood control structures.

Texas Bureau of Economic Geology

The University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology serves as the State Geological Survey of Texas. The bureau conducts research focusing on the intersection of energy, environment, and economy. The bureau partners with federal, state, and local agencies, academic institutions, industry, nonprofit organizations, and foundations to conduct high-quality research and to disseminate the results to the scientific and engineering communities as well as to the broad public. The Geophysical Log Facility (GLF) is the official well log repository for the Railroad Commission of Texas, which by law receives a copy of geophysical logs from every new, deepened, or plugged well drilled in Texas since September 1985.

Texas Forest Service

Texas Forest Service (TFS) was created in 1915 by the 34th Legislature as an integral part of the Texas A&M University System. It is mandated by law to assume direction of all forest interests and all matters pertaining to forestry within the jurisdiction of the state. TFS administers the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) to reduce related risks to life, property, and the environment. Its Fire Control Department provides leadership in wildland fire protection for state and private lands in Texas and reduces wildfire-related loss of life, property, and critical resources.

The intention of the TFS CWPP is to reduce the risk of wildfire and promote ecosystem health. The plan also is intended to reduce home losses and provide for the safety of residents and firefighters during wildfires. It has the following goals and objectives.

Goals:

- Provide for the safety of residents and emergency personnel
- Limit the number of homes destroyed by wildfire
- Promote and maintain healthy ecosystems
- Educate citizens about wildfire prevention

Objectives:

- Complete wildfire risk assessments
- Identify strategic fuels reduction projects
- Address treatment of structural ignitability
- Identify local capacity building and training needs
- Promote wildfire awareness programs
- CWPPs are developed to mitigate losses from wildfires. By developing a CWPP, a community is outlining a strategic plan to mitigate, prepare, respond, and recover.

Texas Department of State Health Services

The mission of the Department of State Health Services is to protect and preserve the health of the citizens of Texas. Public health nurses provide a variety of services including immunizations, preventive assessments of children and the elderly, and a full range of services designed to assist individuals and groups to attain and maintain good health and to cope with illnesses.

Texas Colorado River Floodplain Coalition

The TCRFC is a partnership of cities and counties in the Colorado River Basin and surrounding areas seeking better ways to reduce and mitigate flood damage. The coalition was formed in response to a combination of rapid growth, a greatly expanded number of homes and businesses in the floodplain, and devastating floods that have reoccurred in the basin. TCRFC's mission statement is to "Encourage comprehensive consistent management of the floodplain along the Colorado River and its tributaries; provide a forum for data exchange; and facilitate a structured approach to managing the complex issues related to floodplain management."

Houston-Galveston Area Council of Governments

The Houston-Galveston Area Council of Governments (H-GAC) is the regional organization through which local governments consider issues and cooperate in solving area-wide problems. Through H-GAC, local governments also initiate efforts in anticipating and preventing problems and saving public funds. The 13 counties in H-GAC's service region are Austin, Brazoria, Chambers, Colorado, Fort Bend, Galveston, Harris, Liberty, Matagorda, Montgomery, Walker, Waller, and Wharton. There are more than 100 member cities in the region.

H-GAC's mission is to serve as the instrument of local government cooperation, promoting the region's orderly development and the safety and welfare of its citizens. H-GAC provides planning programs in most areas of shared governmental concern. All H-GAC programs are carried out under the policy direction of H-GAC's local elected official Board of Directors. H-GAC is made up of the region's local governments and their elected officials and works together with public and private sector organizations and a host of volunteers.

H-GAC provides regional 911 and emergency communications planning. The regional 911 system represents the cooperative efforts of 8 counties (Brazoria, Chambers, Colorado, Liberty, Matagorda, Walker, Waller, and Wharton), 23 public safety answering points, some 224 emergency service providers, and numerous telephone companies. H-GAC also provides hurricane evacuation planning; provides information on disaster debris management; and includes several committees and councils relating to natural hazard mitigation, planning, and recovery, including the Regional Flood Management Council.

6.9.3 Wharton County

The Wharton County government is made up of the following offices and departments:

- County Judge
- Commissioners' Court
- County Attorney
- County Clerk
- County Treasurer
- County Tax Assessor/Collector
- Constable
- Sheriff
- Drainage
- Justice of the Peace
- County Auditor
- Indigent Healthcare
- Elections
- Information Technology
- Child Support
- Permits/Inspections
- 911 Addressing
- Veterans Services

Wharton County has multiple plans and functions in place that guide growth and development within the county. The county also has an Economic Development Corporation. Excerpts from applicable policies, regulations, and plans, and program descriptions follow to provide more detail on existing mitigation capabilities.

Wharton County Master Subdivision Policy, 2005 (as amended)

The Wharton County Master Subdivision Policy established rules, regulations, and standards governing the subdivision of land within the unincorporated areas of Wharton County. The Commissioners' Court has the authority to renew, approve, issue variances, or disapprove of any plat submitted under this policy.

The county currently has regulations that limit lot sizes down to one acre with some limitations. It also established standards and specifications for the construction of roads and drainage, utilities, private sewage facilities, and development within the floodplain. The subdivision regulations were designed and enacted for the purpose of promoting the health, safety, and general welfare of the public and to establish standards of subdivision design, which will encourage the development of sound, economical, stable neighborhoods and create a healthy environment for present and future inhabitants of Wharton County.

Wharton County's Flood Damage Prevention Order

The Flood Damage Prevention Order established the Wharton County Permit and Inspection Department as the governing body to administer the National Flood Insurance Act and Texas Flood Control and Insurance Act. The purpose of the order and attached regulations is "to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare and to minimize public and private losses due to flood conditions in specific areas by regulations designed to (1) protect human life and health; (2) minimize the expenditure of public money for costly flood control projects; (3) minimize the need for rescue and relief efforts associated with flooding and usually undertaken at public expense; (4) minimize prolonged business interruptions; (5) minimize damage to public facilities and utilities such as water and gas mains, electric, telephone and sewer lines and streets and bridges located in or near floodplains; (6) help maintain a stable tax base by providing for the sound use and development of flood-prone areas in such a manner as to minimize future flood blight areas; and (7) ensure that potential buyers are notified that property is in a flood area."

The order will be implemented through methods authorized by federal and state law to (1) restrict or prohibit uses that are dangerous to health, safety, or property in times of flood, or uses that cause excessive increases in flood heights or velocities; (2) require that uses vulnerable to floods, including facilities which serve such uses, be protected against flood damage at the time of initial construction; (3) control the alteration of natural floodplains, stream channels, watercourses, and natural protective barriers which are involved in the accommodation of floodwaters; (4) control filling, grading, dredging, and other development which may increase flood damage; and (5) prevent or regulate the construction of flood barriers which will unnaturally divert floodwaters or which may increase flood hazards to other lands.

The order appoints the Director of the Wharton County Permit & Inspection Department the Floodplain Administrator. The duties and responsibilities of the Floodplain Administrator are outlined in section B of the document.

Drainage Fee Ordinance, 2011(as amended)

The drainage fee ordinance requires a review of Engineering Plans for compliance with Federal, State, and County Ordinances to reduce flood risk and damages. Drainage reviews shall be performed on the following: single-family residential developments, commercial/industrial developments, roadway creek crossing projects, conditional letter of map revision review, linear pipeline projects, public improvements construction phase inspections, reviews and close-out, and subdivision plats without public improvements. The fee will be added to that of the Wharton County Development Permit fee and the Wharton County Commissioners Court has the right to grant a variance to the ordinance as it deems appropriate.

Wharton County Floodplain Map

The current floodplain maps from FEMA are dated 12/21/2017.

Wharton County Basic Emergency Operations Plan, 2019

The Wharton County Basic Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) covers the entire county including the Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, Wharton. The EOP is jointly signed by all participants. The EOP outlines the joint approach to emergency operations. It provides general guidance for emergency management activities and an overview of methods of mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. The plan describes participating emergency response organizations and assigns responsibilities for various emergency tasks. The plan is intended to provide a framework for more specific functional annexes that describe in more detail who does what, when, and how. The plan applies to all local officials, departments, and agencies within the communities of Wharton County, and the Cities of Wharton, El Campo, and East Bernard. The primary audience for the document includes the chief elected official and other elected officials of each jurisdiction, the emergency management staff members, department and agency heads and their senior staff members, leaders of local volunteer organizations that support emergency operations, and others who may participate in mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery efforts. A hazard assessment is also included.

Wharton County Office of Emergency Management

The Wharton County Office of Emergency Management coordinates with all county fire and EMS services to prepare and plan for emergencies in Wharton County. In addition, communication is maintained with state and federal agencies for coordination in the event of large disasters, natural or manmade.

Wharton County Commissioners' Court

The Wharton County Commissioners' Court consist of the County Judge and four Commissioners. The court is responsible for approving the platting and enforcing the subdivision rules.

Wharton County Economic Development Corporation

The Wharton County Economic Development Corporation (WEDC), a nonprofit industrial development corporation, was formed in March 1998 with the passage of the one-half-cent sales tax increase. WEDC functions under the City of Wharton, Texas, pursuant to Article 5190.6, Section 4B of the Development Corporation Act of 1979, as amended. Expenditures of the tax revenues are intended for the development of commercial, industrial, and manufacturing enterprises and to promote and encourage employment and public welfare. The purpose for the corporation and constituents include:

- Develop a positive climate for business and industrial growth and investment.
- Assist in the creation of jobs.
- Increase the tax base of the various taxing entities.
- Diversify the local economy to make it more impervious to state and national economic recession.
- Make plans and take necessary actions to ensure that essential infrastructure is in place to allow for proper development.
- Take necessary actions to stop negative developments from occurring that would denigrate the quality of life in the city or impede future development.
- Act as a catalyst for solutions to problems that cross geopolitical boundaries.

6.9.4 City of East Bernard

The government of the City of East Bernard is made up of the following offices and departments:

- Municipal Court

The City of East Bernard has multiple plans and functions in place that guide growth and development within the community. Excerpts from applicable policies, regulations, and plans, and program descriptions follow to provide more detail on existing mitigation capabilities.

City of East Bernard Comprehensive Plan, 2005

The City of East Bernard Comprehensive Plan was created in 2005 in conjunction with the LCRA. The comprehensive plan lays out recommendations for the City of East Bernard and attempts to balance long-term, expensive projects, such as developing a recreation center, with smaller, faster projects, such as a Yard of the Month program. The purpose of the smaller projects is to have some early, quick successes that will build additional community support for the more challenging projects. Because the City of East Bernard is a new city with very limited resources, the plan draws upon many other community organizations, notably the Chamber of Commerce, for implementation. The plan has the following chapters, each of which serves a role in the overall comprehensive plan.

- Baseline Analysis
- Land Use
- Growth Management
- Community Development
- Economic Development
- Housing

City of East Bernard Code of Ordinances

Some of the chapters in the City of East Bernard Code of Ordinances have provisions related, directly or indirectly, to hazard mitigation. These provisions are discussed below:

General Ordinance

- Establishment of the East Bernard Emergency Management Coordinator
- Identification of the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Emergency Management Director
- Development of an emergency management plan to establish and designate divisions and functions; assign responsibilities, tasks, duties, and powers; and designate officers and employees to carry out the provisions of this division

Building Ordinance

- Building permit requirements (June 15, 2009)
- Adoption of the International Building Code, 2015 edition (March 19, 2018)

Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (June 23, 2004)

- Methods of reducing flood losses
- The basis for establishing the areas of special flood hazard and permitting requirements
- Designation, duties, and responsibilities of the floodplain administrator
- Permit and variance procedures for a floodplain development permit
- Provisions for flood hazard reduction
- Construction standards for new construction and substantial improvements to minimize flood damage
- Review of proposed subdivisions and land use areas to minimize flood
- Penalties for noncompliance

Subdivision Regulations

- This chapter includes the purpose of the subdivision regulations and establishes established rules, regulations, and standards governing the subdivision of land within the city. It established standards and specifications for the construction of roads and drainage, private sewage facilities, and development within the floodplain (November 18, 2019)

City of East Bernard Emergency Management

The City of East Bernard Emergency Management coordinates with local fire and EMS services to prepare and plan for emergencies in the City of East Bernard. In addition, communication is maintained with county, state and federal agencies for coordination in the event of large disasters, natural or manmade.

6.9.5 City of El Campo

The government of the City of El Campo is made up of the following offices and departments:

- City Administration
- Finance
- Municipal Court
- Human Resources
- Inspections & Planning
- Public Works
- Parks and Recreation
- Utilities
- Public Safety

The City of El Campo has multiple plans and functions in place that guide growth and development within the community. The city also has the following citizen committees, boards and commissions: Board of Adjustment; Planning and Zoning; Northside Board; Building Standard Commission; Housing Authority Board; Charter Review Commission; Parks Recreation and Community Services Board; City Development Corporation; City Development Corporation; Keep El Campo Beautiful. Excerpts from applicable policies, regulations, and plans, and program descriptions follow to provide more detail on existing mitigation capabilities.

El Campo Office of Emergency Management

The City of El Campo Office of Emergency Management coordinates with local fire and EMS services to prepare and plan for emergencies in the City of El Campo. In addition, communication is maintained with county, state and federal agencies for coordination in the event of large disasters, natural or manmade.

El Campo Comprehensive Plan Update 2017

The City of El Campo 2020 Plan, was originally developed in 1999 and has been updated to the *El Campo Comprehensive Plan Update 2017*. An update was conducted to ensure the plan remains responsive to the needs and vision of the community. The 2017 Update includes three phases: (1) Community Vision, Community Profile, and Land Use Updates; (2) Utility Infrastructure & Transportation; (3) Parks and Recreation, Housing Strategies, and Implementation Plan. The city and various commissions use the plan to help the city budget, prepare for, and manage growth. The plan is cover housing, land use, and other aspects pertinent to the proper growth of a city.

City of El Campo Code of Ordinances

Some of the chapters in the City of El Campo Code of Ordinances have provisions related, directly or indirectly, to hazard mitigation. These provisions are discussed below:

Chapter 1 – General Provisions

- Creation of the Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Board to advise the city council on activities and policies concerning parks, recreation, El Campo Civic Center, and the City of El Campo Aquatic Center. (1988 Code, Ch. 8, sec. 11.01; 2010 Code, sec. 2-106; Ordinance 2018-15 adopted 6/11/18 Ch. 1, sec. 3-31)
- Standard of care for emergency action (1988 Code, Ch. 1, sec. 2.00; Ordinance 1986-12, adopted 5/27/86; 2010 Code, sec. 2-134; Ch. 1, sec. 2-1)
- Establishment of the El Campo Emergency Management Organization (1988 Code, ch. 1, sec. 8.01; Ordinance 1988-09, sec. 1, adopted 7/26/88; 2010 Code, sec. 14-1; Ch. 1, sec. 4-1)

- Identification of the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Emergency Management Director (1988 Code, ch. 1, sec. 8.02; Ordinance 1988-09, sec. 2, adopted 7/26/88; 2010 Code, sec. 14-2; Ch. 1, sec. 4-2)
- Development of an emergency management plan to establish and designate divisions and functions; assign responsibilities, tasks, duties, and powers; and designate officers and employees to carry out the provisions of this division (State law reference–Local and inter-jurisdictional emergency management plans, V.T.C.A., Government Code, sec. 418.106)

Chapter 3 – Building Regulations

- Adoption of the International Building Code, 2015 edition (1988 Code, Ch. 3, sec. 2.01; Ordinance 1996-12, adopted 6/11/96; Ordinance 2006-06, sec. 1(2.01), adopted 3/28/06; Ordinance 2013-11, sec. 1, adopted 7/8/13; 2010 Code, sec. 10-40; Ordinance 2017-15A, sec. 1(A), adopted 12/11/17; Ch. 3, sec. 2-31)
- Building permit requirements (Ordinance 2006-06, sec. 1(2.02), adopted 3/28/06; 2010 Code, sec. 10-41; Ch. 3, sec. 2-32)
- Description of enforcement, authorization, and purpose of the Floodplain administrator (Ordinance 2006-02, exh. A, sec. 8.13, adopted 3/14/06; 2010 Code, sec. 10-353; Ch. 3 sec. 4-13)
- Methods of reducing flood losses (Ordinance 2006-02, exh. A, sec. 8.04, adopted 3/14/06; 2010 Code, sec. 10-345; Ch. 3, sec 4-5)
- Standards for flood hazard reduction (Ordinance 2006-02, exh. A, sec. 8.16, adopted 3/14/06; 2010 Code, sec. 10-356; Ch. 3, sec. 4-16)
- Standards for areas of shallow flooding (AO/AH zones) and floodways (Ordinance 2006-02, exh. A, sec. 8.19, adopted 3/14/06; 2010 Code, sec. 10-359; Ch 3, sec. 4-19)
- Permit and variance procedures for a floodplain development permit (Ordinance 2006-02, exh. A, sec. 8.14, adopted 3/14/06; 2010 Code, sec. 10-354; Ch. 3, sec.4-14)
- Construction standards for new construction and substantial improvements to minimize flood damage (Ordinance 2006-02, exh. A, sec. 8.14, adopted 3/14/06; 2010 Code, sec. 10-354; Ch. 3, sec. 4-14-b-4)

Chapter 5 – Fire Prevention and Protection

- Adoption of International Fire Code, 2015 edition, and appendicies B, C, D, E, and H (1988 Code, ch. 5, sec. 9.01; Ordinance 1996-09, adopted 6/11/96; Ordinance 2006-08, sec. 1(9.01), adopted 4/25/06; 2010 Code, sec. 18-53; Ordinance 2017-19, sec. 1 (18-23), adopted 11/13/17; Ordinance 2019-06 adopted 2/25/19; Ordinance 2019-09 adopted 4/22/19)
- Regulations on the use, possession, and sale of fireworks (1988 Code, ch. 5, sec. 9.02; Ordinance 1996-09, adopted 6/11/96; Ordinance 2006-08, sec. 1(9.02), adopted 4/25/06; 2010 Code, sec. 18-54; Ordinance 2017-19, sec. 1 (18-24), adopted 11/13/17; Ordinance 2019-06 adopted 2/25/19; Ordinance 2019-09 adopted 4/22/19; Ordinance 2020-01 adopted 1/13/20; Ch 5, Sec 2-2-5601.1)
- (1988 Code, ch. 5, sec. 9.02; Ordinance 1996-09, adopted 6/11/96; Ordinance 2006-08, sec. 1(9.02), adopted 4/25/06; 2010 Code, sec. 18-54; Ordinance 2017-19, sec. 1 (18-24), adopted 11/13/17; Ordinance 2019-06 adopted 2/25/19; Ordinance 2019-09 adopted 4/22/19; Ordinance 2020-01 adopted 1/13/20; Ch 5, Sec 2-2-202)

Chapter 9 – Personnel

- Designation of the Building Official, roles, responsibilities, and authorities (1988 Code, Ch. 8, sec. 5.00; Ordinance adopted 6/16/69, secs. 2–5; 2010 Code, sec. 2-22; Ordinance adopting 2018 Code; Ch. 9, sec. 2-2)
- Chapter 10 – Unified Development Code
- Subdivision regulations – purpose and intent (Ordinance 2014-08, sec. I (exh. A), adopted 9/8/14; 2010 Code, sec. 38-1; Ordinance 2019-02 adopted 3/25/19; Ordinance 2019-12 adopted 4/22/19; Ch 10, Sec. 12-1)
- Establishes construction requirements for subdivisions (Ordinance 2014-08, sec. I (exh. A), adopted 9/8/14; 2010 Code, sec. 38-22; Ordinance 2019-02 adopted 3/25/19; Ordinance 2019-12 adopted 4/22/19; Ch. 10, sec. 12-22)
- Establishment of zoning districts (Ordinance 2000-09, exh. A, sec. 4.A, adopted 8/8/00; Ordinance 2004-09, exh. A, adopted 5/25/04; 2010 Code, sec. 50-87; Ordinance 2019-12 adopted 4/22/19)
- Infrastructure standards and plan requirements (Ordinance 2012-02, sec. 3, adopted 4/23/12; 2010 Code, sec. 46-88; Ordinance 2019-12 adopted 4/22/19)

City of El Campo Office of Municipal Services

Based on the close proximity to the Gulf of Mexico, the City of El Campo has conducted extensive hurricane response planning. Standard operating procedures have been developed with roles, responsibilities, checklists, and staffing assignments pre- and post-landfall. Topic areas include streets and bridges, debris clearance, high water, parks, utilities, water plant, equipment maintenance, damage assessment, and incident command.

City of El Campo Emergency Medical Services

The City of El Campo EMS Department consists of 17 full-time medics. The department also has 25 part-time medics. The City of El Campo EMS operates at the Mobile Intensive Care Level. The EMS department has five in-service Type I ambulances and one Type II ambulance.

City of El Campo Code Enforcement

The City of El Campo maintains a Building Official to ensure city ordinances are being upheld. The duty of the Building Official is to enforce all laws relating to the construction, alteration, removal, and demolition of buildings and structures.

City of El Campo Citizen Committees, Boards and Commissions

The following citizen committees, boards and commissions assist in the governance of the City of El Campo.

- **Board of Adjustment:** Hears and decides appeals for interpretations, special exceptions, and variances to the terms of the zoning ordinance, as well as permits.
- **Planning and Zoning:** Recommends changes in development codes and zoning ordinances to City Council. Makes studies and recommendations with regards to proposed annexations. Has final authority over all plats submitted to the City.

- **Northside Board:** Guides and provides feedback and assistance to the Northside Education Center concerning maintenance and operations of the Center.
- **Building Standards Commission:** The Building Standards Commission will advise the City Council on policies and matters concerning plumbing, electrical, mechanical, and building codes and permitting of the City of El Campo.
- **Housing Authority Board:** Guides the Housing Authority by setting policy and providing leadership and oversight that enables the Housing Authority to reach its goals and advance its mission of providing quality, affordable housing options.
- **Charter Review Commission:** Advises council on any additions, edits, or revisions to the city's charter.
- **Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Board:** The Parks, Recreation and Community Services Board will advise the City Council on activities and policies concerning parks, recreation, the El Campo Civic Center, and the City of El Campo Aquatic Center.
- **City Development Corporation:** Aids in the economic development of the city. Provides guidance and feedback to the council regarding the use of 4A sales tax.
- **Keep El Campo Beautiful:** The Keep El Campo Beautiful Board is an advisory board to staff and City Council with the goals and purposes of the Keep El Campo Beautiful program and shall participate with Keep Texas Beautiful, Inc. "To promote public interest in creating a cleaner, more beautiful El Campo through volunteerism and education."

6.9.6 City of Wharton

The City of Wharton government is made up of the following offices and departments:

- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|
| • City Secretary | • Public Works Department |
| • Finance Department | • Facilities Maintenance |
| • Police Department | • Community Services |
| • Fire Department | • Emergency Medical Services |
| • Code Enforcement | • Civic Center |
| • Municipal Court | • Airport |

The City of Wharton has multiple plans and functions in place that guide growth and development within the community. The city also has the following boards and commissions: Airport Board, Beautification City Commission, Building Standards Commission, Electrical Board, Housing Finance Corporation, Mayor's Committee on People with Disabilities, Planning Commission, Plumbing and Mechanical Board, Wharton Economic Development Corporation. Excerpts from applicable policies, regulations, and plans, and program descriptions follow to provide more detail on existing mitigation capabilities.

City of Wharton Code of Ordinances

Some of the chapters in the City of Wharton Code of Ordinances have provisions related, directly or indirectly, to hazard mitigation. These provisions are discussed below:

Article XII. – Planning and Zoning

Provisions under this chapter include:

- Establishing a Planning Commission, powers, and duties (Ord. No. 78-3, § 7, 2-13-78)
- Requirements for a master plan for the growth, development, and beautification of the city (Ord. No. 78-3, § 7, 2-13-78)

Chapter 6 – Aircraft and Airports

Provisions under this chapter include:

- Establishment of airport zoning regulations (Code 1978, § 3-36)
- Establishment of the board of adjustment and their powers, policies, and procedures (Code 1978, § 3-38)

Chapter 18 – Buildings and Construction

Provisions under this chapter include:

- Establishment of fire zone limits (Code 1978, § 6-6)
- Establishment of a Building Official qualification and duties (Code 1978, § 6-1 & Code 1978, § 6-2)
- Criteria for issuance of building permit (Ord. No. 1997-01, 1-13-97; Ord. No. 2004-13, 8-9-04; Ord. No. 2014-13, 12-18-2014; Ord. No. 2017-10, 8-28-17)
- Adoption of the International Building Code, 2018 edition (Ord. No. 2000-18, § I, 9-11-00; Ord. No. 2002-11, § I, 5-28-02; Ord. No. 2006-21, 10-23-06; Ord. No. 2012-11, 9-10-12; Ord. No. 2019-19, 8-26-19)
- Establishment of the Building Standards Commission, powers, and duties (Ord. No. 2017-05, 2-13-17)
- Description of enforcement, authorization, and purpose of the Standard for Floodplain Management (Ord. No. 2006-06, 3-13-06; Ord. No. 2009-04, 5-26-09; Ord. No. 2017-15, 12-11-17)
- Methods of reducing flood losses (Ord. No. 2006-06, 3-13-06))
- Basis for establishing the areas of special flood hazard and permitting requirements (Ord. No. 2006-06, 3-13-06; Ord. No. 2009-04, 5-26-09; Ord. No. 2017-15, 12-11-17)
- Designation, duties, and responsibilities of the floodplain administrator (Ord. No. 2006-06, 3-13-06)
- Permit and variance procedures for a floodplain development permit (Ord. No. 2006-06, 3-13-06)
- Construction standards for new construction and substantial improvements to minimize flood damage (Ord. No. 2006-06, 3-13-06; Ord. No. 2009-04, 5-26-09; Ord. No. 2017-15, 12-11-17)
- Review of proposed subdivisions and land use areas to minimize flood damage (Ord. No. 2006-06, 3-13-06; Ord. No. 2009-04, 5-26-09; Ord. No. 2017-15, 12-11-17)

Chapter 26 – Emergency Management

Provisions under this chapter include:

- Establishment of the Wharton Emergency Management Organization (Code 1978, § 7-1; Ord. No. 2003-08, 8-11-03)

- Identification of the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Emergency Management Director (Code 1978, § 7-2)
- Development of an emergency management plan to establish and designate divisions and functions; assign responsibilities, tasks, duties, and powers; and designate officers and employees to carry out the provisions of this division (Code 1978, § 7-3)

Chapter 27 – Emergency Medical Services

Provisions under this chapter include:

- Agreement with Emergency Services District (ESD) #3 to provide EMS services for their established service area including the city (Ord. No. 2011-08(Corr.), 5-9-2011)

Chapter 30 – Fire Prevention and Protection

Provisions under this chapter include:

- Adoption of the International Fire Code, 2018 edition (Ord. No. 2000-18, § I, 9-11-00; Ord. No. 2002-11, § I, 5-28-02; Ord. No. 2006-21, 10-23-06; Ord. No. 2012-11, 9-10-12; Ord. No. 2019-19, 8-26-19)
- Creation of the Office of Fire Marshal (Ord. No. 2012-15, 10-22-12)
- Regulations on the use, possession, and sale of fireworks (Ord. No. 2012-15, 10-22-12)

Chapter 34 – Health and Sanitation

Provisions under this chapter include:

- Ban on outdoor burning (Code 1978, § 9-1)

Appendix A. Subdivisions

Provisions under this chapter include:

- Established rules, regulations, and standards governing the subdivision of land (Ord. No. 82-8, 3-22-82; Ord. No. 87-4, 2-9-87)
- Defines the process and permits required (Ord. No. 82-8, 3-22-82; Ord. No. 87-4, 2-9-87)
- It established standards and specifications for the construction of roads and drainage (Ord. No. 73-2, 1-22-73; Ord. No. 75-22, 11-10-75; Ord. No. 76-25, 12-13-76; Ord. No. 82-6, 3-8-82; Ord. No. 2004-10, 4-12-04; Ord. No. 2013-11, 6-10-13)

City of Wharton Planning Commission

The Planning Commission is charged with the review, investigation, and recommendation of land use within the City of Wharton. The purpose and goals of the commission are to:

- Make and amend a master plan for the physical development of the city.
- Report to the council proposed zoning regulations and land use plan, and its approval or disapproval of proposed future changes in the zoning plan.
- Exercise control over platting and the subdividing of land within the corporate limits of the city and within an area extending one mile beyond the corporate limits.
- Submit recommended capital improvements for the forthcoming five (5) year period

City of Wharton Economic Development Corporation

The Wharton Economic Development Corporation (WDEC) is dedicated to creating opportunities for economic development through desirable business growth. WDEC manages the affairs of the City's 4B Corporation which promotes economic development in order to eliminate unemployment and underemployment and to promote and encourage employment and the public welfare of, for, and on behalf of the city by developing, purchasing, leasing, implementing, providing, and financing projects.

City of Wharton Floodplain Management

The City of Wharton maintains a Floodplain Administrator appointed by the city manager to ensure and implement the provision of the Wharton County Code of Ordinances and other appropriate sections of 44 CFR (Emergency Management and Assistance – National Flood Insurance Program Regulations) pertaining to floodplain management.

City of Wharton Volunteer Fire Department

The City of Wharton Volunteer Fire Department (VFD) provides fire, rescue, and HAZMAT services for the city and surrounding areas. The department provides automatic mutual aid with Glen Flora VFD, Hungerford VFD, and Boling VFD. The department also maintains a mutual aid agreement with all of Wharton County.

City of Wharton Code Enforcement Department

The City of Wharton Code Enforcement Department is responsible for interpreting and enforcing various city ordinances adopted by the City Council governing nuisances, health, and safety issues, and use of property within the community. Code Enforcement staff works with citizens, property owners, and businesses to achieve and maintain compliance.

City of Wharton Office of Emergency Management

The City of Wharton Office of Emergency Management coordinates with all county fire and EMS services to prepare and plan for emergencies in the City of Wharton. In addition, communication is maintained with county, state, and federal agencies for coordination in the event of large disasters, natural or manmade.

Chapter 7.

HAZARD MITIGATION CAPABILITIES ASSESSMENT

The planning team performed an inventory and analysis of existing authorities and capabilities called a “capability assessment.” A capability assessment creates an inventory of an agency’s mission, programs, and policies, and evaluates its capacity to carry them out. The county and the planning partners used this capabilities assessment to identify mitigation actions to strengthen their ability to mitigate the effects of a natural hazard.

7.1 WHARTON COUNTY

7.1.1 Legal and Regulatory Capabilities

Table 7-1 lists planning and land management tools typically used by local jurisdictions to implement hazard mitigation activities and indicates those that are in place in Wharton County.

| TABLE 7-1. WHARTON COUNTY REGULATORY MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|--|--------|---|
| Regulatory Tool (ordinances, codes, plans) | Yes/No | Comments |
| General plan | No | |
| Zoning ordinance | No | |
| Subdivision ordinance | Yes | Wharton County Master Subdivision Policy, 2005 (as amended) |
| Growth management | No | |
| Floodplain ordinance | Yes | Flood Damage Prevention Order signed October 22, 2001. |
| Other special-purpose ordinances (stormwater, steep slope, wildfire) | Yes | Drainage Master Plan, 2010 |
| Building code | No | |
| Erosion or sediment control program | No | Erosion and sediment control are managed by TCEQ via the general permit with EPA and LCRA |
| Stormwater management | Yes | Drainage Criteria Manual, 2010 |
| Site plan review requirements | Yes | Contracted to Scheibe Consulting, LLC |
| Capital improvement plan | No | |
| Economic development plan | No | |
| Local emergency operations plan | Yes | Wharton County Basic Emergency Operations Plan |
| Other special plans | Yes | Wharton County Traffic Safety and Control Plan |

| TABLE 7-1. WHARTON COUNTY REGULATORY MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|---|--------|--|
| Regulatory Tool (ordinances, codes, plans) | Yes/No | Comments |
| Flood insurance study or other engineering study for streams | Yes | The Permit and Inspection Department is the local repository for the FEMA FIRM for the unincorporated areas of the county and makes the maps available for public review. The department maintains flood insurance rate maps in conjunction with the NFIP. |
| Elevation certificates | Yes | The Commissioners' Court of Wharton County keeps records of flood elevation certificates on file in its office. |
| Notes: FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency FIRM Flood Insurance Pate Map NFIP National Flood Insurance Program EPA Environmental Protection Agency | | |

7.1.2 Administrative and Technical Capabilities

Table 7-2 identifies the county personnel responsible for activities related to mitigation and loss prevention in Wharton County.

| TABLE 7-2. WHARTON COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE/TECHNICAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|--|--------|---|
| Personnel Resources | Yes/No | Department/Position |
| Planner/engineer with knowledge of land development/land management practices | No | Outsourced – Scheibe Consulting, LLC |
| Engineer/professional trained in construction practices related to buildings or infrastructure | No | Outsourced – Scheibe Consulting, LLC |
| Planner/engineer/scientist with an understanding of natural hazards | No | Outsourced – Scheibe Consulting, LLC |
| Personnel skilled in GIS | No | Outsourced – Scheibe Consulting, LLC |
| Full-time building official | Yes | Managed by the county (when necessary) |
| Floodplain manager | Yes | Permits & Inspections (Monica Martin) |
| Emergency manager | Yes | Judge; Emergency Management Coordinator (Andy Kirkland) |
| Grant writer | No | Outsourced as needed |
| Other personnel | No | |
| GIS data: Hazard areas | No | Outsourced – Scheibe Consulting, LLC |
| GIS data: Critical facilities | No | Outsourced – Scheibe Consulting, LLC |

| TABLE 7-2. WHARTON COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE/TECHNICAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|--|--------|--|
| Personnel Resources | Yes/No | Department/Position |
| GIS data: Building footprints | No | Outsourced – Scheibe Consulting, LLC |
| GIS data: Land use | No | Outsourced – Scheibe Consulting, LLC |
| GIS data: Links to Assessor's data | No | Outsourced – Scheibe Consulting, LLC |
| Warning systems/services (Reverse 911 callback, cable override, outdoor warning signals) | Yes | Nixle reverse 911 notification system, neighborhood warning procedures; Wharton County manages |
| Other | Yes | Local Radio Station; Social Media |
| Notes: | | |
| GIS Geographic Information System | | |

7.1.3 Financial Capabilities

Table 7-3 identifies financial tools or resources that Wharton County could use to help fund mitigation activities.

| TABLE 7-3. WHARTON COUNTY FINANCIAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Financial Resources | Accessible/Eligible to Use (Yes/No) |
| Community Development Block Grants | Yes |
| Capital improvements project funding | No |
| Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes | Yes |
| Fees for water, sewer, gas, or electric services | No |
| Impact fees for new development | No |
| Incur debt through general obligation bonds | Yes; No current debt |
| Incur debt through special tax bonds | No |
| Incur debt through private activities | No |
| Withhold spending in hazard-prone areas | No |
| Other | No |

7.2 CITY OF EAST BERNARD

7.2.1 Legal and Regulatory Capabilities

Table 7-4 lists regulatory and planning tools typically used by local jurisdictions to implement hazard mitigation activities and indicates those that are in place in the City of East Bernard.

TABLE 7-4.
CITY OF EAST BERNARD REGULATORY MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX

| Regulatory Tool (ordinances, codes, plans) | Yes/No | Comments |
|--|--------|---|
| General plan | Yes | East Bernard Comprehensive Plan was created in 2005 to help the city prepare for and manage growth. |
| Zoning ordinance | No | |
| Subdivision ordinance | Yes | East Bernard Subdivision Policy signed November 18, 2019 |
| Growth management | No | |
| Floodplain ordinance | Yes | Adopted the Standard for Floodplain Management (2004). |
| Other special-purpose ordinances (stormwater, steep slope, wildfire) | No | |
| Building code | Yes | East Bernard adopted the International Building Code and International Residential Code (2015 editions). |
| Erosion or sediment control program | No | Erosion and sediment control are managed by TCEQ via the general permit with EPA. |
| Stormwater management | No | Stormwater management is managed by the LCRA. |
| Site plan review requirements | Yes | Contracted to the county. |
| Capital improvements plan | No | |
| Economic development plan | No | |
| Local emergency operations plan | No | East Bernard works in conjunction with the Wharton County Emergency Management. |
| Other special plans | No | East Bernard Comprehensive Traffic Safety and Control Plan |
| Flood insurance study or other engineering study for streams | Yes | FEMA floodplain maps indicate flood insurance is necessary along the San Bernard River. |
| Elevation certificates | No | The Commissioners' Court of Wharton County keeps records of flood elevation certificates on file in its office. |
| Notes: FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency LCRA Lower Colorado River Authority TCEQ Texas Commission on Environmental Quality EPA Environmental Protection Agency | | |

7.2.2 Administrative and Technical Capabilities

Table 7-5 identifies the city personnel responsible for activities related to mitigation and loss prevention in the City of East Bernard.

| TABLE 7-5. CITY OF EAST BERNARD ADMINISTRATIVE/TECHNICAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|--|--------|--|
| Personnel Resources | Yes/No | Department/Position |
| Planner/engineer with knowledge of land development/land management practices | No | Outsourced to Kelly Kaluza Inc. |
| Engineer/professional trained in construction practices related to buildings or infrastructure | No | Outsourced to the county (when necessary); Permits & Inspections (Monica Martin) |
| Planner/engineer/scientist with an understanding of natural hazards | No | Outsourced to Kelly Kaluza Inc. |
| Personnel skilled in GIS | No | |
| Full-time building official | No | Managed by the county (when necessary) |
| Floodplain manager | No | Outsourced to the County (when necessary); Permits & Inspections (Monica Marton) |
| Emergency manager | Yes | City Secretary |
| Grant writer | No | Outsourced as needed |
| Other personnel | No | |
| GIS data: Hazard areas | No | |
| GIS data: Critical facilities | No | |
| GIS data: Building footprints | No | |
| GIS data: Land use | No | |
| GIS data: Links to Assessor's data | No | |
| Warning systems/services (Reverse 911 callback, cable override, outdoor warning signals) | No | Management of the Callback system is Wharton Co. |
| Other | Yes | The local radio stations and social media |
| Notes: GIS Geographic Information System | | |

7.2.3 Financial Capabilities

Table 7-6 identifies financial tools or resources that the City of East Bernard could use to help fund mitigation activities.

| TABLE 7-6. CITY OF EAST BERNARD FINANCIAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Financial Resources | Accessible/Eligible to Use (Yes/No) |
| Community Development Block Grants | Yes |
| Capital improvements project funding | No |
| Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes | Yes |
| Fees for water, sewer, gas, or electric services | No |
| Impact fees for new development | No |
| Incur debt through general obligation bonds | Yes; No current debt |
| Incur debt through special tax bonds | No |
| Incur debt through private activities | No |
| Withhold spending in hazard-prone areas | No |
| Other | No |

7.3 CITY OF EL CAMPO

7.3.1 Legal and Regulatory Capabilities

Table 7-7 lists planning and land management tools typically used by local jurisdictions to implement hazard mitigation activities and indicates those that are in place in the City of El Campo.

| TABLE 7-7. CITY OF EL CAMPO REGULATORY MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|--|--------|--|
| Regulatory Tool (ordinances, codes, plans) | Yes/No | Comments |
| General plan | Yes | The El Campo Comprehensive Plan (updated 2017) was created to help the city prepare for and manage growth. |
| Zoning ordinance | Yes | Chapter 10, Unified Development Code – City of El Campo Zoning Ordinance (2000, as amended). UDC was adopted in 2019, but Zoning was approved well before. |
| Subdivision ordinance | Yes | Chapter 10, Article 10.12, Subdivision Regulations (2014, as amended). |
| Growth management | No | |
| Floodplain ordinance | Yes | Chapter 3, Article 3.04, Flood Damage Prevention (2006, as amended). |
| Other special-purpose ordinances (stormwater, steep slope, wildfire) | Yes | Adopted Stormwater Management Code, Chapter 14 in City Code. Reference Wharton Co. DCM (2020, as amended). |
| Building code | Yes | El Campo adopted the International Building Code and International Residential Code (2015 editions) |
| Erosion or sediment control program | Yes | Within Design Manual (2020, as amended). |
| Stormwater management | Yes | Within Design Manual (2020, as amended). |

| TABLE 7-7. CITY OF EL CAMPO REGULATORY MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Regulatory Tool (ordinances, codes, plans) | Yes/No | Comments |
| Site plan review requirements | Yes | Managed by the Building Official and Public Works Department. |
| Capital improvements plan | Yes | 2021 Capital Improvements Plan |
| Economic development plan | Yes | Managed by the City Development Corporation of El Campo who manages the use of 4A sales tax. |
| Local emergency operations plan | Yes | Public Safety Emergency Operations Plan |
| Other special plans | No | |
| Flood insurance study or other engineering study for streams | Yes | FEMA floodplain maps indicate flood insurance is necessary along the Tres Palacios and Blue Creek. |
| Elevation certificates | Yes | Building Official reviews Elevation Certificates. |
| Notes: | | |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency | |
| UDC | Unified Development Code | |
| DCM | Drainage Criteria Manual | |

7.3.2 Administrative and Technical Capabilities

Table 7-8 identifies the City of El Campo personnel responsible for activities related to mitigation and loss prevention.

| TABLE 7-8. CITY OF EL CAMPO ADMINISTRATIVE/TECHNICAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|--|--------|--|
| Personnel Resources | Yes/No | Department/Position |
| Planner/engineer with knowledge of land development/land management practices | Yes | City Planning Director; list of Engineering Consultants on an as-needed basis. |
| Engineer/professional trained in construction practices related to buildings or infrastructure | Yes | Public Works Department, Building Official, and City Planning Director; list of Engineering Consultants on an as-needed basis. |
| Planner/engineer/scientist with an understanding of natural hazards | Yes | Public Works Department, Building Official, and City Planning Director; list of Engineering Consultants on an as-needed basis. |
| Personnel skilled in GIS | Yes | Public Works Department, and Planning Department. |
| Full-time building official | Yes | Inspection Department |
| Floodplain manager | Yes | Public Works Department |
| Emergency Management Coordinator | Yes | Emergency Management Coordinator |

| TABLE 7-8. CITY OF EL CAMPO ADMINISTRATIVE/TECHNICAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|--|--------|--|
| Personnel Resources | Yes/No | Department/Position |
| Grant writer | Yes | All departments; also use consultants on an as-needed basis. |
| Other personnel | No | |
| GIS data: Hazard areas | No | |
| GIS data: Critical facilities | No | |
| GIS data: Building footprints | No | |
| GIS data: Land use | Yes | Public Works Department and Planning Department |
| GIS data: Links to Assessor's data | Yes | Public Works Department and Planning Department |
| Warning systems/services (Reverse 911 callback, cable override, outdoor warning signals) | Yes | Smart 911 (Rave) system (Reverse 911 system). |
| Other | Yes | Local radio station; Social Media; bi-weekly newspaper. |
| Notes: | | |
| GIS Geographical Information System | | |

7.3.3 Financial Capabilities

Table 7-9 identifies financial tools or resources that the City of El Campo could use to help fund mitigation activities.

| TABLE 7-9. CITY OF EL CAMPO FINANCIAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Financial Resources | Accessible/Eligible to Use (Yes/No) |
| Community Development Block Grants | Yes |
| Capital improvements project funding | Yes |
| Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes | Yes |
| Fees for water, sewer, gas, or electric services | Water and Sewer utility fees |
| Impact fees for new development | No (Drainage Infrastructure Fee) |
| Incur debt through general obligation bonds | Yes |
| Incur debt through special tax bonds | Yes |
| Incur debt through private activities | No |
| Withhold spending in hazard-prone areas | No |
| Other | Yes |

7.4 CITY OF WHARTON

7.4.1 Legal and Regulatory Capabilities

Table 7-10 lists planning and land management tools typically used by local jurisdictions to implement hazard mitigation activities and indicates those that are in place in the City of Wharton.

| TABLE 7-10. CITY OF WHARTON REGULATORY MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|--|--------|--|
| Regulatory Tool (ordinances, codes, plans) | Yes/No | Comments |
| General plan | Yes | 2018-2028 Wharton Comprehensive Plan was created in 2018 to help the city prepare for and manage growth. |
| Zoning ordinance | No | |
| Subdivision ordinance | Yes | Subdivision regulations are included in the Code of Ordinances Appendix A (1964, as amended). |
| Growth management | Yes | Growth management is accomplished through the 2018-2028 Wharton Comprehensive Plan. |
| Floodplain ordinance | Yes | Chapter 18 – Article VI, Flood Damage Prevention (2006, as amended). |
| Other special-purpose ordinances (stormwater, steep slope, wildfire) | Yes | Adopted Wharton County Drainage Criteria Manual. Working on putting together a Drainage Ordinance. |
| Building code | Yes | The City of Wharton adopted the International Building Code and International Residential Code (2018 editions). |
| Erosion or sediment control program | Yes | Erosion and sediment control are managed by TCEQ via the general permit with EPA. SWPPP controls are required as per Building Code |
| Stormwater management | Yes | Adopted Wharton County Drainage Criteria Manual. Working on putting together a Drainage Ordinance. |
| Site plan review requirements | Yes | Contracted to Jones and Carter and do some in-house reviews |
| Capital improvements plan | Yes | City of Wharton 2021 Proposed Budget: Street and Drainage |
| Economic development plan | Yes | Key policies and actions to guide economic development are managed by the Wharton Economic Development Advisory Board. |
| Local emergency operations plan | No | Wharton works in conjunction with the Wharton County Emergency Management/911 Coordinator. |
| Other special plans | No | |
| Flood insurance study or other engineering study for streams | Yes | FEMA floodplain maps indicate flood insurance is necessary along the Wharton River. |
| Elevation certificates | Yes | City of Wharton Building Department keeps track of Elevation Certificates |

| TABLE 7-10. CITY OF WHARTON REGULATORY MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|---|--------|----------|
| Regulatory Tool (ordinances, codes, plans) | Yes/No | Comments |
| Notes: FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency LCRA Lower Colorado River Authority | | |

7.4.2 Administrative and Technical Capabilities

Table 7-11 identifies the City of Wharton personnel responsible for activities related to mitigation and loss prevention.

| TABLE 7-11. CITY OF WHARTON ADMINISTRATIVE/TECHNICAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | | |
|--|--------|--|
| Personnel Resources | Yes/No | Department/Position |
| Planner/engineer with knowledge of land development/land management practices | No | Outsourced – Jones & Carter Engineering |
| Engineer/professional trained in construction practices related to buildings or infrastructure | Yes | Building Official |
| Planner/engineer/scientist with an understanding of natural hazards | Yes | Community Development Director |
| Personnel skilled in GIS | No | Outsourced - Jones & Carter Engineering |
| Full-time building official | Yes | Code Enforcement Department |
| Floodplain manager | Yes | Code Enforcement Department |
| Emergency manager | Yes | Emergency Management Coordinator |
| Grant writer | Yes | Community Development Director |
| Other personnel | No | |
| GIS data: Hazard areas | No | |
| GIS data: Critical facilities | No | |
| GIS data: Building footprints | No | |
| GIS data: Land use | No | |
| GIS data: Links to Assessor's data | No | |
| Warning systems/services (Reverse 911 callback, cable override, outdoor warning signals) | Yes | Rave – Reverse 911 Call-Back; Outdoor warning system |
| Other | Yes | Local TV or radio station; Facebook |
| Notes: GIS Geographic Information System | | |

7.4.3 Financial Capabilities

Table 7-12 identifies financial tools or resources that the City of Wharton could use to help fund mitigation activities.

| TABLE 7-12. CITY OF WHARTON FINANCIAL MITIGATION CAPABILITIES MATRIX | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Financial Resources | Accessible/Eligible to Use (Yes/No) |
| Community Development Block Grants | Yes |
| Capital improvements project funding | Yes |
| Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes | Yes |
| Fees for water, sewer, gas, or electric services | Yes; Water/Sewer Utility Fee |
| Impact fees for new development | No |
| Incur debt through general obligation bonds | Yes |
| Incur debt through special tax bonds | No |
| Incur debt through private activities | No |
| Withhold spending in hazard-prone areas | No |
| Other | No |

PART 2

RISK ASSESSMENT

Chapter 8.

EXPANSIVE SOILS

| EXPANSIVE SOILS RANKING | |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Wharton County | Medium |
| City of East Bernard | Medium |
| City of El Campo | Medium |
| City of Wharton | Medium |


DEFINITIONS

Expansive Soils – Expansive soils are soils that expand when water is added and shrink when they dry out. They usually undergo significant volume change with the addition of depletion of pore water. Generally, the result of the chemical structure of certain types of clay soils.

8.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

Expansive and collapsible soils are some of the most widely distributed and costly geologic hazards. Collapsible soils are a group of soils that can rapidly settle or collapse the ground. They are also known as metastable soils and are unsaturated soils that undergo changes in volume and settlement in response to wetting and drying, often resulting in severe damage to structures. The sudden and usually large volume change could cause considerable structural damage. Expansive soil and rock are characterized by clayey material that shrinks as it dries or swells as it becomes wet. In addition, trees and shrubs placed close to a structure can lead to soil drying and subsequent shrinkage. The parent (source) rock most associated with expansive soils is shale. Figure 8-1 shows expansive soil distribution in the U.S. Collapsible soils consist of loose, dry, low-density materials that collapse and compact under the addition of water or excessive loading. Soil collapse occurs when the land surface is saturated at depths greater than those reached by typical rain events. This saturation eliminates the clay bonds holding the soil grains together. Similar to expansive soils, collapsible soils result in structural damage such as cracking of the foundation, floors, and walls in response to ground settlement. Swelling soils cause cracked foundations, as well as damage to the upper floors of a building when the motion in the structure is significant. Shrinkage as a result of dried soils can remove support from buildings or other structures and result in damaging subsidence. Fissures in the soil can also develop. These fissures can facilitate the deep penetration of water when moist conditions or runoff occurs.

Figure 8-1. Expansive Soil Regions



8.2 HAZARD PROFILE

8.2.1 Past Events

Wharton County is mostly underlain by soils with clay that have high shrink-swell properties (Figure 8-1). Expansive soils can cause structural damage, and even though structural foundation issues occur in the Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) update area, there is little documentation of site-specific past events from local, state, or national datasets.

Expansive soil is a condition that is native to Wharton County and participating communities because of the clay composition of the soils in this region. Expansive soils cannot be documented as a time-specific event, except when it leads to structural and infrastructure damage. There are no specific damage reports or historical records of events in Wharton County and participating communities, however, future events can occur. See Chapter 8.2.3 below for more information on future events.

8.2.2 Location

Structural foundation issues are a known occurrence through this region of South Texas including Wharton County and participating communities. The potential vertical rise of the clay soil in the area can be as high as several inches over a drought cycle. Structural foundations in the participating communities are thus subject to cyclical perimeter lifting and lowering from seasonal changes in soil moisture content because of the semi-arid conditions that persist in the area.

8.2.3 Frequency

Expansive soil is a condition that is native to Wharton County and participating communities. In Texas, it can take five or more years for an initial moisture dome to stabilize in a foundation. The establishment of the initial moisture dome usually causes the worst of the damage from foundation deflection. Afterward, the foundation is subject to cyclic perimeter lifting and lowering from seasonal changes in soil moisture content. For example, most homeowners with moving foundations find that cracks widen in the summer and close in the winter. This is due to the area's normal weather consisting of the most annual rainfall in May and September, along with dry summers and less evapotranspiration in the winter. Due to the amount of swelling potential, an event is possible in the next 10 years for Wharton County and participating communities.

Future Events

The large increase in development in the greater Houston-Galveston area, of which Wharton County is a part, could lead to an increase in land subsidence events. More structures, residents, and people could cause a strain on previously undeveloped areas of land and resources. This could increase the probability of an event occurring in Wharton County and participating communities. Future events are possible in the next 10 years for Wharton County and participating communities.

8.2.4 Severity

The severity of expansive soil is largely related to the extent and location of areas that are impacted. Such events can cause property damage as well as loss of life; however, events may also occur in remote areas of the HMP update area where there is little to no impact on people or property.

Expansive soil is the hidden force behind basement and foundation problems. The U.S. Dept. of Agriculture (USDA) claims that expansive soils are responsible for more home damage every year than floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes combined. The USDA estimates 50% of all homes in the U.S. are built on expansive soils. Each year in the U.S., expansive soils cause \$2.3 billion in structural damage. Structures may be condemned as a result of this damage resulting in large losses. Shrink-swell problems are the second most likely problem a homeowner would encounter, after insects.

The *State of Texas Hazard Mitigation Plan* defines soil expansion measurements in terms of its swelling potential or volumetric swell. The State uses the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) soil expansion index adopted by ASTM in 1988. This expansion index has been determined to have a greater range and better sensitivity of expansion than other indexes. The following ratings define expansive soil extent 'per the ASTM D4729-11 Expansive Soils Index:

- 0-20% Very Low
- 21-50% Low
- 51-90% Medium
- 91-130% High
- 130%+ Very High

As seen in Figure 8-1, Wharton County and participating communities are vulnerable to expansive soils as up to 50% of the area is underlain by soils with clays of high swelling potential, and therefore fall under the 'Low' Extent. Most Unified Building Codes (UBC) mandates that special foundation design consideration be employed if the Expansion Index is 20 or greater. This applies to all participating communities.

8.2.5 Warning Time

Soil expansion generally occurs gradually over time; however, these processes may be intensified as a result of natural or human-induced activities.

8.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Events that cause damage to improved areas can result in secondary hazards, such as explosions from natural gas lines, loss of utilities such as water and sewer due to shifting infrastructure, and potential failures of reservoir dams. Additionally, these events may occur simultaneously with other natural hazards such as flooding. Erosion can cause undercutting that can result in an increase in landslide or rockfall hazards. Additionally, erosion can result in the loss of topsoil, which can affect agricultural production in the area. Deposition can have impacts that aggravate flooding, bury crops, or reduce the capacities of water reservoirs.

8.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

In areas where climate change results in less precipitation and reduced surface-water supplies, communities will pump more groundwater. Changes in precipitation events and the hydrological cycle may result in changes in the rate of subsidence and soil erosion. According to a 2003 paper published by the Soil and Water Conservation Society (Soil and Water Conservation 2003):

The potential for climate change – as expressed in changed precipitation regimes – to increase the risk of soil erosion, surface runoff, and related environmental consequences is clear. The actual damage that would result from such a change is unclear. Regional, seasonal, and temporal variability in precipitation is large both in simulated climate regimes and in the existing climate record. Different landscapes vary greatly in their vulnerability to soil erosion and runoff. Timing of agricultural production practices creates even greater vulnerabilities to soil erosion and runoff during certain seasons. The effect of a particular storm event depends on the moisture content of the soil before the storm starts. These interactions between precipitation, landscape, and management mean the actual outcomes of any particular change in precipitation regime will be complex.

8.5 EXPOSURE

While all structures and foundations are exposed to expansive soils, Wharton County and participating communities' clay soil composition increases the likelihood and severity of the seasonal swelling and contraction of soils. Each participating community's structures and population are potentially exposed and equally at risk by expansive soils.

8.5.1 Population

It can be assumed that the entire planning area is exposed equally to some extent to expansive soils events. Certain areas are more exposed due to geographic location and local weather patterns. Current growth trends could cause more area residents to be exposed to expansive soils. Increased population will increase demands on structure development, as well as surface and sub-surface soil activities, and may introduce new expansive soils in areas where soil expansion activities have not yet occurred.

8.5.2 Property

According to the Hazards United States Multi-Hazard (HAZUS-MH) system inventory data (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), there are an estimated 15,217 buildings (residential, commercial, and other) with a total asset inventory (excluding contents) value of over \$3.4 billion within the type D soil group. Type D soil group is that consisting of over 40% clay. Areas underlain by this soil group are considered the most at risk for expansive soils. See hazard loss tables for community-specific total assessed numbers (e.g., Table 8-1 and Table 8-3). Table 8-1 list the exposed structures and population for the participating communities.

| TABLE 8-1 EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|------------|------------------|------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other* | Total Structures | Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 852 | 57 | 41 | 950 | 2,327 |
| City of El Campo | 4,201 | 349 | 192 | 4,742 | 12,116 |
| City of Wharton | 2,526 | 236 | 85 | 2,847 | 7,439 |
| Unincorporated Area | 6,329 | 182 | 167 | 6,678 | 15,301 |
| Wharton County Total | 13,908 | 824 | 485 | 15,217 | 37,183 |
| Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications. | | | | | |

8.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Any critical facilities or infrastructure that are located in the participating communities on or near areas prone to expansive soils are equally exposed to risk from this hazard. Bare ground or lack of tree cover may result in additional exposure.

8.5.4 Environment

Expansive soils are naturally occurring processes, but can still cause damage to the natural environment. These processes and events can alter the natural environment where they occur.

8.6 VULNERABILITY

Wharton County and participating communities have a high risk from expansive soils because of the amounts of clay with swelling potential in the soils that underlay the planning area. For the specific rankings given for each entity see ranking tables in chapter 21. Because expansive soils cannot be directly modeled in HAZUS-MH, annualized losses were estimated using geographic information system- (GIS) based analysis, historical data analysis, and statistical risk assessment methodology. Event frequency, severity indicators, expert opinions, and historical local knowledge of the region were used for this assessment.

8.6.1 Population

The risk of injury or fatalities as a result of this hazard is limited but possible. The most vulnerable demographics will be the economically disadvantaged population areas, children under 16 years of age, and the elderly. Economically disadvantaged families and those living on a fixed income may not have the financial means to adequately deal with the effects of an event and make the necessary structural improvements. The youth and elderly population may require further assistance as dependents if an event were to occur. Table 8-2 shows all vulnerable populations per participating community regardless of the soil type.

| TABLE 8-2 MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Youth Population (< 16) | % of Total Population | Elderly Population (> 65) | % of Total Population | Economically Disadvantage (Income < \$20,000) | % of Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 638 | 28.07 | 342 | 15.05 | 129 | 5.68 |
| City of El Campo | 3402 | 29.33 | 1648 | 14.21 | 992 | 8.55 |
| City of Wharton | 2317 | 26.23 | 1288 | 14.58 | 1251 | 14.17 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4,715 | 25.39 | 2,741 | 14.76 | 1,537 | 8.28 |
| Wharton County Total | 11,072 | 26.82 | 6,019 | 14.58 | 3,910 | 9.47 |

8.6.2 Property

All properties are at some level of risk from expansive soils, but properties in poor condition or in particularly vulnerable locations (economically disadvantaged communities and areas with low tree cover) may risk the most damage. Generally, damage is minimal and goes unreported.

Loss estimations for expansive soil hazards are not based on damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, loss estimates were developed representing projected damages (annualized loss) on exposed values. Historical events, statistical analysis, and probability factors were applied to the counties and communities exposed values to create an annualized loss. Table 8-3 lists the property loss estimates for each participating community compared to the exposed value (excluding content). Annualized losses of ‘negligible’ are less than \$50 annually. Negligible loss hazards are still included despite minimal annualized losses because of the potential for a high-value damaging event.

| TABLE 8-3. LOSS ESTIMATES FOR EXPANSIVE SOILS | | | |
|--|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value | Annualized Loss | Annualized Loss Percentage |
| City of East Bernard | \$246,550,000 | Negligible | <0.01 |
| City of El Campo | \$1,300,853,000 | Negligible | <0.01 |
| City of Wharton | \$686,117,000 | Negligible | <0.01 |
| Unincorporated Area | \$1,230,354,000 | \$1,807 | <0.01 |
| Wharton County Total | \$3,463,874,000 | \$1,807 | <0.01 |

Vulnerability Narrative

All participating communities are at risk to expansive soils. Table 8-2 lists the vulnerable population per community. Table 8-3 lists the estimated annualized losses in dollars for each participating community.

- **City of East Bernard** - The effects of expansive soils are more likely to be felt in the more developed areas of the City, such as along US 90 or SH 60. Property owners face additional maintenance costs because of structure foundation issues caused by the swelling of soils. Owners unaware of the areas of higher risk at the time the property was purchased are more likely to not be prepared for its effects. If an event were to occur near a critical facility, such as an area school, government building, or site containing hazardous materials, area residents would be increasingly impacted. Communities implementing Emergency Response Plans help to mitigate these negative impacts.
- **City of El Campo** – Weather events of greater disparity (such as short intense periods of rainfall to prolonged drought conditions) cause more stress on areas affected by expansive soils. As the soil expands, cracks in foundations can occur as well as other structural damages. This can cause damages to critical facilities (such as emergency response facilities, schools, and homes). If major area thoroughfares, such as US 59, were to be closed or become impassable by an event, response times to the community and mobility in and out of the city would be limited. Structures built without the benefit of building requirements designed to minimize the risk of property damage are more vulnerable as well. Communities unaware of the areas of higher risk, such as with the implementation of hazard mapping, are more at risk as well.
- **City of Wharton** - The effects of expansive soils are more likely to be felt in the more developed areas of the City, such as along TX 183. Property owners face additional maintenance costs because of structure foundation issues caused by the swelling of soils. Owners unaware of the areas of higher risk at the time the property was purchased are more likely to not be prepared for its effects. If an event were to occur near a critical facility, such as area schools or emergency response centers, residents would be increasingly impacted. Communities that do not proactively identify the mitigation measures that would mitigate the negative impacts of expansive soils increase their vulnerability as well.
- **Wharton County (Unincorporated Area)** – All of the Unincorporated Areas of Wharton County are vulnerable to expansive soils as up to 50% of the area is underlain by soils with clays of high swelling potential. Critical facilities and structures that have not been inspected for expansive soils may have a greater risk. If an event were to occur in one of these areas (or any rural area) response times could be slow. Residents and business owners who are unaware of the dangers of expansive soils are more vulnerable as well. Communities who monitor the structural integrity of critical facility structures and conduct the improvements needed to major thoroughfares or crossings help to mitigate these risks.

Community Perception of Vulnerability

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this HMP update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

8.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Even though expansive soils cause enormous amounts of damage, the effects can occur slowly and may not be attributed to a specific event. The damage done by expansive soils is then attributed to poor construction practices or a misconception that all buildings experience this type of damage as they age. Cracked foundations, floors, and basement walls, as well as damage to the upper floors of the building

when the motion in the structure is significant, are typical types of damage done by swelling soils. Shrinkage can remove support from buildings or other structures and result in damaging subsidence.

When critical facilities and infrastructure are affected and closed down for maintenance due to structure foundation problems as a result of soil expansion, critical response times and services to the affected communities will become limited.

8.6.4 Environment

Ecosystems that are exposed to increased soil expansion as a result of the clay content of their soil habitats. However, some soil swelling and contraction is required for healthful ecosystem functioning. Ecosystems that are already exposed to other pressures, such as encroaching development, may be more vulnerable to impacts from these hazards.

8.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

Jurisdictions in the planning area should ensure that known hazard areas are regulated under their planning and zoning programs. In areas where hazards may be present, permitting processes should require geotechnical investigations to assess risk and vulnerability to hazard areas. Soil expansion issues generally do impact land use and structure development. Issues pertaining to land use in these areas are likely addressed through jurisdictional building codes, ordinances, and regulations.

8.8 SCENARIO

A worst-case scenario would occur if a rapidly occurring soil swelling and contraction caused severe structure deformation or the subsurface soil to crack and open up beneath a structure where many individuals lived or worked. This situation could result in a number of injuries or fatalities and would cause extensive damage to the area directly impacted.

8.9 ISSUES

The major issues for soil expansion are the following:

- The onset of actual or observed soil expansion in many cases is related to changes in land use. Land uses permitted in known hazard areas should be carefully evaluated.
- Knowledge of hydrologic factors is critical for evaluating most types of soil swelling.
- Some land use and housing developments have had soil site investigations completed before development. This practice should be reviewed and expanded as needed.
- A more detailed analysis should be conducted for critical facilities and infrastructure exposed to hazard areas. This analysis should address how potential structural issues were addressed in facility design and construction.

Chapter 9.

DAM/LEVEE FAILURE

| DAM/LEVEE FAILURE RANKING | |
|---------------------------|-------------|
| Wharton County | No Exposure |
| City of East Bernard | No Exposure |
| City of El Campo | No Exposure |
| City of Wharton | No Exposure |

DEFINITIONS

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Breach | An opening through which floodwaters may pass after part of a levee has given way. |
| Dam Failure | An uncontrolled release of impounded water due to structural deficiencies in a dam. |
| Emergency Action Plan | A document that identifies potential emergency conditions at a dam and specifies actions to be followed to minimize property damage and loss of life. The plan specifies actions the dam owner should take to alleviate problems at a dam. It contains procedures and information to assist the dam owner in issuing an early warning and notification messages to responsible downstream emergency management authorities of the emergency situation. It also contains inundation maps to show emergency management authorities the critical areas for action in case of an emergency. (FEMA 64) |
| High Hazard Dam | Dams where failure or operational error will probably cause loss of human life. (FEMA 333) |
| Significant hazard Dam | Dams where failure or operational error will result in no probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, or disruption of lifeline facilities, or can impact other concerns. Significant hazard dams are often located in rural or agricultural areas but could be located in areas with population and significant infrastructure. (FEMA 333) |
| Accredited Levee | A levee that is shown on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) as providing protection from the 1% annual chance or greater flood. A non-accredited or de-accredited levee is a levee that is not shown on a FIRM as providing protection from the 1% annual chance or greater flood. A provisionally accredited levee is a previously accredited levee that has been de-accredited for which data and/or documentation is pending that will show the levee is compliant with National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations. |

9.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND


9.1.1 Dams

Water is an essential natural resource and one of the most efficient ways to manage and control water resources is through dam construction. A dam is defined in the Texas Water Code as “any barrier, or barriers with an appurtenant structure, constructed for the purpose of either permanently or temporarily impounding water” (Texas Administrative Code, Ch. 299, 1986).

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) has jurisdiction over rule changes to dams as 99% of dams are under state regulatory authority. Those regulations are implemented by the TCEQ Dam Safety Program, which monitors and regulates both private and public dams in Texas. The program periodically inspects dams that pose a high or significant hazard and makes recommendations and reports to dam owners to help them maintain safe facilities. The primary goal of the state’s Dam Safety Program is to reduce the risk to lives and property from the consequences of dam failure.

According to the TCEQ, a dam in Texas is a barrier with a “height greater than or equal to 25 feet and a maximum storage capacity greater than or equal to 15 acre-feet; a height greater than 6 feet and a maximum storage capacity greater than or equal to 50 acre-feet; are a high- or significant-hazard dam as defined in n §299.14 (relating to Hazard Classification Criteria), regardless of height or maximum storage capacity; or are used as a pumped storage or terminal storage facility” (TCEQ, Ch 1, 2009). Figure 9-1 shows the specifications required for a dam to be regulated by TCEQ.


Figure 9-1. TCEQ Dam Definition



Note: From TCEQ, Ch 1, 2009

The majority of dams and lakes in Texas are used for water supply. Dams also provide benefits such as irrigation for agriculture, hydropower, flood control, maintenance of lake levels, and recreation. The primary purposes and benefits of dams are shown in Figure 9-2. However, despite the benefits and importance of dams to our public works infrastructure, many safety issues exist for dams as with any complex infrastructure; the most serious threat is dam failure. Almost all the dams in Wharton County are privately owned.


Figure 9-2. Primary Purpose/Benefit of U.S. Dams



Note: From FEMA, Living With Dams

Approximately 9% of the dams in all of Wharton County and participating communities are owned by either the local government or local government agency. The remaining 91% are privately owned. See Figure 9-3 for the location of dams in the participating communities.

Figure 9-3. Locations of Dams in Wharton County and Participating Communities



Note: From HAZUS-MH

9.1.2 Levees


The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) defines a levee as a “man-made structure, usually, an earthen embankment, designed and constructed in accordance with sound engineering practices to contain, control, or divert the flow of water so as to provide protection from temporary flooding.” The terms dike and levee are sometimes used interchangeably. A few examples of levee systems are the Texas City Hurricane Protection Structure, Freeport Hurricane Protection Structure, the Port Arthur Hurricane Protection Structure in the Houston area, and the Trinity Floodway Levees in the Dallas area. Levees reduce the risk of flooding but no levee system can eliminate all flood risks. There is always a chance that a flood will exceed the capacity of a levee, no matter how well built. Levees can work to provide critical time for local emergency management officials to safely evacuate residents during flooding events. The possibility exists that levees can be overtopped or breached by large floods; however, levees sometimes fail even when a flood is small.

Although there are levees in all 50 states, there is no single agency responsible for levee construction and maintenance. It is a common misperception that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) manages all levees in the nation. In reality, the levees included in the USACE Levee Safety Program represent only about 10% of the nation’s levees (as estimated by the National Committee on Levee Safety). Some estimates indicate that over 100,000 miles of levees exist across the nation. Of that number, the USACE designed and constructed over 14,000 miles of levees with another 14,000 to 16,000 miles operated by other federal agencies, such as the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. The majority of the nation’s levees were constructed by private and non-federal interests and are not federally operated or maintained. However, more than 10 million people live or work behind USACE program levees. For this reason, USACE considers its role in assessing, communicating, and managing risk to be a top priority. Figure 9-4 shows USACE program levees versus other levee programs. Wharton County and participating communities do have known levees (See Figure 9-5). Wharton County contains four levees according to the National Levee Database (NLD) and local knowledge. These levees are the Colorado River Levee, Jarvis Creek Levee, and the West Bernard Creek Levee. All these levees are located within the Wharton County Unincorporated area. The Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton do not have any levees inside their city limits although plans for a levee system within the city limits of Wharton are proposed. Additional small private levees may exist which are unaccounted for.

Flooding can happen anywhere, but certain areas are especially prone to serious flooding. To help communities understand the risk behind levee structures, FEMA uses levee accreditation on flood insurance rate maps (FIRM) to show the locations with reduced risks from the base flood. Conditions in, near, or under levees can change due to environmental factors. The FIRMs consider these factors. If the risk level for property changes, so may the requirement to carry flood insurance.


Levee accreditation is FEMA’s recognition that a levee is reasonably certain to contain the base (1% annual chance exceedance, sometimes referred to as the 100-year flood) regulatory flood. In order to be accredited, levee owners must certify to FEMA that the levee will provide protection from the base flood. Certification is a technical finding by a professional engineer based on data, drawings, and analyses that the levee system meets the minimum acceptable standards. FEMA’s accreditation is not a guarantee of performance; it is intended to provide updated information for insurance and floodplain development.

Figure 9-4. U.S. Levee Systems



Note: From USACE

Figure 9-5. Counties in Texas with Levees



9.1.3 Causes of Dam Failure

Dam failure is a collapse or breach in a dam. While most dams have storage volumes small enough that failures have little or no repercussions, dams with large storage amounts can cause significant downstream flooding. Dam failures in the United States typically occur from any one or combination of the following:

- Overtopping of the primary dam structure, which accounts for 34% of all dam failures, can occur due to inadequate spillway design, settlement of the dam crest, blockage of spillways, and other factors.
- Foundation defects due to differential settlement, slides, slope instability, uplift pressures, and foundation seepage can also cause dam failure. These account for 30% of all dam failures.
- Failure due to piping and seepage accounts for 20% of all failures. These are caused by internal erosion due to piping and seepage, erosion along hydraulic structures such as spillways, erosion due to animal burrows, and cracks in the dam structure.
- Failure due to problems with conduits and valves, typically caused by the piping of embankment material into conduits through joints or cracks, constitutes 10% of all failures.

The remaining 6% of U.S. dam failures are due to miscellaneous causes. Many dam failures in the United States have been secondary results of other disasters. The prominent causes are earthquakes, landslides, extreme storms, massive snowmelt, equipment malfunction, structural damage, foundation failures, and sabotage.

Poor construction, lack of maintenance and repair, and deficient operational procedures are preventable or correctable by a program of regular inspections. Terrorism and vandalism are serious concerns that all operators of public facilities must plan for; these threats are under continuous review by public safety agencies.

9.1.4 Causes of Levee Failure

Levee data used in this report is from the FEMA Midterm Levee Inventory (MLI) and the USACE NLD. The FEMA MLI captures all levee data (USACE and non-USACE), with a primary focus on levees that provide protection from the base (1% annual chance) flood. Levees providing less than base flood protection will also be included, but only for those levees with data readily available. The HAZUS-MH database did not list any levees in Wharton County. However, the FEMA MLI database did contain levees for Wharton County. In addition, there may be private levees located within the county and participating cities that are not listed in these databases.

A levee breach occurs when part of a levee gives way, creating an opening through which floodwaters may pass. A breach may occur gradually or suddenly. The most dangerous breaches happen quickly during periods of high water. The resulting torrent can quickly swamp a large area behind the failed levee with little or no warning.

Earthen levees can be damaged in several ways. For instance, strong river currents and waves can erode the surface. Debris and ice carried by floodwaters—and even large objects such as boats or barges—can collide with and gouge the levee. Trees growing on a levee can blow over, leaving a hole where the root wad and soil used to be. Burrowing animals can create holes that enable water to pass through a levee. If severe enough, any of these situations can lead to a zone of weakness that could cause a levee breach. In seismically active areas, earthquakes and ground shaking can cause a loss of soil strength, weakening a

levee and possibly resulting in failure. Seismic activity can also cause levees to slide or slump, both of which can lead to failure. Unfortunately, in the rare occurrence when a levee system fails or is overtopped, severe flooding can occur due to increased elevation differences associated with levees and the increased water velocity that is created.

It is also important to remember that no levee provides protection from events for which it was not designed, and proper operation and maintenance are necessary to reduce the probability of failure. In some cases, flooding may not be directly attributable to a river, stream, or lake overflowing its banks. Rather, it may simply be the combination of excessive rainfall or snowmelt, saturated ground, and inadequate drainage. With no place to go, the water will find the lowest elevations—areas that are often not in a floodplain. This type of flooding, often referred to as sheet flooding, is becoming increasingly prevalent as development outstrips the ability of the drainage infrastructure to properly carry and disburse the water flow. Flooding also occurs due to combined storm and sanitary sewers that cannot handle the amount of water.

The complicated nature of levee protection was made evident by events such as Hurricane Katrina. Flooding can be exacerbated by levees that are breached or overtopped. As a result, FEMA and USACE are reevaluating their policies regarding enforcement of levee maintenance and post-flood rebuilding. Both agencies are also conducting stricter inspections to determine how much protection individual levees provide. The Texas Water Development Board's (TWDB) mission is to provide leadership, information, education, and support for planning, financial assistance, and outreach for the conservation and responsible development of water for Texas. TWDB will assist qualifying entities who are in good standing with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) through technical and financial assistance. TWDB assistance may include grant funding, participation in levee inspections, assistance in developing Maintenance Deficiency Correction Plans, site visits, and participation in public hearings. In addition, the TWDB will also discourage the construction of new levees to protect new developments, and instead encourage other types of flood mitigation projects.

9.1.5 Regulatory Oversight

The potential for catastrophic flooding due to dam failures led to the passage of the National Dam Safety Act (Public Law 92-367). The National Dam Safety Program requires a periodic engineering analysis of every major dam in the country. The goal of this FEMA-monitored effort is to identify and mitigate the risk of dam failure so as to protect the lives and property of the public.

Texas Rules and Regulations for Dam Safety and Dam Construction

Effective September 1, 2013, dams are exempt from safety requirements if they are located on private property, have a maximum impoundment capacity of fewer than 500 acre-feet, are classified as low or significant hazard, are located in a county with a population of less than 350,000 (as per 2010 U.S. Census), and are not located within the corporate limits of a municipality. Dam owners will still have to comply with maintenance and operation requirements. There is no exemption expiration date. Figure 9-6 shows counties in Texas that fall under this exemption criteria. Four of the dams in Wharton County are non-exempt while the others are exempt per 30 TAC 299.

To help the State Dam Safety Program achieve its goal, the state's dam safety regulations now include the requirement for emergency action plans on all non-exempt Significant-Hazard and High-Hazard Potential dams (Title 30, Texas Administrative Code, Ch. 299, 299.61b). Dam count and exemptions 30 TAC 299 are detailed below by jurisdiction in Table 9-1.

| TABLE 9-1. DAM COUNTS AND EXEMPTIONS | | |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Jurisdiction | Dam Count | Exemptions |
| City of East Bernard | 0 | 0 |
| City of El Campo | 0 | 0 |
| City of Wharton | 0 | 0 |
| Unincorporated Areas | 11 | 7 |
| Wharton County Total | 11 | 7 |
| Note: Dam data provided by the National Inventory of Dams (NID) in 2018 | | |

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Dam Safety Program

USACE is responsible for safety inspections of some federal and non-federal dams in the United States that meet the size and storage limitations specified in the National Dam Safety Act. USACE has inventoried dams; surveyed each state and federal agency's capabilities, practices, and regulations regarding design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the dams; and developed guidelines for inspection and evaluation of dam safety.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Dam Safety Program

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) cooperates with a large number of federal and state agencies to ensure and promote dam safety. More than 3,000 dams are part of regulated hydroelectric projects in the FERC program. Two-thirds of these are more than 50 years old. As dams age, concern about their safety and integrity grows, so oversight and regular inspection are important. FERC inspects hydroelectric projects on an unscheduled basis to investigate the following:


- Potential dam safety problems
- Complaints about constructing and operating a project
- Safety concerns related to natural disasters
- Issues concerning compliance with the terms and conditions of a license

Every 5 years, an independent engineer approved by the FERC must inspect and evaluate projects with dams higher than 32.8 feet (10 meters) or with a total storage capacity of more than 2,000 acre-feet.

FERC monitors and evaluates seismic research and applies it in investigating and performing structural analyses of hydroelectric projects. FERC also evaluates the effects of potential and actual large floods on the safety of dams. During and following floods, FERC visits dams and licensed projects, determines the extent of damage, if any, and directs any necessary studies or remedial measures the licensee must undertake. The FERC publication *Engineering Guidelines for the Evaluation of Hydropower Projects* guides the FERC engineering staff and licensees in evaluating dam safety. The publication is frequently revised to reflect current information and methodologies.

FERC requires licensees to prepare emergency action plans and conducts training sessions on how to develop and test these plans. The plans outline an early warning system if there is an actual or potential sudden release of water from a dam due to failure. The plans include operational procedures that may be used, such as reducing reservoir levels and reducing downstream flows, as well as procedures for notifying affected residents and agencies responsible for emergency management. These plans are frequently updated and tested to ensure that everyone knows what to do in emergency situations.

Figure 9-6. Texas County Population Exemptions for Dams



9.2 HAZARD PROFILE

9.2.1 Past Events


There are approximately 7,324 dams in the inventory of dams in Texas. Two major dam failures occurred in the City of Austin, which is not a participating jurisdiction in this effort. The last failure for the city was in 1915. There have been no previous dam failure events in Wharton County and the participating communities.

After a series of high-profile failures throughout the United States during the 1960s and early 1970s, the U.S. Congress enacted legislation mandating inspections and strict safety requirements for all governmental and privately operated dams. Stricter state and federal dam safety regulations were adopted in the 1970s and 1980s as a direct response to numerous dam failures across the country. These standards require that dams be able to withstand the most severe flood imaginable, the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). This flood is so severe and statistically remote that its probability of occurrence in any given year cannot be measured. Since that time the number of failures and deaths has dramatically decreased.

The Lower Colorado River Authority (LCRA) conducted a Dam Modernization Program between 1994 and 2004 to strengthen the dams in its jurisdiction and ensure their safety for years to come. This program addressed a common problem with the stability of the “gravity” sections of the dams. Since gravity sections derive strength from their size and weight, post-tensioned anchors were added to improve stability. The dam modernization program helps ensure that LCRA’s dams meet required design safety standards to resist the water load and pressure of the PMF.

An extreme precipitation event occurred May 23 through 25, 2015, (this event is further outlined in Chapter 12, Flood) causing a rise in Lake Travis (Mansfield Dam, Figure 9-7); however, no releases occurred from LCRA.

Figure 9-7. Lake Travis Water Surface Elevation During the May 2015 Precipitation Event



9.2.2 Location

Dam locations are based on the 2018 USACE National Inventory of Dams. This database lists 11 dams in Wharton County, all of which are in the Unincorporated area. Figure 9-8 shows locations of the dams in the county and participating cities with potential dam inundation extents and population densities. The FEMA MLI data provided a listing of levee locations in Texas. Figure 9-5 shows counties with levees in Texas and Figure 9-9 shows levee locations in Wharton County. These levees have not been certified as providing protection from the 100-year floodplain (See section 9.1.2 for more information on certification). All of the existing levees in Wharton County are not located near populated areas. The levee near the City of Wharton is located on the southern edge of the city, not along the populated town center. All of the levees in the participating jurisdiction are earthen and not certified (not used to remove people and property out of the 100-year flood plain).

There is an uncounted number of ‘non-jurisdictional dams on public and private lands in the planning area. These are small dams that normally do not store water but may impound water during heavy precipitation events. Because they are not monitored or maintained, there is potential for them to overtop or fail and cause flooding and property damage during a significant rainfall event. The extent and risk associated with these dams are not known.

The risks of a dam failure are spread throughout the county while that of a levee failure is limited to the City of Wharton and the southern portions of the county. The planning area could be impacted by several high-hazard dams that are located outside of the county. If a failure of a high-hazard dam occurred, it could result in loss of life. Other high-hazard dams are located outside of the county and their drainages enter Wharton County and participating communities either by direct drainage through parts of the planning area or by inflow into the Colorado River or San Bernard River upstream from Colorado County. However there have not been any dam breaches immediately upstream of or within the participating communities, thus the overall chance of this occurring is minimal, and therefore classified as ‘No Exposure’. Additionally, major dams located outside of the planning area that could affect the participating communities, including Cedar Creek Dam and Tom Miller Dam are located approximately 65 and 165 miles, respectively, upstream of Wharton County, along the Colorado River. Because of these two dams’ upstream location, any major dam breach will minimally affect Wharton County. A detailed description of exposure and vulnerability per jurisdiction is described in Chapter 9.5 and Chapter 9.6.

Figure 9-8. Wharton County and Participating Communities Dam Potential Inundation Areas and Population





Figure 9-9. Levees in Wharton County



9.2.3 Frequency

There has been no occurrence of dam failure in the past 100 years in the HMP update area. Overall, the probability of a dam failure somewhere in Wharton County and the participating communities are considered rare or unlikely (event not probable in the next 100 years). This same probability applies to future events (events not probable in the next 100 years).

9.2.4 Severity

USACE and TCEQ developed the classification system shown in Table 9-2 and Table 9-3 for the hazard potential of dam failures. The hazard rating systems are both based only on the potential consequences of a dam failure; neither system takes into account the probability of such failures. Table 9-3 shows the specifications required for a dam to be regulated by TCEQ.

**TABLE 9-2.
USACE HAZARD POTENTIAL CLASSIFICATION**

| Hazard Category | Direct Loss of Life ^b | Lifeline Losses ^c | Property Losses ^d | Environmental Losses ^e |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Low | None (rural location, no permanent structures for human habitation) | No disruption of services (cosmetic or rapidly repairable damage) | Private agricultural lands, equipment, and isolated buildings | Minimal incremental damage |
| Significant | Possible (rural location, only transient or day-use facilities) | Disruption of essential facilities and access | Major public and private facilities | Major mitigation required |
| High | Certain (one or more persons; extensive residential, commercial, or industrial development) | Disruption of essential facilities and access | Extensive public and private facilities | Extensive mitigation cost or impossible to mitigate |
| Notes: a. Categories are assigned to overall projects, not individual structures at a project. b. Loss of life potential based on inundation mapping of area downstream of the project. Analyses of loss of life potential should take into account the population at risk, time of flood wave travel, and warning time. c. Indirect threats to life caused by the interruption of lifeline services due to project failure or operational disruption; for example, loss of critical medical facilities or access to them. d. Damage to project facilities and downstream property and indirect impact due to loss of project services, such as impact due to loss of a dam and navigation pool, or impact due to loss of water or power supply. e. Environmental impact downstream caused by the incremental flood wave produced by the project failure, beyond what would normally be expected for the magnitude flood event under which the failure occurs. From 7 CFR Appendix A-Subpart E-Part 1724 | | | | |

**TABLE 9-3.
TCEQ HAZARD POTENTIAL CLASSIFICATION**

| Hazard Category | Human Impact | Economic Impact |
|-----------------|--|--|
| Low | No loss of life expected (no lives or permanent habitable structures in the inundation area) | Minimal economic loss (failure may cause damage to occasional farms, agricultural improvements, and minor highways) |
| Significant | Loss of life is possible (1 to 6 lives or 1 to 2 permanent habitable structures in the inundation area) | Appreciable economic loss (failure may cause damage to isolated homes, secondary highways, minor railroads, or cause interruption of public services) |
| High | Loss of life is expected (7 or more lives or 3 or more permanent habitable structures in the inundation area) | Excessive economic losses (failure may cause damage to public, agricultural, industrial, or commercial facilities or utilities, and main highways or railroads) |

Note: From Title 30 Texas Administrative Code, Ch 299, Subchapter B, Rule §299.14

9.2.5 Warning Time

Warning time for dam failure varies depending on the cause of the failure. In events of extreme precipitation or massive snowmelt, evacuations can be planned with sufficient time. In the event of a structural failure due to an earthquake, there may be no warning time. A dam's structural type also affects warning time. Earthen dams do not tend to fail completely or instantaneously. Once a breach is initiated, discharging water erodes the breach until either the reservoir water is depleted or the breach resists further erosion. Concrete gravity dams also tend to have a partial breach as one or more monolith sections are forced apart by escaping water. The time of breach formation ranges from a few minutes to a few hours (USACE 1997).

Emergency action plans for all high-hazard dams that would affect Wharton County are on file with TCEQ. Additionally, possible evacuation routes in the event of a failure have been identified.

9.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Dam failure can cause severe downstream flooding, depending on the magnitude of the failure. Other potential secondary hazards of dam failure are landslides around the reservoir perimeter, bank erosion on the rivers, and destruction of downstream habitat.

9.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Dams are designed partly based on assumptions about a river's flow behavior, expressed as hydrographs. Changes in weather patterns can have significant effects on the hydrograph used for the design of a dam. If the hydrograph changes, it is conceivable that the dam can lose some or all of its designed margin of safety, also known as freeboard. If freeboard is reduced, dam operators may be forced to release increased volumes earlier in a storm cycle in order to maintain the required margins of safety. Such early releases of increased volumes can increase flood potential downstream.

Dams are constructed with safety features known as "spillways." Spillways are put in place on dams as a safety measure in the event of the reservoir filling too quickly. Spillway overflow events, often referred to as "design failures," result in increased discharges downstream and increased flooding potential.

Although climate change will not increase the probability of catastrophic dam failure, it may increase the probability of design failures.

9.5 VULNERABILITY

Dam data records and exposures are described in general in this section. Figure 9-8 shows potential estimated areas of impact by a dam breach and population vulnerability by census block. While some Unincorporated Wharton has property and population that may be affected by an event, due to the lack of previous events, local knowledge, and no high hazard dams or certified levees in the area, the overall probability of occurrence is highly unlikely and therefore classified as “No Exposure”. Other participating communities fall outside of the risk area and therefore are classified as “No Exposure”.

Table 9-4 below lists the dams in each jurisdiction, as well as dam height, maximum discharge, and storage. A higher discharge and storage area corresponds with a greater extent of damage from a dam failure. High-hazard dams are susceptible to human, economic, and environmental impact from a failure (Table 9-2 and Table 9-3). This table includes major upstream dams outside of the planning area that may affect Wharton County participating communities. However, due to their distant location from the planning area, the effects of a dam breach are minimized, and would not significantly contribute to damages.

Overall, dam failure impacts would likely be rare and limited in Wharton County, largely affecting the downstream areas during a failure event. Roads closed due to dam failure floods could result in serious transportation disruptions due to the limited number of roads in the county. The maximum inundation depth for a dam breach would be in line with the height of the dam, as listed in the table below. Small dams in the rural parts of the unincorporated area of the county do not have the data available to predict breach analysis inundation effects on local road crossings. Existing road closure policies and emergency management practices will be used. The Colorado River at the City of Wharton has a bank full stage of 20 feet and a Flood Stage of 39 feet. The San Bernard River at East Bernard has an action stage of 13’, and a flood stage of 17’. Participating communities use gauges for measurements, monitoring of conditions, road closures, and emergency conditions during events.

Overall, dam failure impacts would likely be rare and limited in Wharton County, largely affecting the downstream areas during a failure event. Roads closed due to dam failure floods could result in transportation disruptions due to the limited number of roads in the county.

| TABLE 9-4. WHARTON COUNTY AND PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES DAM EXTENTS | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Dam Name | Community | Dam Height (feet) | Max Discharge (cubic feet/second) | Max Storage (acre feet) |
| CARLSON FRANCIS RESERVOIRS | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 7 | NA | 209 |
| E S ROTHROCK TRUST LAKE NO 1 DAM | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 24 | 244 | 340 |
| EG GOFF DAM | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 9 | NA | 63 |
| HUTCHINS LAKE DAM | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 9 | NA | 108 |
| NEWGULF LAKE LEVEE | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 18 | 3,701 | 20,609 |
| NEWGULF OFF-CHANNEL RESERVOIR LEVEE | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 18 | 1,498 | 2,596 |
| RESERVOIR NO 4 DAM | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 7 | NA | 210 |
| RICHARDS NO 2 LEVEE | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 8 | 160 | 194 |
| LANE CITY DIVERSION DAM | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 36 | NA | 305 |
| ROCKIN RANCH LAKE DAM | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 6 | NA | 50 |
| TEXAS GULF INC RESERVOIR DAM | Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 10 | NA | 2,875 |
| Dams Located Outside Planning Area | | | | |
| TOM MILLER DAM** | City of Austin | 85 | 1,517,697 | 115,404 |
| CEDAR CREEK DAM** | Fayette County Unincorporated Area | 102 | 1,152 | 88,628 |
| Notes: *No Dams within participating community's city limits **Major Dams upstream of participating Communities Dam data provided by the National Inventory of Dams (NID) in 2018 | | | | |

9.5.1 Population

Exposed populations are all populations downstream from dam failures or behind levees that are incapable of escaping the area within the allowable time frame. This population includes the elderly and young who may be unable to get themselves out of the inundation area. The vulnerable population also

includes those who would not have an adequate warning from a television or radio emergency warning systems. Table 9-5 lists the exposed structures and population for the participating communities based on the estimated inundation areas. While some communities have a population that may be affected by an event, due to the lack of previous events, local knowledge and no high hazard dams in the area, the overall probability of occurrence is minimal and therefore classified as ‘No Exposure’.

9.5.2 Property

According to HAZUS-MH data analysis, within the participating communities in the HMP update area, there are an estimated 1,122 buildings (residential, commercial, and other) within the possible risk area. Other types of buildings in this report include agricultural, educational, religious, and governmental structures. See hazard loss tables for community-specific total assessed numbers (Table 9-7). While some communities have property that may be affected by an event, due to the lack of previous events, local knowledge and no high hazard dams in the area, the overall probability of occurrence is minimal and therefore classified as ‘No Exposure’.

| TABLE 9-5. EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION | | | | | |
|---|--------------|------------|-----------|------------------|------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of El Campo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of Wharton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 1,050 | 38 | 34 | 1,122 | 2,462 |
| Wharton County Total | 1,050 | 38 | 34 | 1,122 | 2,462 |
| Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications. | | | | | |

9.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Any critical facilities or infrastructure that are located within the dam inundation area are exposed to risk from the hazard. Dam or levee failure can result in serious structural damage to critical facilities and infrastructure, in particular roads, bridges, underground utilities, and pipelines.

9.5.4 Environment

Reservoirs held behind dams affect many ecological aspects of a river. River topography and dynamics depend on a wide range of flows, but rivers below dams often experience long periods of very stable flow conditions or saw-tooth flow patterns caused by releases followed by no releases. Water releases from dams usually contain very little suspended sediment; this can lead to scouring of river beds and banks.

The environment would be vulnerable to a number of risks in the event of dam failure. The inundation could introduce many foreign elements into local waterways. This could result in the destruction of downstream habitat and could have detrimental effects on many species of animals.

9.6 EXPOSURE

Dam failure inundation mapping for the planning area was not available to allow HAZUS-MH loss estimations to be modeled. Due to this data deficiency, for both levees and dams, annualized losses were estimated using GIS-based analysis, historical data analysis, and statistical risk assessment methodology. Event frequency, severity indicators, expert opinions, and historical local knowledge of the region were used for this assessment. Overall, dam failure impacts would likely be rare and limited in Wharton County and the participating communities, with 10 to 25% of the planning area affected during a failure event. While parts of the county could be affected, the likelihood of this occurring (based on historical events, and local knowledge) is minimal. Roads closed due to dam failure floods could result in transportation disruptions due to the limited number of roads in the rural areas of the HMP update area.

After profiling and analyzing the dam and levee information (including general background, historical occurrences, extent, exposure, and vulnerability), the risk analysis was discussed and among the participating members. Through these discussions and analysis, it was decided that while some communities have property and population that may be affected by an event due to the local knowledge, lack of previous events, no high hazard dams in the immediate or upstream area, no certified levees affected by 100-year floodplain requirements, and the overall probability of a minimal occurrence, all participating communities classified their respective jurisdictions as ‘No Exposure’.

9.6.1 Population

The risk of injury or fatalities as a result of this hazard is limited but possible. The most vulnerable demographics will be the economically disadvantaged population areas, children under 16 years of age, and the elderly. See Table 9-6 for vulnerable populations per participating community in the inundation area.

| TABLE 9-6. VULNERABLE POPULATION | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Youth Population (< 16) | % of Total Population | Elderly Population (> 65) | % of Total Population | Economically Disadvantage (Income $< \$20,000$) | % of Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of El Campo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of Wharton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton County Unincorporated Area | 676 | 27.46 | 333 | 13.53 | 192 | 7.80 |
| Wharton County Total | 676 | 27.46 | 333 | 13.53 | 192 | 7.80 |

9.6.2 Property

All downstream properties in the inundation area are equally at risk from a dam breach, but properties in poor condition or in particularly vulnerable locations (economically disadvantaged communities and areas nearest to the dam breach) may risk the most damage.

Loss estimations for dam hazards are not based on HAZUS-MH modeled damage functions, because detailed dam inundation mapping from hydrology and hydraulic modeling was unavailable. Annualized losses were estimated using GIS-based analysis, historical data analysis, and statistical risk assessment methodology. Event frequency, severity indicators, expert opinions, and historical local knowledge of the region were used for this assessment. Table 9-7 lists the property loss estimates for each participating community given exposed building value (excluding content). Annualized losses of ‘negligible’ are less than \$50 annually. Negligible loss hazards are still included despite minimal annualized losses because of the potential for a high-value damaging event.

| TABLE 9-7. LOSS ESTIMATES FOR DAM EVENT | | | |
|--|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value | Annualized Loss | Annualized Loss Percentage |
| City of East Bernard | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of El Campo | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of Wharton | \$0 | Negligible | 0 |
| Unincorporated Area | \$250,341,000 | Negligible | <0.01 |
| Wharton County Total | \$251,041,000 | Negligible | <0.01 |

Vulnerability Narrative

The entire participating communities are equally at risk of a dam/levee breach. Communities with dams inside as well as upstream of their jurisdictions are the most vulnerable. Table 9-6 lists the vulnerable population per community. Table 9-7 lists the estimated annualized losses in dollars for each participating community. The previous tables list the minimally exposed structures to an unlikely event. Based on previous occurrences (0), local knowledge and no high hazard dams in the area, the overall probability of occurrence is minimal and therefore classified as ‘No Exposure’.

- **City of East Bernard** - The City of East Bernard does not have any documented dams or levees within the city limits. With no known significant or high hazard dams upstream of the City, no known previous events, and local knowledge, the City of East Bernard is classified as ‘No Exposure’.
- **City of El Campo** - The City of El Campo does not have any documented dams or levees within the city limits. With no known significant or high hazard dams upstream of the City, no known previous events, and local knowledge, the City of El Campo is classified as ‘No Exposure’.
- **City of Wharton** – The City of Wharton does not have any documented dams or levees within the city limits. With no known significant or high hazard dams upstream of the City, no known previous events, and local knowledge, the City of Wharton is classified as ‘No Exposure’. It should be noted

that there is planned construction of a levee which could affect the city of Wharton in the future. For the purpose of this hazard mitigation plan, the impacts of the proposed levee have not been evaluated.

- **Wharton County (Unincorporated Area)** – Wharton County Unincorporated Areas do not have any high or significant hazard dams within the County. While an upstream event may affect the county, the extremely minimal chance occurrence (as based on previous events, local knowledge, and dam hazard classification), the community can be described as ‘No Exposure’. With no known previous events and local knowledge, Wharton County Unincorporated Areas are classified as ‘No Exposure’.

Community Perception of Vulnerability

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this plan update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

9.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

Land use in the planning area will be directed by general plans. The safety elements of the general plans establish standards and plans for the protection of the community from hazards. Dam or levee failure is not typically addressed as a standalone hazard in the safety elements, but flooding is. The planning partners have established plans and policies regarding sound land use in identified flood hazard areas. Most of the areas vulnerable to the more severe impacts from dam failure are likely to intersect the mapped flood hazard areas. Flood-related policies in the general plans will help to reduce the risk associated with the dam failure hazard for all future development in the planning area.

9.8 SCENARIO

An earthquake in the region (although rare) could lead to liquefaction of soils around a dam or levee. This could occur without warning during any time of the day. A human-caused failure such as a terrorist attack also could trigger a catastrophic failure of a dam or levee that impacts the planning area. While the probability of dam or levee failure is very low, the probability of flooding associated with changes to dam operational parameters in response to climate change is higher. Dam and levee designs and operations are developed based on hydrographs with historical records. If these hydrographs experience significant changes over time due to the impacts of climate change, the design and operations may no longer be valid for the changed condition. This could have significant impacts on dams and levees that provide flood control. Specified release rates and impound thresholds may have to be changed. This would result in increased discharges downstream of these facilities, thus increasing the probability and severity of flooding.

9.9 ISSUES

The most significant issue associated with dam and levee failure involves the properties and populations in the inundation zones. Flooding as a result of a dam failure would significantly impact these areas. There is often limited warning time for dam failure. These events are frequently associated with other natural hazard events such as earthquakes, landslides, or severe weather, which limits their predictability and compounds the hazard. Important issues associated with dam failure hazards include the following:

- Federally regulated dams have an adequate level of oversight and sophistication in the development of emergency action plans for public notification in the unlikely event of failure. However, the

protocol for notification of downstream citizens of imminent failure needs to be tied to local emergency response planning.

- Mapping for federally regulated dams is already required and available; however, mapping for non-federally regulated dams that estimates inundation depths is needed to better assess the risk associated with dam failure from these facilities.
- Most dam failure mapping required at federal levels requires determination of the PMF. While the PMF represents a worst-case scenario, it is generally the event with the lowest probability of occurrence. For non-federally regulated dams, mapping of dam failure scenarios that are less extreme than the PMF but have a higher probability of occurrence can be valuable to emergency managers and community officials downstream of these facilities. This type of mapping can illustrate areas potentially impacted by more frequent events to support emergency response and preparedness.
- The concept of residual risk associated with structural flood control projects should be considered in the design of capital projects and the application of land use regulations.
- Security concerns should be addressed and the need to inform the public of the risk associated with dam failure is a challenge for public officials.
- The county should maintain accreditation of the levees in Wharton County.

Chapter 10.

DROUGHT AND EXTREME HEAT

| DROUGHT AND EXTREME HEAT RANKING | | |
|----------------------------------|---------|--------------|
| Jurisdiction | Drought | Extreme Heat |
| Wharton County | High | High |
| City of East Bernard | Medium | High |
| City of El Campo | Medium | High |
| City of Wharton | Low | Medium |

| DEFINITIONS | |
|---------------------|---|
| Drought | The cumulative impacts of several dry years on water users. It can include deficiencies in surface and subsurface water supplies and generally impacts health, well-being, and quality of life. |
| Extreme Heat | Summertime weather that is substantially hotter or more humid than average for a location at that time of year. |

10.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

10.1.1 Drought

Drought is a normal phase in the climatic cycle of most geographical areas. According to the National Drought Mitigation Center, drought originates from a deficiency of precipitation over an extended period, usually a season or more. This results in a water shortage for some activity, group, or environmental sector. Drought is the result of a significant decrease in water supply relative to what is “normal” in a given location. Unlike most disasters, droughts normally occur slowly but last a long time. There are four generally accepted operational definitions of drought (Wilhite and Glantz 1985):

- **Meteorological drought** is an expression of precipitation’s departure from normal over some period of time. Meteorological measurements are the first indicators of drought. Definitions are usually region-specific and based on an understanding of regional climatology. A definition of drought developed in one part of the world may not apply to another, given the wide range of meteorological definitions.
- **Agricultural drought** occurs when there is not enough soil moisture to meet the needs of a particular crop at a particular time. Agricultural drought happens after a meteorological drought but before a hydrological drought. Agriculture is usually the first economic sector to be affected by drought.
- **Hydrological drought** refers to deficiencies in surface and subsurface water supplies. It is measured as streamflow and as lake, reservoir, and groundwater levels. There is a time lag between the lack of rain and the volume of water in streams, rivers, lakes, and reservoirs, so hydrological measurements are not the earliest indicators of drought. After precipitation has been reduced or deficient over an extended period of time, this shortage is reflected in declining surface and subsurface water levels.

Water supply is controlled not only by precipitation, but also by other factors, including evaporation (which is increased by higher-than-normal heat and winds), transpiration (the use of water by plants), and human use.


- **Socioeconomic drought** occurs when a physical water shortage starts to affect people, individually and collectively. Most socioeconomic definitions of drought associate it with the supply and demand of an economic good.

Defining when drought begins is a function of the impacts of drought on water users, and includes consideration of the supplies available to local water users as well as the stored water they may have available in surface reservoirs or groundwater basins. Different local water agencies have different criteria for defining drought conditions in their jurisdictions. Some agencies issue drought watch or drought warning announcements to their customers. Determinations of regional or statewide drought conditions are usually based on a combination of hydrologic and water supply factors.

10.1.2 Extreme Heat

Excessive heat events are defined by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as “summertime weather that is substantially hotter or more humid than average for a location at that time of year” (EPA 2016). Criteria that define an excessive heat event may differ among jurisdictions and in the same jurisdiction depending on the time of year. Excessive heat events are often a result of more than just ambient air temperature. Heat index tables, such as that defined by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in Figure 10-1, are commonly used to provide information about how hot it feels, which is based on the interactions between several meteorological conditions. Since heat index values were devised for shady, light wind conditions, exposure to full sunshine can increase heat index values by up to 15 degrees Fahrenheit (°F). Also, strong winds, particularly with very hot, dry air, can be extremely hazardous.

Figure 10-1. Heat Index Table



Note: From NOAA National Weather Service

10.2 HAZARD PROFILE

Droughts originate from a deficiency of precipitation resulting from an unusual weather pattern. If the weather pattern lasts a short time (a few weeks or a couple of months), the drought is considered short-term. If the weather pattern becomes entrenched and the precipitation deficits last for several months or years, the drought is considered to be long-term. It is possible for a region to experience a long-term circulation pattern that produces drought, and to have short-term changes in this long-term pattern that result in short-term wet spells. Likewise, a long-term wet circulation pattern can be interrupted by short-term weather spells that result in short-term drought.

Precipitation into the area lakes and dams is the main source of Texas' water supply. Precipitation is the only naturally reoccurring/renewable water supply for Wharton County. Annual precipitation in the populated areas of the planning area is approximately 40 to 48 inches per year. Various streams and

tributaries are contributing to the water supply in the area. This supply is stored in four forms throughout the state: streamflow, reservoir water, soil moisture, and groundwater.

The summer months in Texas are frequently affected by severe heat hazards. Persistent domes of high pressure establish themselves, which set up hot and dry conditions. This high pressure prevents other weather features such as cool fronts or rain events from moving into the area and providing necessary relief. Daily high temperatures range into the upper 90s and low 100s. When combined with moderate to high relative humidity levels, the heat index moves into dangerous levels. A heat index of 105°F is considered the level where many people begin to experience extreme discomfort or physical distress.

10.2.1 Past Events

Drought

Texas officially experienced the driest nine-month period in the state's history between October 2010 and June 2011 according to the National Weather Service (NWS) in Fort Worth. This beat the previous record of June 1917 to February 1918. The substantial dry period has led to widespread extreme to exceptional drought conditions throughout the state. The 2010-2011 drought neared record levels, ranking as the third-worst in Texas history. The worst of the 2010-2011 drought was found in central and western Texas where precipitation deficits during the 10 months exceeded 20 inches in some areas.

Based on previous occurrences, drought conditions in South Texas counties, such as Wharton County (and participating communities), are usually limited, typically with periods of dryness and moderate drought. These drought conditions are shown as D0 to D2 drought intensity in Figure 10-2 and Figure 10-3. These figures show the severity of drought conditions in Texas in spring 2012 and spring 2015. During March 2015, portions of Wharton County (and participating communities) were still experiencing D0 drought conditions. However, the drought conditions changed in May 2015 with heavy spring rains falling over the Texas region. According to the Office of the State Climatologist at Texas A&M University Texas received a statewide average of 8.81 inches of rain in May 2015, exceeding the previous record wet month of June 2004 during which a statewide average of 6.66 inches of rain fell. The Texas region received more rain in the first 5 months of 2015 than in all of 2011.

Figure 10-4 shows the drought conditions for June 2015. This was the first time in 3 years that none of the state fell within the U.S. Drought Monitor's most severe classification. Almost all of Wharton County (and participating communities) no longer experienced drought and area reservoirs were 100% full or experienced large capacity gains during the spring and early summer of 2015.

Figure 10-5 shows the state's current drought conditions for March 2020. This was the first time in 6 years that Wharton County experienced a level D3 extreme drought. Figure 10-6 shows the state's current drought conditions as of April 2021. Wharton County has shown abnormally dry to moderate drought conditions since the previous year.

The National Drought Mitigation Center developed the Drought Impact Reporter in response to the need for a national drought impact database for the United States. Information comes from a variety of sources such as online drought-related news stories and scientific publications, members of the public who visit the website and submit a drought-related impact for their region, members of the media, and members of relevant government agencies. The database is being populated beginning with the most recent impacts and working backward in time. Since drought impacts affect large areas across multiple counties, the impacts affect Wharton County and participating communities equally.

Figure 10-2. U.S. Drought Monitor, March 27, 2012




Figure 10-3. U.S. Drought Monitor, March 17, 2015




Figure 10-4. U.S. Drought Monitor, June 16, 2015




Figure 10-5. U.S. Drought Monitor, March 17, 2020





Figure 10-6. U.S. Drought Monitor, April 6, 2021



The Drought Impact Reporter

The Drought Impact Reporter contains information on impacts from droughts that affected Wharton County and participating communities between January 2005 and April 2021. Most of the impacts were classified as “agriculture” (1,505). Other impacts include “society and public health” (241), “fire” (912), “tourism and recreation” (89), “water supply and quality” (901), “energy” (18), “business and industry” (62), “plants and wildlife” (894), and “relief, response, and restrictions” (699). These categories are described as follows:

- **Agriculture** – Drought effects associated with agriculture, farming, aquaculture, horticulture, forestry, or ranching. Examples of drought-induced agricultural impacts include damage to crop quality; income loss for farmers due to reduced crop yields; reduced productivity of cropland; insect infestation; plant disease; increased irrigation costs; cost of new or supplemental water resource development (wells, dams, pipelines) for agriculture; reduced productivity of rangeland; forced reduction of foundation stock; closure/limitation of public lands to grazing; high cost or unavailability of water for livestock, Christmas tree farms, forestry, raising domesticated horses, bees, fish, shellfish, or horticulture.
- **Society and Public Health** – Drought effects associated with human, public, and social health include health-related problems related to reduced water quantity or quality, such as increased concentration of contaminants; loss of human life (e.g., from heat stress, suicide); increased respiratory ailments; increased disease caused by wildlife concentrations; increased human disease caused by changes in insect carrier populations; population migration (rural to urban areas, migrants into the United States); loss of aesthetic values; change in daily activities (non-recreational, like putting a bucket in the shower to catch water); elevated stress levels; meetings to discuss drought; communities creating drought plans; lawmakers altering penalties for violation of water restrictions; demand for higher water rates; cultural/historical discoveries from low water levels; cancellation of fundraising events; cancellation/alteration of festivals or holiday traditions; stockpiling water; public service announcements and drought information websites; protests; and conflicts within the community due to competition for water.
- **Fire** – Drought often contributes to the forest, range, rural, or urban fires, fire danger, and burning restrictions. Specific impacts include enacting or increasing burning restrictions; fireworks bans; increased fire risk; occurrence of fire (number of acres burned, number of wildfires compared to average, people displaced, etc.); state of emergency during periods of high fire danger; closure of roads or land due to fire occurrence or risk; and expenses to state and county governments of paying firefighters overtime and paying equipment (helicopter) costs.
- **Tourism and Recreation** – Drought effects associated with recreational activities and tourism include the closure of state hiking trails and hunting areas due to fire danger; water access or navigation problems for recreation; bans on recreational activities; reduced license, permit, or ticket sales (e.g., hunting, fishing, ski lifts, etc.); losses related to curtailed activities (e.g., bird watching, hunting and fishing, boating, etc.); reduced park visitation; and cancellation or postponement of sporting events.
- **Water Supply and Quality** – Drought effects associated with a water supply and water quality include dry wells; voluntary and mandatory water restrictions; changes in water rates; increasing water restrictions; increases in requests for new well permits; changes in water use due to water restrictions; greater water demand; decreases in water allocation or allotments; installation or alteration of water pumps or water intakes; changes to allowable water contaminants; water line

damage or repairs due to drought stress; drinking water turbidity; change in water color or odor; declaration of drought watches or warnings; and mitigation activities.

- **Energy** – Drought effects on power production, rates, and revenue include production changes for both hydropower and non-hydropower providers; changes in electricity rates; revenue shortfalls and/or windfall profits; and purchase of electricity when hydropower generation is down.
- **Business and Industry** – Drought effects on non-agriculture and non-tourism businesses, such as lawn care; recreational vehicles or gear dealers; and plant nurseries. Typical impacts include reduction or loss of demand for goods or services; reduction in employment; variation in the number of calls for service; late opening or early closure for the season; bankruptcy; permanent store closure; and other economic impacts.
- **Plants and Wildlife** – Drought effects associated with unmanaged plants and wildlife, both aquatic and terrestrial, include loss of biodiversity of plants or wildlife; loss of trees from rural or urban landscapes, shelterbelts, or wooded conservation areas; reduction and degradation of fish and wildlife habitat; lack of feed and drinking water; greater mortality due to increased contact with agricultural producers as animals seek food from farms and producers are less tolerant of the intrusion; disease; increased vulnerability to predation (from species concentrated near water); migration and concentration (loss of wildlife in some areas and too much wildlife in others); increased stress on endangered species; salinity levels affecting wildlife; wildlife encroaching into urban areas; and loss of wetlands.
- **Relief, Response, and Restrictions** – Drought effects associated with disaster declarations, aid programs, requests for disaster declaration or aid, water restrictions, or fire restrictions. Examples include disaster declarations; aid programs; USDA Secretarial disaster declarations; Small Business Association disaster declarations; government relief and response programs; state-level water shortage or water emergency declarations; county-level declarations; a declared “state of emergency;” requests for declarations or aid; non-profit organization-based relief; water restrictions; fire restrictions; NWS Red Flag warnings; and declaration of drought watches or warnings.

Extreme Heat

According to a 2016 EPA study, a total of more than 9,000 Americans suffered heat-related deaths between 1979 and 2010. The 2012 Natural Resource Defense Council study of 40 major U.S. cities showed that the historic average mortality per summer was 1,332 between 1975 and 2004. This reveals that annually more people in the U.S. die from severe summer heat than from hurricanes, lightning, tornadoes, floods, and earthquakes combined.

According to the National Climatic Data Center (NCDC), a strong heatwave affected Texas in the summers of 1999, 2000, and 2011. During these heatwaves, multiple counties suffered in terms of injuries and deaths, mostly to the elderly. During these periods, some Texas counties also experienced extreme heat events. Table 10-1 contains temperature summaries related to extreme heat for Wharton County recorded by NOAA weather stations. NOAA weather station climate data consists of information collected from May 1904 to September 2011 by Pierce 1 E (USC00417020) weather station augmented with data from October 2011 to March 2021 from El Campo (USC00412786) weather station. These temperatures are experienced throughout the entire planning area (City of East Bernard, City of El Campo, City of Wharton, and Wharton County Unincorporated Areas).

**TABLE 10-1.
MAXIMUM TEMPERATURE DATA SUMMARIES**

| Statistic | Years | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
|--|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Highest Recorded Maximum | 1904-2021 | 85 | 95 | 97 | 99 | 100 | 105 | 107 | 108 | 112 | 100 | 94 | 93 |
| Highest Recorded Minimum | 1904-2021 | 73 | 72 | 76 | 79 | 82 | 85 | 87 | 88 | 81 | 80 | 75 | 75 |
| Average Maximum | 1904-2021 | 63.7 | 66.9 | 73.3 | 79.7 | 85.6 | 90.9 | 93.3 | 94.3 | 90.0 | 83.5 | 73.5 | 65.7 |
| Average Days with a Maximum Above 90 | 1904-2021 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 6.4 | 21.5 | 26.8 | 27.4 | 18.6 | 6.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Notes: Temperatures are in degrees Fahrenheit From NOAA Weather Station Climate Data (May 1904 – March 2021) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

10.2.2 Location

Drought

The NOAA has developed several indices to measure drought impacts and severity and to map their extent and locations:

- The Palmer Crop Moisture Index measures short-term (up to 4 weeks) and is used to quantify drought's impacts on agriculture during the growing season. The index can vary significantly from week to week and indicates normal conditions at the beginning and end of the growing season. Figure 10-7 shows this index for the week ending on April 17, 2021.
- The Palmer Z Index measures short-term drought on a monthly scale. Figure 10-8 shows this index for March 2021.
- The Palmer Drought Index (PDI) measures the duration and intensity of long-term drought-inducing circulation patterns. Long-term drought is cumulative, so the intensity of drought during a given month is dependent on the current weather patterns plus the cumulative patterns of previous months. Weather patterns can change quickly from a long-term drought pattern to a long-term wet pattern, and the PDI can respond fairly rapidly. Figure 10-9 and Figure 10-10 show this index for March 2014 and May 2015 to show the change in PDI after the May 2015 rain. Figure 10-11 shows the most current index of March 2021.
- The hydrological impacts of drought (e.g., reservoir levels, groundwater levels, etc.) take longer to develop and it takes longer to recover from them. The Palmer Hydrological Drought Index (PHDI), another long-term index, was developed to quantify hydrological effects. The PHDI responds more slowly to changing conditions than the PDI. Figure 10-12 shows this index for March 2021.
- While the Palmer indices consider precipitation, evapotranspiration, and runoff, the Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) considers only precipitation. In the SPI, an index of zero indicates the median precipitation amount; the index is negative for drought and positive for wet conditions. The SPI is computed for time scales ranging from 1 month to 24 months. Figure 10-13 shows the 24-month SPI map from April 2019 through March 2021.

Figure 10-7. Crop Moisture Index (Week Ending April 17, 2021)




Figure 10-8. Palmer Z Index Short-Term Drought Conditions (March 2021)




Figure 10-9. Palmer Drought Index (March 2014)




Figure 10-10. Palmer Drought Index (May 2015)




Figure 10-11. Palmer Drought Index (March 2021)




Figure 10-12. Palmer Hydrological Drought Index Long-Term Hydrologic Conditions (March 2021)





Figure 10-13. 24-Month Standardized Precipitation Index (through March 2021)



Because of Texas's humid sub-tropical to semi-arid conditions, drought is a regular but unpredictable occurrence in the state. However, because of natural variations in climate and precipitation sources, it is rare for all of Texas to be deficient in moisture at the same time. Single-season droughts over some portions of the state are quite common. From 1950 to 1957, Texas experienced the most severe drought in recorded history. By the time the drought ended, 244 of Texas' 254 counties had been declared federal disaster areas. In 2011, Texas experienced its most intense single-year drought in recorded history.

Droughts occur regularly in South Texas and are a normal condition. However, they can vary greatly in their intensity and duration. The entire HMP update area is at risk to drought conditions. Drought is one of the few hazards that has the potential to directly or indirectly impact every person in the participating communities as well as adversely affect the local economy. A total of 9 drought events occurred within 50 miles of Wharton County from 1950 to 2010. Table 10-2 lists notable past drought events for Wharton County and the participating communities in this HMP update.

| TABLE 10-2. | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| HISTORIC DROUGHT EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY (1996-2021) | | | | |
| Date | Estimated Damage Cost | | | |
| | Property | Crops | Injuries | Deaths |
| April 1996 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| May 1996 | \$20,000,000 | \$40,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| June 1996 | \$20,000,000 | \$40,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| May 1998 | \$20,000,000 | \$40,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| June 1998 | \$20,000,000 | \$40,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| July 1998 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| August 1998 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| August 2000 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| September 2000 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| August 2011 | No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data |

Extreme Heat

The entire planning area is at risk to extreme heat events; however, these events may be exacerbated in urban areas, where reduced airflow, reduced vegetation, and increased generation of waste heat can contribute to temperatures that are several degrees higher than in surrounding rural (Wharton County Unincorporated Areas) or less urbanized areas. This phenomenon is known as the urban heat island effect. This can happen in the City of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton.

The record highs for Texas occur from May through October. The Wharton County (and participating communities) area experiences an average of four days with temperatures 100°F and above during these months, according to data recorded by the NWS between 2000 and 2014. During 2011, Texas experienced the hottest summer in U.S. history with an average temperature of 86.8°F. The planning area experienced more than 40 days with temperatures 100°F and above in 2011. Figure 6-3 shows the annual average maximum temperature distribution in Texas.

Even though the NCDC storm events database doesn't list any documented specific past events for extreme heat, the local participating communities in this HMP update report that extreme heat days do occur a few days in the year during the summer months.

10.2.3 Frequency

Drought

The probability of future drought in Wharton and participating communities is likely, with an event possible in the next 8 years or less. According to information from the NCDC, Wharton County had 3 documented drought years between 1996 and 2021. Based on this historical information, the probability of a drought occurring in any given year is 12% (About 1 in 8 years). The same frequency (1 in 8 years) applies to the future probability. The level of probability for the entire community is therefore classified as "High"

Short-duration droughts occur much more frequently. Various studies indicate that drought occurrence in Texas is expected to increase in frequency and will continue to be an inevitable factor in the climate of Texas. Table 10-2 lists historic drought events. Furthermore, since drought affects a large area (more regional than city-specific) historical analyses are applied to all participating communities equally.

Extreme Heat

On average, Wharton County and participating communities have experienced an average of 108.3 days per year where temperatures exceed 90°F so the frequency of extreme heat events is expected to be very likely in any given year (per NOAA weather station data). This level of heat is considered an extreme danger for the area due to the moderate to high humidity levels combined with 90°F dry bulb temperature resulting in a heat index above 105. Wharton County and participating communities can expect similar numbers in the future (108.3 days per year and highly likely). With this frequency, the probability for extreme heat is classified as "High".

10.2.4 Severity

Drought

Drought impacts are wide-reaching and may be economic, environmental, or societal. The most significant impacts associated with drought in Texas are those related to water-intensive activities such as agriculture, wildfire protection, municipal usage, commerce, tourism, recreation, and wildlife preservation. An ongoing drought may leave an area more prone to wildfires. Drought conditions can also cause soil to compact, increasing an area's susceptibility to flooding, and reduce vegetation cover, which exposes soil to wind and erosion. A reduction of electric power generation and water quality deterioration are also potential problems. Drought impacts increase with the length of a drought, as carry-over supplies in reservoirs are depleted and water levels in streams and groundwater decline.

According to the information in this hazard profile, drought impacts on Wharton County could be considered moderate. Moderate drought typically means less than 25% to 50% of the property (mainly agricultural) is severely damaged; injuries/illnesses are treatable or do not result in permanent disability; crop fields become withered; cattle herds are thinned; and for coastal communities, fishermen net light loads. Due to the low probability of severe drought, the overall significance is considered moderate with significant potential impact. Drought can have a widespread impact on the environment and the economy, depending upon its severity, although it typically does not result in loss of life or damage to property, as

do other natural disasters. The National Drought Mitigation Center uses three categories to describe likely drought impacts:

- **Agricultural** – Drought threatens crops that rely on natural precipitation.
- **Water supply** – Drought threatens supplies of water for irrigated crops and for communities.
- **Fire hazard** – Drought increases the threat of wildfires from dry conditions in forests and rangelands.

On average, the nationwide annual impacts of drought are greater than the impacts of any other natural hazard. They are estimated to be between \$6 billion and \$8 billion annually in the United States and occur primarily in the agriculture, transportation, recreation and tourism, forestry, and energy sectors. Social and environmental impacts are also significant, although it is difficult to put a precise cost on these impacts.

The severity of a drought depends on the degree of moisture deficiency, the duration, and the size and location of the affected area. The longer the duration of the drought and the larger the area impacted, the more severe the potential impacts. Droughts are not usually associated with direct impacts on people or property, but they can have significant impacts on agriculture, which can impact people indirectly.

When measuring the severity of droughts, analysts typically look at economic impacts on a planning area. A drought directly or indirectly impacts all people in the affected areas. All people could pay more for water if utilities increase their rates due to shortages. Agricultural impacts can result in loss of work for farm workers and those in related food processing jobs. Other water- or electricity-dependent industries are commonly forced to shut down all or a portion of their facilities, resulting in further layoffs. A drought can harm recreational companies that use water (e.g., swimming pools, water parks, and river rafting companies) as well as landscape and nursery businesses because people will not invest in new plants if water is not available to sustain them.

Drought generally does not affect groundwater sources as quickly as surface water supplies, but groundwater supplies generally take longer to recover. Reduced precipitation during a drought means that groundwater supplies are not replenished at a normal rate. This can lead to a reduction in groundwater levels and problems such as reduced pumping capacity or wells going dry. Shallow wells are more susceptible than deep wells. Reduced replenishment of groundwater affects streams. Much of the flow in streams comes from groundwater, especially during the summer when there is less precipitation and after snowmelt ends. Reduced groundwater levels mean that even less water will enter streams when stream flows are lowest.

Additionally, there is an increased danger of wildfires associated with most droughts. Millions of board feet of timber have been lost due to drought, and in many cases, erosion has occurred, which caused serious damage to aquatic life, irrigation, and power production by heavy silting of streams, reservoirs, and rivers.

Extreme Heat

Drought also is often accompanied by extreme heat. When temperatures reach 90°F and above, people are vulnerable to heat cramps, heat exhaustion, and heatstroke. Pets and livestock are also vulnerable to heat-related injuries. Crops can be vulnerable as well.

Based on the information in this hazard profile, the magnitude/severity of extreme temperatures is considered moderate. This is defined as less than 25% to 50% of the property (mainly agricultural) is severely damaged, or injuries/illnesses are treatable or do not result in permanent disability. Due to the

expansive nature of soils in this area, extreme heat could pose foundation issues. Overall significance is considered minimal: moderate potential impact.

10.2.5 Warning Time

Drought

Droughts are climatic patterns that occur over long periods of time. Only generalized warnings can take place due to the numerous variables that scientists have not pieced together well enough to make accurate and precise predictions. Empirical studies conducted over the past century have shown that meteorological drought is never the result of a single cause. It is the result of many causes.

Scientists at this time do not know how to predict drought more than a month in advance for most locations. Predicting drought depends on the ability to forecast precipitation and temperature. Anomalies of precipitation and temperature may last from several months to several decades. How long these anomalies last depend on interactions between the atmosphere and the oceans, soil moisture and land surface processes, topography, internal dynamics, and the accumulated influence of weather systems on the global scale.

Texas is semi-arid to humid sub-tropical; thus, drought is a regular and natural occurrence in the state. The main source of water supply in the state is precipitation and much of this occurs in the spring and fall. Although drought conditions are difficult to predict, low levels of spring precipitation may act as an indicator that drought conditions are occurring.

Extreme Heat

NOAA issues watch, warning, and advisory information for extreme heat. Extreme heat is a regular and natural occurrence in the state.

10.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Drought

The secondary hazard most commonly associated with drought is wildfire. A prolonged lack of precipitation dries out vegetation, which becomes increasingly susceptible to ignition as the duration of the drought extends. According to the State of Texas 2014 Emergency Management Plan (updated 2016) (Drought Annex), economic impacts may also occur for industries that are water-intensive such as agriculture, wildfire protection, municipal usage, commerce, tourism, recreation, and wildfire preservation. Additionally, a reduction of electric power generation and water quality deterioration are also potential effects. Drought conditions can also cause soil to compact, decreasing its ability to absorb water, making an area more susceptible to flash flooding and erosion. Drought may also increase the speed at which dead and fallen trees dry out and become more potent fuel sources for wildfires. Drought may also weaken trees in areas already affected by insect infestations, causing more extensive damage to trees and increasing wildfire risk, at least temporarily. An ongoing drought that severely inhibits natural plant growth cycles may impact critical wildlife habitats. Drought impacts increase with the length of a drought, as carry-over supplies in reservoirs are depleted and water levels in groundwater basins decline.

Extreme Heat

Excessive heat events can cause the failure of motorized systems such as ventilation systems used to control temperatures inside buildings. The lack of air conditioning in businesses and homes can exacerbate existing health conditions, particularly in senior citizens.

10.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

The long-term effects of climate change on regional water resources are unknown, but global water resources are already experiencing the following stresses without climate change:

- Growing populations
- Increased competition for available water
- Poor water quality
- Environmental claims
- Uncertain reserved water rights
- Groundwater overdraft
- Aging urban water infrastructure

With a warmer climate, droughts could become more frequent, more severe, and longer-lasting. From 1987 to 1989, losses from drought in the U.S. totaled \$39 billion (Congressional Office of Technology Assessment 1993). More frequent extreme events such as droughts could end up being more cause for concern than the long-term change in temperature and precipitation averages.

The best advice to water resource managers regarding climate change is to start addressing current stresses on water supplies and build flexibility and robustness into any system. Flexibility helps to ensure a quick response to changing conditions, and robustness helps people prepare for and survive the worst conditions. With this approach to planning, water system managers will be better able to adapt to the impacts of climate change.

10.5 EXPOSURE


Because droughts cannot be directly modeled in HAZUS-MH, annualized losses were estimated using GIS-based analysis, historical data (frequency and damage) analysis, and statistical risk assessment methodology. Event frequency, severity indicators, expert opinions, and historical knowledge of the region were used for this assessment. The primary data source was the HAZUS-MH data inventory (updated 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), and the 2017 Census of Agriculture augmented with state and federal datasets as well as the National Drought Mitigation Center reports.

All people, property, and environments in the planning area would be exposed to some degree to the impacts of moderate to extreme drought conditions and extreme heat. Populations living in densely populated urban areas are likely to be more exposed to extreme heat events. Furthermore, farms and agriculture will be greatly impacted by drought and extreme temperatures. For drought Figure 10-14 profiles the county and participating cities' agriculture use, which could all be potentially impacted by drought. The exposure rate for the entire HMP update area is approximately \$208,540,000 based on the USDA's 2017 Census of Agriculture (See Table 10-5). This number is for the entire planning area. Even

though most farmlands are usually outside the city limits, droughts still impact local communities economically. Table 10-3 lists the structures and populations most exposed to drought and extreme heat.

| TABLE 10-3 EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 909 | 62 | 43 | 1,014 | 2,272 |
| City of El Campo | 4,465 | 352 | 200 | 5,017 | 11,602 |
| City of Wharton | 3,299 | 321 | 138 | 3,758 | 8,832 |
| Unincorporated Area | 6,799 | 210 | 181 | 7,190 | 18,574 |
| Wharton County Total | 15,472 | 945 | 562 | 16,979 | 41,280 |
| Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications. | | | | | |

Figure 10-14. USDA Census of Agriculture Wharton County Profile 2017



Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold

| | Sales (\$1,000) | Rank in State ^b | Counties Producing Item | Rank in U.S. ^b | Counties Producing Item |
|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Total | 208,540 | 22 | 254 | 486 | 3,077 |
| Crops | 179,249 | 2 | 253 | 194 | 3,073 |
| Grains, oilseeds, dry beans, dry peas | 74,447 | 3 | 232 | 543 | 2,916 |
| Tobacco | - | - | - | - | 323 |
| Cotton and cottonseed | 49,444 | 16 | 174 | 28 | 647 |
| Vegetables, melons, potatoes, sweet potatoes | 1,359 | 35 | 188 | 662 | 2,821 |
| Fruits, tree nuts, berries | 1,030 | 48 | 225 | 467 | 2,748 |
| Nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, sod | 49,275 | 4 | 155 | 62 | 2,601 |
| Cultivated Christmas trees, short rotation woody crops | - | - | 43 | - | 1,384 |
| Other crops and hay | 3,695 | 54 | 251 | 690 | 3,040 |
| Livestock, poultry, and products | 29,291 | 103 | 254 | 1,352 | 3,073 |
| Poultry and eggs | 112 | 82 | 235 | 1,021 | 3,007 |
| Cattle and calves | 23,219 | 86 | 254 | 697 | 3,055 |
| Milk from cows | (D) | 78 | 94 | (D) | 1,892 |
| Hogs and pigs | (D) | (D) | 216 | (D) | 2,856 |
| Sheep, goats, wool, mohair, milk | 34 | 172 | 247 | 1,959 | 2,984 |
| Horses, ponies, mules, burros, donkeys | 259 | 107 | 254 | 806 | 2,970 |
| Aquaculture | 5,123 | 3 | 79 | 64 | 1,251 |
| Other animals and animal products | (D) | 37 | 229 | (D) | 2,878 |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|---|--------|
| Total Producers ^c | 2,431 | Percent of farms that: | Top Crops in Acres ^d | |
| Sex | | | | |
| Male | 1,631 | Have internet access | 67 | |
| Female | 800 | | | |
| Age | | Farm organically | 1 | |
| <35 | 242 | | | |
| 35 – 64 | 1,317 | | | |
| 65 and older | 872 | | | |
| Race | | Sell directly to consumers | 1 | |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 6 | | | |
| Asian | 18 | | | |
| Black or African American | 215 | | | |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | - | | | |
| White | 2,175 | Hire farm labor | 25 | |
| More than one race | 17 | | | |
| Other characteristics | | Are family farms | 96 | |
| Hispanic, Latino, Spanish origin | 197 | | | |
| With military service | 221 | | | |
| New and beginning farmers | 730 | | | |
| | | | Livestock Inventory (Dec 31, 2017) | |
| | | | Broilers and other meat-type chickens | 627 |
| | | | Cattle and calves | 57,475 |
| | | | Goats | 436 |
| | | | Hogs and pigs | 133 |
| | | | Horses and ponies | 1,580 |
| | | | Layers | 7,670 |
| | | | Pullets | 34 |
| | | | Sheep and lambs | 700 |
| | | | Turkeys | 38 |

See 2017 Census of Agriculture, U.S. Summary and State Data, for complete footnotes, explanations, definitions, commodity descriptions, and methodology.

^a May not add to 100% due to rounding. ^b Among counties whose rank can be displayed. ^c Data collected for a maximum of four producers per farm.

^d Crop commodity names may be shortened; see full names at www.nass.usda.gov/go/cropnames.pdf. * Position below the line does not indicate rank. (D) Withheld to avoid disclosing data for individual operations. (NA) Not available. (Z) Less than half of the unit shown. (-) Represents zero.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.

10.6 VULNERABILITY

Drought produces a complex web of impacts that spans many sectors of the economy and reaches well beyond the area experiencing physical drought. This complexity exists because water is integral to the ability to produce goods and provide services. Drought can affect a wide range of economic, environmental, and social activities. The vulnerability of an activity to the effects of drought usually depends on its water demand, how the demand is met, and what water supplies are available to meet the demand. Extreme heat can exacerbate the effects of drought.

Because droughts cannot be directly modeled in HAZUS-MH, annualized losses were estimated using GIS-based analysis, historical data (frequency and damage) analysis, and statistical risk assessment methodology. Event frequency, severity indicators, expert opinions, and historical knowledge of the region were used for this assessment. The primary data source was the HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 Census Data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), and the 2017 Census of Agriculture augmented with state and federal data sets as well as the National Drought Mitigation Center reports and local knowledge.

10.6.1 Population

Drought

The planning partnership has the ability to minimize any impacts on residents and water consumers in the county and participating cities should several consecutive dry years occur. No significant life or health impacts are anticipated as a result of drought within the planning area

Extreme Heat

According to the EPA, the individuals with the following characteristics are typically at greater risk to the adverse effects of excessive heat events: individuals with physical or mobility constraints, cognitive impairments, economic constraints, and social isolation. See Table 10-4 for populations most vulnerable to extreme heat and drought per jurisdiction.

| TABLE 10-4 MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Youth Population (< 16) | % of Total Population | Elderly Population (> 65) | % of Total Population | Economically Disadvantage (Income< \$20,000) | % of Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 638 | 28.07 | 342 | 15.05 | 129 | 5.68 |
| City of El Campo | 3402 | 29.33 | 1648 | 14.21 | 992 | 8.55 |
| City of Wharton | 2317 | 26.23 | 1288 | 14.58 | 1251 | 14.17 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4,715 | 25.39 | 2,741 | 14.76 | 1,537 | 8.28 |
| Wharton County Total | 11,072 | 26.82 | 6,019 | 14.58 | 3,910 | 9.47 |

10.6.2 Property

Drought

No structures will be directly affected by drought conditions, though some structures may become vulnerable to wildfires, which are more likely following years of drought. Droughts can also have significant impacts on landscapes, structure foundation issues (because of soil expansion and contraction) which could cause a financial burden to property owners. However, these impacts are not considered critical in planning for impacts from the drought hazard.

Loss estimations for drought are not based on damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, loss estimates were developed representing projected damages (annualized loss) on historical events, statistical analysis, and probability factors. These were applied to the exposed agriculture values of participating communities to create an annualized loss (Table 10-5).

| TABLE 10-5. LOSS ESTIMATES FOR DROUGHT EVENTS | | | |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value (\$) | Annualized Loss (\$) | Annualized Loss (%) |
| Wharton County Total | 208,540,000 | 4,800,000 | 2.30 |

Extreme Heat

Typically, the only impact extreme heat has on general building stock is increased demand for air conditioning equipment, which in turn may cause strain on electrical systems. Due to the expansive nature of soils in this area, extreme heat also could pose foundation issues. It costs an average homeowner at least \$5,000 to fix or repair structure foundation issues.

Vulnerability Narrative

All participating communities are at risk to drought and extreme heat events. In addition to the documented impacts from the Drought Impact Reporter listed in Chapter 10.2.1, the participating communities also experience the following for both drought and extreme heat events:

- **City of East Bernard** - The City will be at a greater risk of rolling blackouts during an extreme heat event due to high usage. This would have a greater effect on the young, elderly, and economically disadvantaged that may not have the means to respond to such an event. Lawn watering and other outdoor water activities will have to be scheduled and rationed. Communities that have not developed or implemented a Drought Contingency Plan or Emergency Response Plan are more vulnerable to the effects of drought. Residents who are uninformed of the benefits of water conservation or how to effectively apply it are at an increased risk as well.
- **City of El Campo** - The City of El Campo will be at a greater risk of rolling blackouts during an extreme heat event due to high usage. This would have a greater effect on the young, elderly, and economically disadvantaged populations that may not have the means to respond to such an event. Uninformed residents and business owners on the effects of drought on their properties and water conservation tactics are more vulnerable. Communities that do not have Drought Contingency or Emergency Response Plans increase their risk as well.
- **City of Wharton** - The City of Wharton will be at a greater risk of rolling blackouts during an extreme heat event due to high usage. This would have a greater effect on the young, elderly, and

economically disadvantaged populations that may not have the means to respond to such an event. Due to the rural landscape of the area and dry climate, during times of drought and extreme heat events, water restrictions could be enforced. Communities that have not identified the areas and facilities of higher risk to the negative impacts of drought increase their vulnerability. Those who do not have mitigation plans in place or techniques to fund them are more at risk as well.

- **Wharton County (Unincorporated Area)** - Unincorporated county areas are at a greater risk of rolling blackouts during an extreme heat event due to high usage from other areas of the electrical grid. Due to the rural nature of some of Wharton County's Unincorporated Areas, response times restoring outages caused by a blackout could be lengthy. This would have a greater effect on the young, elderly, and economically disadvantaged. Communities not implementing wildfire mitigation measures are increasing their risk to potential negative impacts of this hazard as well. Many residents may not know of the risks extreme heat can place on themselves, their families, and homes. Those uninformed on the risks and hazards associated with drought are more vulnerable to its effects.

Community Perception of Vulnerability

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this plan update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

10.6.3 Critical Facilities

Drought

Critical facilities as defined for this plan will continue to be operational during a drought. Critical facility elements such as landscaping may not be maintained due to limited resources, but the risk to the planning area's critical facilities inventory will be largely aesthetic. For example, when water conservation measures are in place, landscaped areas will not be watered and may die. These aesthetic impacts are not considered significant.

Extreme Heat

Power outages may occur as a result of extreme heat events. Additionally, transportation systems may experience disruption in services. It is common in Texas for concrete pavements to experience "blowouts or heaves" both on local highways and the higher volume parkway and interstate systems. Blowouts occur when pavements expand and cannot function properly within their allotted spaces. Pavement sections may rise several inches during such events. These conditions can cause motor vehicle accidents in their initial stages and can shut down traffic lanes or roadways entirely until such times as the conditions are mitigated.

10.6.4 Environment

Environmental losses from drought are associated with damage to plants, animals, wildlife habitat, and air and water quality; forest and range fires; degradation of landscape quality; loss of biodiversity; and soil erosion. Some of the effects are short-term and conditions quickly return to normal following the end of the drought. Other environmental effects linger for some time or may even become permanent. Wildlife habitat, for example, may be degraded through the loss of wetlands, lakes, and vegetation. However, many species will eventually recover from this temporary aberration. The degradation of landscape quality, including increased soil erosion, may lead to a more permanent loss of biological productivity.

Although environmental losses are difficult to quantify, growing public awareness and concern for environmental quality has forced public officials to focus greater attention and resources on these effects.

10.6.5 Economic Impact

The economic impact will be largely associated with industries that use water or depend on water for their business. For example, landscaping businesses were affected in the droughts of the past as the demand for service significantly declined because landscaping was not watered. Agricultural industries will be impacted if water usage is restricted for irrigation. The tourism sector may also be impacted.

10.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

Each municipal planning partner in this effort has an established comprehensive plan or policies directing land use and dealing with issues of water supply and the protection of water resources. These plans provide the capability at the local municipal level to protect future development from the impacts of drought. All planning partners reviewed their plans under the capability assessments performed for this effort. Deficiencies identified by these reviews can be identified as mitigation initiatives to increase the capability to deal with future trends in development. Vulnerability to drought will increase as population growth increases, putting more demands on existing water supplies. Future water use planning should consider increases in population as well as potential impacts of climate change.

10.8 SCENARIO

An extreme multi-year drought could impact the region with little warning. Combinations of low precipitation and unusually high temperatures could occur over several consecutive years. Intensified by such conditions, extreme wildfires could break out throughout the planning area, increasing the need for water. Surrounding communities, also in drought conditions, could increase their demand for water supplies relied upon by the planning partnership, causing social and political conflicts. If such conditions persisted for several years, the economy of Wharton County could experience setbacks, especially in water-dependent industries.

10.9 ISSUES

The following are extreme heat and drought-related issues:

- Identification and development of alternative water supplies.
- Utilization of groundwater recharge techniques to stabilize the groundwater supply.
- The probability of increased drought frequencies and durations due to climate change.
- The promotion of active water conservation even during non-drought periods.
- Increasing vulnerability to drought over time as demand for water from different sectors increases.
- The effects of climate change may result in an increase in the frequency of extreme heat events.
- The effects of recent droughts have exposed the vulnerability of the planning area's economy to drought events.
- Environmental and erosion control impact analysis for transportation projects.
- Wildlife habitat management for landowners.

- Human health impacts from droughts and extreme heat.
- Monitoring and evaluating risks to the power supply and water rights.
- Development of mitigation- or response-based state drought plans.

Chapter 11. EARTHQUAKE

| EARTHQUAKE RANKING | |
|----------------------|-------------|
| Wharton County | No Exposure |
| City of East Bernard | No Exposure |
| City of El Campo | No Exposure |
| City of Wharton | No Exposure |

| DEFINITIONS | |
|---------------------|--|
| Earthquake | The shaking of the ground caused by an abrupt shift of rock along a fracture in the earth or a contact zone between tectonic plates. |
| Epicenter | The point on the earth's surface directly above the hypocenter of an earthquake. The location of an earthquake is commonly described by the geographic position of its epicenter and by its focal depth. |
| Fault | A fracture in the earth's crust along which two blocks of the crust have slipped with respect to each other |
| Focal Depth | The depth from the earth's surface to the hypocenter. |
| Hypocenter | The region underground where an earthquake's energy originates. |
| Liquefaction | Loosely packed, water-logged sediments losing their strength in response to strong shaking, causing major damage during earthquakes. |

11.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

11.1.1 How Earthquakes Happen

An earthquake is a sudden release of energy from the earth's crust that creates seismic waves. Tectonic plates become stuck, putting a strain on the ground. When the strain becomes so great that rocks give way, fault lines occur. At the Earth's surface, earthquakes may manifest themselves by a shaking or displacement of the ground, which may lead to loss of life and destruction of property. The size of an earthquake is expressed quantitatively as magnitude and local strength of shaking as intensity. The inherent size of an earthquake is commonly expressed using a magnitude. For a more detailed description of seismic/earthquake hazards visit FEMA's website on hazards, <http://www.fema.gov/hazard>.

Earthquakes tend to reoccur along faults, which are zones of weakness in the crust. Even if a fault zone has recently experienced an earthquake, there is no guarantee that all the stress has been relieved. Another earthquake could still occur.

Geologists classify faults by their relative hazards. Active faults, which represent the highest hazard, are those that have ruptured to the ground surface during the Holocene period (about the last 11,000 years). Potentially active faults are those that displaced layers of rock from the Quaternary period (the last 1,800,000 years). Determining if a fault is "active" or "potentially active" depends on geologic evidence,

which may not be available for every fault. Although there are probably still some unrecognized active faults, nearly all the movement between the two plates, and therefore the majority of the seismic hazards, are on the well-known active faults.

Faults are more likely to have earthquakes on them if they have more rapid rates of movement, have had recent earthquakes along them, experience greater total displacements, and are aligned so that movement can relieve accumulating tectonic stresses. A direct relationship exists between a fault's length and location and its ability to generate damaging ground motion at a given site. In some areas, smaller, local faults produce lower magnitude quakes, but ground shaking can be strong, and damage can be significant as a result of the fault's proximity to the area. In contrast, large regional faults can generate great magnitudes but, because of their distance and depth, may result in only moderate shaking in the area.

11.1.2 Earthquake Classifications

Earthquakes are typically classified in one of two ways: by the amount of energy released, measured as magnitude; or by the impact on people and structures, measured as intensity.

Magnitude

Currently, the most commonly used magnitude scale is the moment magnitude (M_w) scale, with the following classifications of magnitude:

- Great $M_w > 8$
- Major $M_w = 7.0 - 7.9$
- Strong $M_w = 6.0 - 6.9$
- Moderate $M_w = 5.0 - 5.9$
- Light $M_w = 4.0 - 4.9$
- Minor $M_w = 3.0 - 3.9$
- Micro $M_w < 3$

Estimates of moment magnitude roughly match the local magnitude scale (ML) commonly called the Richter scale. One advantage of the M_w scale is that, unlike other magnitude scales, it does not saturate at the upper end. That is, there is no value beyond which all large earthquakes have about the same magnitude. For this reason, the M_w scale is now the most often used estimate of large earthquake magnitudes.

Intensity

Currently, the most commonly used intensity scale is the modified Mercalli intensity scale, with ratings defined as follows (U.S. Geological Survey [USGS] 1989):

- I. Not felt except by a very few under especially favorable conditions.
- II. Felt only by a few persons at rest, especially on upper floors of buildings.
- III. Felt quite noticeably by persons indoors, especially on upper floors of buildings. Many people do not recognize it is an earthquake. Standing cars may rock slightly. Vibrations are similar to the passing of a truck.

- IV. Felt indoors by many, outdoors by few during the day. At night, some awakened. Dishes, windows, doors disturbed; walls make cracking sound. Sensation like a heavy truck striking building. Standing cars rocked noticeably.
- V. Felt by nearly everyone; many awakened. Some dishes, windows are broken. Unstable objects overturned. Pendulum clocks may stop.
- VI. Felt by all; many frightened. Some heavy furniture moved; a few instances of fallen plaster. Damage slight.
- VII. Damage negligible in buildings of good design and construction; slight in well-built ordinary structures; considerable in poorly built or badly designed structures. Some chimneys are broken.
- VIII. Damage slight in specially designed structures; considerable damage in ordinary buildings with partial collapse. Damage great in poorly built structures. Fall of chimneys, factory stacks, columns, monuments, walls. Heavy furniture overturned.
- IX. Damage considerable in specially designed structures; well-designed frame structures thrown out of plumb. Damage is great in substantial buildings, with partial collapse. Buildings shifted off foundations.
- X. Some well-built wooden structures are destroyed; most masonry and frame structures are destroyed with foundations. Rails bent.
- XI. Few, if any (masonry) structures remain standing. Bridges destroyed. Rails bent greatly.
- XII. Damage total. Lines of sight and level are distorted. Objects are thrown into the air.

11.1.3 Ground Motion

Earthquake hazard assessment is also based on expected ground motion. This involves determining the annual probability that certain ground motion accelerations will be exceeded, then summing the annual probabilities over the period of interest. The most commonly mapped ground motion parameters are the horizontal and vertical peak ground accelerations (PGA) for a given soil or rock type. Instruments called accelerographs record levels of ground motion due to earthquakes at stations throughout a region. These readings are recorded by state and federal agencies that monitor and predict seismic activity.

Maps of PGA values form the basis of seismic zone maps that are included in building codes such as the International Building Code. Building codes that include seismic provisions specify the horizontal force due to lateral acceleration that a building should be able to withstand during an earthquake. PGA values are directly related to these lateral forces that could damage “short-period structures” (e.g., single-family dwellings). Longer-period response components create the lateral forces that damage larger structures with longer natural periods (apartment buildings, factories, high-rises, bridges). Table 11-1 list damage potential and perceived shaking by PGA factors, compared to the Mercalli scale.

| TABLE 11-1. | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| MERCALLI SCALE AND PEAK GROUND ACCELERATION COMPARISON | | | | |
| Modified Mercalli Scale | Perceived Shaking | Potential Structure Damage | | Estimated PGA ^a (%g) |
| | | Resistant Buildings | Vulnerable Buildings | |
| I | Not Felt | None | None | <0.17% |
| II to III | Weak | None | None | 0.17% - 1.4% |
| IV | Light | None | None | 1.4% - 3.9% |
| V | Moderate | Very Light | Light | 3.9% - 9.2% |
| VI | Strong | Light | Moderate | 9.2% - 18% |
| VII | Very Strong | Moderate | Moderate/Heavy | 18% - 34% |
| VIII | Severe | Moderate/Heavy | Heavy | 34% - 65% |
| IX | Violent | Heavy | Very Heavy | 65% - 124% |
| X to XII | Extreme | Very Heavy | Very Heavy | >124% |
| Note: | | | | |
| a. PGA measured in percentage of gravity (g), where g is the acceleration of gravity From USGS, 2008; USGS, 2010 | | | | |

11.1.4 Effect of Soil Types

The impact of an earthquake on structures and infrastructure is largely a function of ground shaking, distance from the source of the quake, and liquefaction. Liquefaction is a secondary effect of an earthquake in which soils lose their shear strength and flow or behave as a liquid, thereby damaging structures that derive their support from the soil. Liquefaction generally occurs in soft, unconsolidated sedimentary soils. A program called the National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program (NEHRP) creates maps based on soil characteristics to help identify locations subject to liquefaction. Table 11-2 summarizes NEHRP soil classifications. NEHRP Soils B and C typically can sustain ground shaking without much effect, dependent on the earthquake magnitude. The areas that are commonly most affected by ground shaking have NEHRP Soils D, E, and F. In general, these areas are also most susceptible to liquefaction

| TABLE 11-2. | | |
|---|--|---|
| NEHRP SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM | | |
| NEHRP Soil Type | Description | Mean Shear Velocity to 30 meters (Meters per second) |
| A | Hard Rock | 1,500 |
| B | Firm to Hard Rock | 760-1,500 |
| C | Dense Soil/Soft Rock | 360-760 |
| D | Stiff Soil | 180-360 |
| E | Soft Clays | < 180 |
| F | Special Study Soils (liquefiable soils, sensitive clays, organic soils, soft clays >36 meters thick) | |

11.2 HAZARD PROFILE

Earthquakes can last from a few seconds to over five minutes; they may also occur as a series of tremors over several days. The actual movement of the ground in an earthquake is seldom the direct cause of injury or death. Casualties generally result from falling objects and debris, because the shocks shake, damage, or demolish buildings and other structures. Disruption of communications, electrical power supplies, gas, sewer, and water lines should be expected. Earthquakes may trigger fires, dam failures, landslides, or releases of hazardous material, compounding their disastrous effects.

Small, local faults produce lower magnitude quakes, but ground shaking can be strong and damage can be significant in areas close to the fault. In contrast, large regional faults can generate earthquakes of great magnitudes but, because of their distance and depth, they may result in only moderate shaking in an area.

The severity of earthquakes is influenced by several factors, including the depth of the quake, the geology in the area, and the soils. The severity of soil liquefaction is dependent on the soil's grain size, thickness, compaction, and degree of saturation.

11.2.1 Past Events

Most past earthquakes in Texas have been of low magnitude and have mainly occurred in west Texas or the Panhandle area. Figure 11-1 shows the location of recorded and documented earthquake events in Texas as well as the planning area. As can be seen in Figure 11-2, the probability of a severe earthquake in Wharton County and participating communities is low. According to the State Hazard Mitigation Plan, the probability of an earthquake in the Central Region is considered rare. This includes Wharton County and participating communities. Although a small event is possible, it would pose little to no risk for the area. According to the USGS Earthquake Hazard Program, no earthquakes have been recorded in Wharton County and the participating communities since 1847, the earliest date data is available.

11.2.2 Location

While Texas does face some earthquake hazards, this hazard is very small in comparison to many other states. The biggest threat appears to be from the New Madrid fault system in Missouri, a system powerful enough to pose a risk to the north Texas area. Two regions, near El Paso and in the Panhandle, should expect earthquakes with magnitudes of approximately 5.5 to 6.0 to occur every 50 to 100 years, with even larger earthquakes possible. In Central Texas, the hazard is generally low, but residents should be aware that small earthquakes can occur, including some that are theoretically triggered by oil or gas production.

Elsewhere in Texas, earthquakes are exceedingly rare. However, the hazard level is not zero anywhere in Texas; small earthquakes are possible almost anywhere, and all regions face possible ill effects from very large, distant earthquakes. Figure 11-2 shows earthquake hazard threats in the U.S. Figure 11-1 shows the location of recorded past events in Texas.

Figure 11-1. Texas Earthquakes (1847-2021)





Figure 11-2. Probabilistic Earthquake Hazard Map for the U.S.



Faults have been classified based on the geologic time frame of their latest suspected movement (in order of activity occurrence, most recent is listed first):

- H Holocene (within past 15,000 years)
- LQ Late Quaternary (15,000 to 130,000 years ago)
- MLQ Middle to Late Quaternary (130,000 to 750,000 years ago)
- Q Quaternary (approximately past 2 million years)
- LC Late Cenozoic (approximately past 23.7 million years)

Known named faults in Texas are the Balcones Fault Zone, Mexia Fault Zone, Luling Fault Zone, Hueco Bolson, Marathon Uplift, and Talco Fault Zone.

The impact of an earthquake is largely a function of the following components:

- Ground shaking (ground motion accelerations)
- Liquefaction (soil instability)
- Distance from the source (both horizontally and vertically)

No earthquake scenarios were selected for this plan because an earthquake event for the planning area is rare, according to the *2013 State of Texas Hazard Mitigation Plan*.

11.2.3 Frequency

According to the USGS, the probability that a magnitude 5 or greater earthquake will occur in the planning area in the next few years is unlikely (event not probable in the next 100 years). The USGS Earthquake Probability Mapping application estimates that the probability that a magnitude 5 or greater earthquake will occur in the next 500 years in Wharton County and the participating community is 2 percent or less. Overall, the probability of a damaging earthquake somewhere in Wharton County and participating community is considered rare. Small earthquakes that cause no or little damage are more likely (see Figure 11-2). The future probability of an earthquake event in Wharton County and the participating communities is unlikely (event not probable in next 100 years).

11.2.4 Severity

Earthquakes can cause structural damage, injury, and loss of life, as well as damage to infrastructure networks, such as water, power, communication, and transportation lines. Damage and life loss can be particularly devastating in communities where buildings were not designed to withstand seismic forces (e.g., historic structures). Other damage-causing effects of earthquakes include surface rupture, fissuring, settlement, and permanent horizontal and vertical shifting of the ground. Secondary impacts can include landslides, rock falls, liquefaction, fires, dam failure, and hazardous materials incidents.

There are no known deaths or injuries from earthquakes in Wharton County and the participating communities. Some of the past earthquake events in Texas were severe enough to cause minor property damage such as broken windows or contents falling from shelves. The very low probability of an event suggests that the potential for these impacts is minimal.

The severity of an earthquake can be expressed in terms of intensity or magnitude. Intensity represents the observed effects of ground shaking on people, buildings, and natural features. The USGS has created ground motion maps based on current information about several fault zones. These maps show the PGA

that has a certain probability (2% or 10%) of being exceeded in a 50-year period, as shown in Figure 11-3. The PGA is measured in numbers of g's (the acceleration associated with gravity). The 500-Year HAZUS-MH probabilistic-event scenario for Wharton County produced a PGA of 0.0148, which is lower than the FEMA PGA minimum requirement (3%g) for earthquake analysis profiling. Figure 11-4 shows the 500-year probability event, which produces only a light ground shaking and is likely to cause no damage. Vibrations feel like those of a heavy truck passing by. This means that during an event of such magnitude, dishes, windows, and doors rattle; walls and frames of structures creak; liquids in open vessels are slightly disturbed; standing vehicles rock noticeably.

Magnitude is related to the amount of seismic energy released at the hypocenter of an earthquake. It is calculated based on the amplitude of the earthquake waves recorded on instruments. Whereas intensity varies depending on location with respect to the earthquake epicenter, magnitude is represented by a single, instrumentally measured value for each earthquake event.

In simplistic terms, the severity of an earthquake event can be measured in the following terms:

- How hard did the ground shake?
- How did the ground move? (horizontally or vertically)
- How stable was the soil?
- What is the fragility of the built environment in the area of impact?

Figure 11-3. Peak Ground Acceleration (10% Probability of Exceedance in 50-Year Map of Peak Ground Acceleration)





Figure 11-4. 500-Year Probability Event in Wharton County



11.2.5 Warning Time

Part of what makes earthquakes so destructive is that they generally occur without warning. The main shock of an earthquake can usually be measured in seconds, and rarely lasts for more than a minute. Aftershocks can occur within the days, weeks, and even months following a major earthquake.

By studying the geologic characteristics of faults, geoscientists can often estimate when the fault last moved and estimate the magnitude of the earthquake that produced the last movement. Because the occurrence of earthquakes is relatively low to none in the county and participating cities and the historical earthquake record is short, accurate estimations of magnitude, timing, or location of future dangerous earthquakes in Wharton County are difficult to estimate.

There is currently no reliable way to predict the day or month that an earthquake will occur at any given location. Research is being done with warning systems that use the low energy waves that precede major earthquakes. These potential warning systems give approximately 40 seconds of notice that a major earthquake is about to occur. The warning time is very short but it could allow for someone to get under a desk, step away from a hazardous material they are working with, or shut down sensitive equipment.

11.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Earthquakes can cause large and sometimes disastrous landslides and mudslides. River valleys are vulnerable to slope failure, often as a result of loss of cohesion in clay-rich soils. Soil liquefaction occurs when water-saturated sands, silts, or gravelly soils are shaken so violently that the individual grains lose contact with one another and float freely in the water, turning the ground into a pudding-like liquid. Building and road foundations lose load-bearing strength and may sink into what was previously solid ground. Unless properly secured, hazardous materials can be released, causing significant damage to the environment and people. Earthen dams and levees are highly susceptible to seismic events and the impacts of their eventual failures can be considered secondary risks for earthquakes.

11.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

The impacts of global climate change on earthquake probability are unknown. Some scientists say that melting glaciers could induce tectonic activity. As ice melts and water runs off, tremendous amounts of weight are shifted on the earth's crust. As newly freed crust returns to its original, pre-glacier shape, it could cause seismic plates to slip and stimulate volcanic activity according to research into prehistoric earthquakes and volcanic activity. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and USGS scientists found that retreating glaciers in southern Alaska may be opening the way for future earthquakes (NASA 2004).

Secondary impacts of earthquakes could be magnified by climate change. Soils saturated by repetitive storms could experience liquefaction during seismic activity due to the increased saturation. Dams storing increased volumes of water due to changes in the hydrograph could fail during seismic events. There are currently no models available to estimate these impacts.

11.5 EXPOSURE

All structures, people, and infrastructure within the participating communities are vulnerable to earthquake damages. The FEMA How-To Guidance, Understanding Your Risks (FEMA 386-2, page 1-7), suggests the earthquake hazard should be profiled if the PGA is greater than 3%g. Wharton County and all participating communities PGA are less than 2%g (.02) and there have been no recorded

earthquakes in or near the HMP update area. Furthermore, Wharton County and participating communities do not have any geologic fault lines running through their jurisdiction (See Figure 11-1). Therefore, only a minimum level-1 HAZUS-MH analysis was profiled using the 500-year probability event scenario.

11.5.1 Population

The populations along the major geologic fault lines are the most potentially exposed to direct and indirect impacts from earthquakes. There are no fault lines within the HMP update area (See Figure 11-1). Therefore, the entire county population is at extremely minimal risk. The degree of exposure is dependent on many factors, including the age and construction type of the structures people live in, the soil types their homes are constructed on, their proximity to fault location, and other factors. Whether impacted directly or indirectly, the entire population will have to deal with the consequences of earthquakes to some degree. Business interruption could keep people from working, road closures could isolate populations, and functional loss of utilities could impact populations that suffered no direct damage from an event itself.

11.5.2 Property

According to the HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), there are 16,979 buildings within the census blocks that define the planning area with an asset replaceable value of almost \$3.9 billion (excluding contents). About 91% of these buildings (and 75% of the building value) are associated with residential housing. All the structures along the major geologic fault lines in the planning area are susceptible to earthquake impacts to varying degrees. There are no fault lines within the HMP update area (See Figure 11-1), therefore the HMP Area is at extremely minimal risk.

11.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

All critical facilities and infrastructure in the planning area are exposed to the earthquake hazard. Table 6-3 and Table 6-4 list the number of each type of facility by jurisdiction. Hazardous material releases can occur during an earthquake from fixed facilities or transportation-related incidents. Transportation corridors can be disrupted during an earthquake, leading to the release of materials to the surrounding environment. Facilities holding hazardous materials are of particular concern because of the possible isolation of neighborhoods surrounding them. During an earthquake, structures storing these materials could rupture and leak into the surrounding area or an adjacent waterway, having a disastrous effect on the environment.

11.5.4 Environment

Secondary hazards associated with earthquakes will likely have some of the most damaging effects on the environment. Earthquake-induced landslides can significantly impact the surrounding habitat. It is also possible for streams to be rerouted after an earthquake. This can change the water quality, possibly damaging habitat and feeding areas. There is a possibility of streams fed by groundwater drying up because of changes in underlying geology.

11.6 VULNERABILITY

All structures, people, and infrastructure within the participating communities are vulnerable to earthquake damage, however, due to the low risk of occurrence, only a minimum level-1 HAZUS-MH 500-year probability event analysis was conducted. The 500-Year HAZUS-MH modeled event for Wharton County and the participating communities produced a maximum PGA of 1.48%g (Figure 11-4), which is lower than the FEMA PGA minimum requirement for earthquake analysis (3%g). The potential shaking (0.0148 PGA) of the 500-year event in Wharton County (and all participating communities) creates a ‘weak’ perceived shaking with no potential damage on the USGS Instrumental Intensity Scale. While the probability of an event is rare, if an event were to occur, it would be of minimal magnitude with no damage.

Due to no previous earthquake events in the planning area and the rare likelihood that such an earthquake event may occur for Wharton County and the participating communities, annualized economic losses from the HAZUS-MH 500-Year modeled event produced \$0. Wharton County and participating communities can expect no loss of functionality for critical facilities and infrastructures, utility, transportation, and other essential services.

Vulnerability Narrative

- **City of East Bernard** - The City of East Bernard is classified as ‘No Exposure’ due to a PGA of less than 2%, the number of previous events (0), probability of future events (minimal), and local knowledge.
- **City of El Campo** - The City of El Campo is classified as ‘No Exposure’ due to a PGA of less than 2%, the number of previous events (0), probability of future events (minimal), and local knowledge.
- **City of Wharton** – The City of Wharton is classified as ‘No Exposure’ due to a PGA of less than 2%, the number of previous events (0), probability of future events (minimal), and local knowledge.
- **Wharton County (Unincorporated Area)** - There are no fault lines throughout the Unincorporated Areas of Wharton County. The closest fault lines are located approximately 55 miles to the west in Fayette and Gonzales counties. However, if an earthquake were to occur in the Unincorporated Areas of Wharton County, damages to critical facilities and major thoroughfares (such as US 59 or US 90) could delay emergency service support from neighboring communities. Rural residents and property are more vulnerable as response times could be limited. Rural roadways with single-lane crossings or crossings currently in need of improvements increase the risk and vulnerability to these residents as emergency response efforts would be further compromised.

Community Perception of Vulnerability

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this plan update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

11.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

Land use in the planning area will be directed by master plans adopted by the county and its planning partners as well as local permitting departments and zoning maps. The information in this plan provides the participating partners a tool to ensure that there is no increase in exposure in areas of high seismic risk. Development in the planning area will be regulated through building standards and performance measures so that the degree of risk will be reduced. The International Building Code also establishes provisions to address seismic risk.

11.8 SCENARIO

An earthquake does not have to occur within the planning area to have a significant impact on the people, property, and economy of the county and participating cities. However, any seismic activity of 6.0 or greater on faults within the planning area would have significant impacts throughout the county. Earthquakes of this magnitude or higher would lead to massive structural failure of property on highly liquefiable soils. Levees and revetments built on these poor soils would likely fail, representing a loss of critical infrastructure. These events could cause secondary hazards, including landslides and mudslides that would further damage structures. River valley hydraulic-fill sediment areas are also vulnerable to slope failure, often as a result of loss of cohesion in clay-rich soils.

11.9 ISSUES

Important issues associated with an earthquake include but are not limited to the following:

- Many structures within the planning area were built prior to 1994 when seismic provisions became uniformly applied through building code applications.
- Critical facility owners should be encouraged to create or enhance continuity of operations plans using the information on risk and vulnerability contained in this plan.
- Geotechnical standards should be established that take into account the probable impacts from earthquakes in the design and construction of new or enhanced facilities.
- Earthquakes could trigger other natural hazard events such as dam failures and landslides, which could severely impact the county and participating cities.
- A worst-case scenario would be the occurrence of a large seismic event during a flood or high-water event. Failures could happen at multiple locations, increasing the impacts of individual events.
- The cost of retrofitting buildings to meet earthquake seismicity standards may be cost-prohibitive.
- Dams located in the county and participating cities may not have been engineered to withstand probable seismic events.
- Information regarding the liquefaction susceptibility of soils in the planning area is lacking.

Chapter 12. FLOOD

| FLOOD RANKING | |
|----------------------|------|
| Wharton County | High |
| City of East Bernard | High |
| City of El Campo | High |
| City of Wharton | High |

| DEFINITIONS | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Flood | The inundation of normally dry land resulting from the rising and overflowing of a body of water. |
| Floodplain | The land area along the sides of a river that becomes inundated with water during a flood. |
| 100-Year Floodplain | The area is flooded by a flood that has a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded each year. This is a statistical average only; a 100-year flood can occur more than once in a short period of time. The 1% annual chance flood is the standard used by most federal and state agencies. |
| Riparian Zone | The area along the banks of a natural watercourse. |

12.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

12.1.1 Flood

The following description of flooding is an excerpt from the *2013 State of Texas Flood Mitigation Plan*.

A flood is a general and temporary condition of partial or complete inundation of normally dry land areas from:

- The overflow of stream banks
- The unusual and rapid accumulation of runoff of surface waters from any source
- Mudflows or the sudden collapse of shoreline land

Flooding results when the flow of water is greater than the normal carrying capacity of the stream channel. The rate of rise, magnitude (or peak discharge), duration, and frequency of floods are a function of specific physiographic characteristics. Generally, the rise in water surface elevation is quite rapid on small (and steep gradient) streams and slow in large (and flat sloped) streams.

The causes of floods relate directly to the accumulation of water from precipitation, or the failure of man-made structures, such as dams or levees. Floods caused by precipitation are further classified as coming from the rain in a general storm system, rain in a localized intense thunderstorm, melting snow and ice, and hurricane/tropical storms. Floods may also be caused by structural or hydrologic failures of dams or levees. A hydrologic failure occurs when the volume of water behind the dam or levee exceeds the

structure's capacity resulting in overtopping. Structural failure arises when the physical stability of the dam or levee is compromised due to age, poor construction and maintenance, seismic activity, rodent tunneling, or myriad other causes. For more information on floods resulting from dam and levee failure refer to Chapter 9 of this plan.

General Rain Floods

General rain floods can result from moderate to heavy rainfall occurring over a wide geographic area lasting several days. They are characterized by a slow steady rise in stream stage and a peak flood of long duration. As various minor streams empty into larger and larger channels, the peak discharge on the mainstream channel may progress upstream or downstream (or remain stationary) over a considerable length of a river. General rain floods can result in considerably large volumes of water. Because the rate of rise is slow and the time available for a warning is great, few lives are usually lost, but millions of dollars in valuable public and private property are at risk.

Thunderstorm Floods

Damaging thunderstorm floods are caused by intense rain over basins of a relatively small area. They are characterized by a sudden rise in stream level, short duration, and a relatively small volume of runoff.

Because there is little or no warning time, the term "flash flood" is often used to describe thunderstorm floods. Texas is known as the "Flash Flood Alley" and the area along the Balcones Escarpment (from Austin south to San Antonio, then west to Del Rio) is one of the nation's three most flash flood-prone regions. Figure 12-1 shows the number of flash floods in each county from 1986 to 1999. Wharton County lies just south of the "Flash Flood Alley".

Thunderstorm floods occur every month of the year in Texas but are most common in the spring and summer. The mean annual number of thunderstorm flood days varies from 40 in eastern Texas to 60 in western Texas. Most flash flooding is caused by slow-moving thunderstorms, thunderstorms repeatedly moving over the same area, or heavy rains from hurricanes and tropical storms.

Flash floods can occur within a few minutes or after hours of excessive rainfall. Flash floods can roll boulders, tear out trees, destroy buildings and bridges, and carve out new channels. Rapidly rising water can reach heights of thirty feet or more. Flash flood-producing rains can also trigger catastrophic mudslides. Often there is no warning that flash floods are coming. Hill Country flash floods devastated the river basin and are a major reason why the LCRA located Mansfield Dam and Lake Travis (the flood control components of the Highland Lake chain) upstream of Austin. Flash flooding poses a deadly danger to residents of the Lower Colorado River Basin. A number of roads run through low-lying areas that are prone to sudden and frequent flooding during heavy rains. Motorists often attempt to drive through barricaded or flooded roadways. It takes only 18 to 24 inches of water moving across a roadway to carry away most vehicles. Floating cars easily get swept downstream, making rescues difficult and dangerous.

Rain on Snowmelt Floods

Winter is the driest time of the year in Texas. Snowfall occurs at least once every winter in the northern half of Texas, although accumulations rarely are substantial except in the High Plains. Snow is not uncommon in the mountainous areas of the Trans-Pecos, though heavy snows (five inches or more) come only once every two or three winters. More often than not, snow falling in the southern half of the state melts and does not stick to the surface; snow stays on the ground only once or twice in every decade. Snowfall rarely is observed before early November and hardly ever occurs after mid-April. Where it is

not uncommon, snow is almost always heaviest in either January or February. Mean seasonal snowfall is 15 to 18 inches in the Texas Panhandle and 4 to 8 inches elsewhere in the High and Low Rolling Plains. It is worth noting that the recent snowstorm of 2021 resulted in significant snow accumulation in the headwaters of the Colorado River, it was an extremely unusual event with essentially no flood risk impacts downstream and into Wharton County.


Hurricanes and Tropical Storms

The United States has a significant hurricane problem. More than 60% of the U.S. population lives in coastal states from Maine to Texas, Washington to California, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. In the United States, the Atlantic and Gulf Coast coastlines are densely populated and many regions lie less than 3 meters (10 feet) above mean sea level.

Wharton County, being a Texas Coastal Bend County, is exposed to flooding from hurricanes and tropical storms. Coastal flooding triggered by hurricanes is as destructive as wind but can be even more deadly, and is by far the greatest threat to life and property along the coastline. Storm surge, wave, and tides are the greatest contributors to coastal flooding, while precipitation and river flow also contribute during some storms. Hurricanes produce soaking rain, high winds, flying debris, storm surges, tornadoes, and often the deadliest of all, inland flooding. Rain-triggered flooding is not just limited to coastlines as the reach of a large hurricane can cause deadly flooding well inland to communities hundreds of miles from the coast as intense rain falls from these huge tropical air masses. Increased flooding and erosion rates may cause landslides in some areas, especially mountainous regions

Besides causing extensive damage in coastal areas, hurricanes and tropical storms can often cause extensive damages to communities several miles inland. Just a few inches of water from a flood can cause tens of thousands of dollars in damage. Examples include Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Ike, Hurricane Harvey, and Tropical Storm Allison. For more information on floods resulting from hurricanes and tropical storms, refer to Chapter 13 of this plan.

Figure 12-1. Number of Flash Floods in Texas per County (1986-1999)



12.1.2 Floodplain

A floodplain is an area adjacent to a river, creek, or lake that becomes inundated during a flood. Floodplains may be broad, as when a river crosses an extensive flat landscape, or narrow, as when a river is confined in a canyon.

When floodwaters recede after a flood event, they leave behind layers of rock and mud. These gradually build up to create a new floor of the floodplain. Floodplains generally contain unconsolidated sediments (accumulations of sand, gravel, loam, silt, or clay), often extending below the bed of the stream. These sediments provide a natural filtering system, with water percolating back into the ground and replenishing groundwater. These are often important aquifers, the water drawn from them being filtered compared to the water in the stream. Fertile, flat reclaimed floodplain lands are commonly used for agriculture, commerce, and residential development.

Connections between a river and its floodplain are most apparent during and after major flood events. These areas form a complex physical and biological system that not only supports a variety of natural resources but also provides natural flood and erosion control. When a river is separated from its floodplain with levees and other flood control facilities, natural, built-in benefits can be lost, altered, or significantly reduced.

12.1.3 Measuring Floods and Floodplains

The frequency and severity of flooding are measured using a discharge probability, which is the probability that a certain river discharge (flow) level will be equaled or exceeded in a given year. Flood studies use historical records to estimate the probability of occurrence for the different discharge levels. The flood frequency equals 100 divided by the discharge probability. For example, the 100-year discharge has a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. These measurements reflect statistical averages only; it is possible for two or more floods with a 100-year or higher recurrence interval to occur in a short period of time. The same flood can have different recurrence intervals at different points on a river.

The extent of flooding associated with a 1% annual probability of occurrence (the base flood or 100-year flood) is used as the regulatory boundary by FEMA and many agencies. Also referred to as the special flood hazard area (SFHA), this boundary is a convenient tool for assessing vulnerability and risk in flood-prone communities. Many communities have maps that show the extent and likely depth of flooding for the base flood. Corresponding water surface elevations describe the elevation of water that will result from a given discharge level, which is one of the most important factors used in estimating flood damage.

12.1.4 Floodplain Ecosystems

Floodplains can support ecosystems that are rich in plant and animal species. A floodplain can contain 100 or even 1,000 times as many species as a river. Wetting of the floodplain soil releases an immediate surge of nutrients: those left over from the last flood, and those that result from the rapid decomposition of organic matter that has accumulated since then. Microscopic organisms thrive and larger species enter a rapid breeding cycle. Opportunistic feeders (particularly birds) move in to take advantage. The production of nutrients peaks and falls away quickly, but the surge of new growth endures for some time. This makes floodplains valuable for agriculture. Species growing in floodplains are markedly different from those that grow outside floodplains. For instance, riparian trees (trees that grow in floodplains) tend to be very tolerant of root disturbance and very quick-growing compared to non-riparian trees.

12.1.5 Effects of Human Activities

Because they border bodies of water, floodplains have historically been popular sites to establish settlements. Human activities tend to concentrate in floodplains for a number of reasons: water is readily available; the land is fertile and suitable for farming; transportation by water is easily accessible; the land is flatter and easier to develop. However, human activity in floodplains frequently interferes with the natural function of floodplains. It can affect the distribution and timing of drainage, thereby increasing flood problems. Human development can create local flooding problems by altering or confining drainage channels. This increases flood potential in two ways: it reduces the stream's capacity to contain flows, and it increases flow rates or velocities downstream during all stages of a flood event. Human activities can interface effectively with a floodplain as long as steps are taken to mitigate the activities' adverse impacts on floodplain functions.

12.1.6 Community Rating System

The Community Rating System (CRS) is a voluntary program within the NFIP that encourages floodplain management activities that exceed the minimum NFIP requirements. Flood insurance premiums are discounted to reflect the reduced flood risk resulting from community actions meeting the following three goals of the CRS:


- Reduce flood losses
- Facilitate accurate insurance rating
- Promote awareness of flood insurance

For participating communities, flood insurance premium rates are discounted in increments of 5%. For example, a Class 1 community would receive a 45% premium discount, and a Class 9 community would receive a 5% discount. (Class 10 communities are those that do not participate in the CRS; they receive no discount.) The CRS classes for local communities are based on 18 creditable activities in the following categories:

- Public information
- Mapping and regulations
- Flood damage reduction
- Flood preparedness.

Figure 12-2 shows the nationwide number of CRS communities by class as of April 2021, when there were 1,211 communities receiving flood insurance premium discounts under the CRS program.

Figure 12-2. CRS Communities by Class Nationwide as of April 2021.



CRS activities can help to save lives and reduce property damage. Communities participating in the CRS represent a significant portion of the nation's flood risk; over 66% of the NFIP's policy base is located in these communities. Communities receiving premium discounts through the CRS range from small to large and represent a broad mixture of flood risks. Of the communities involved in this HMP updated, only the City of Wharton participates in the CRS program.

12.2 HAZARD PROFILE

Texas has the most flash flood deaths of any state in the country. Although Wharton County and participating communities do not fall in the "Flash Flood Alley" area of Texas, it is still susceptible to flash flood events every year. Factors contributing to flash floods in the area include its location between the Rocky Mountains and the moisture-laden Gulf of Mexico. As weather systems stall and dissipate over Texas, and they drop intense rains over small areas. In the past, Wharton County and participating communities in this HMP update have had significant seasonal floods along the Colorado and San Bernard Rivers; however, these floods have been greatly reduced by the construction of large reservoirs along the Colorado River. This has also helped to reduce the impacts of seasonal floods in the planning area. By far the highest risk areas for flash flooding are regions of overflow from the Colorado River, primarily being the upper headwaters of Peach Creek, Caney Creek, and Baughman Slough. During Hurricane Harvey, the headwaters of these specific creeks became inundated with overflows from the Colorado River that rushed through neighborhoods causing extreme flooding in a very short period of time. In some cases, the flooding extends were up to the eaves of homes.

Flooding in the county and participating cities is mostly caused by slow-moving thunderstorms, thunderstorms repeatedly moving over the same area, or heavy rains from hurricanes and tropical storms. Flash floods can occur within a few minutes or after hours of excessive rainfall. These rain events are most often microbursts, which produce a large amount of rainfall in a short amount of time. Flash floods,

by their nature, occur suddenly but usually dissipate within hours. Despite their sudden nature, the NWS is usually able to issue advisories, watches, and warnings in advance of a flood, but some level of additional work is still needed on this front.

The potential for flooding can change and increase through various land-use changes and changes to the land surface. A change in environment can create localized flooding problems inside and outside of natural floodplains by altering or confining watersheds or natural drainage channels. These changes are commonly created by human activities (e.g., development). These changes can also be created by other events such as wildfires. Wildfires create hydrophobic soils, a hardening or “glazing” of the earth’s surface that prevents rainfall from being absorbed into the ground, thereby increasing runoff, erosion, and downstream sedimentation of channels.

Potential flood impacts include loss of life, injuries, and property damage. Floods can also affect infrastructure (water, gas, sewer, and power utilities), transportation, jobs, tourism, the environment, and ultimately local and regional economies.

12.2.1 Past Events

The NCDC Storm Events Database includes flood events that occurred in Wharton County and participating communities between 1965 and 2019. Table 12-1 provides a summary of the results of these statistics. Events listed as Wharton County and participating communities in the table below affected large portions of the HMP update area. Specific events described for each participating community are counted and described below. Large flood storms may have affected additional jurisdictions.

| TABLE 12-1. SUMMARY OF HISTORIC FLOODS IN WHARTON COUNTY AND PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES (1965-2019) | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Location | Property Damage | Crop Damage | Injuries | Deaths |
| Lane City | \$8,000.00 | - | 0 | 0 |
| El Campo | \$376,000.00 | \$2,000.00 | 4 | 0 |
| Wharton County | \$1,365,000.00 | \$20,000.00 | 1 | 0 |
| City of Wharton | \$604,000.00 | - | 0 | 0 |
| East Bernard | \$115,000.00 | - | 3 | 0 |
| Note: From NOAA Storm Events Database | | | | |


Notable incidents from the NDCD Storm Events Database (and confirmed by local data) in Wharton County and participating communities are described below:

- April 4, 1997 – Intense rainfall rates of 3 to 4 inches per hour caused street flooding throughout the county and led to many inundated homes in El Campo. In total, the associated property damage was \$50,000, but no injuries or fatalities were reported.
- April 11, 1997 – Heavy rains led to flooding throughout Wharton County, where numerous streets were reported to be flooded. In the City of Wharton, one house was flooded. No injuries or fatalities were associated with the storm, but the event resulted in \$15,000 in property damage.

- October 17, 1998 – Major flooding occurred across the northwest part of Wharton County, inundating homes along FM 102. Some Elm Grove subdivision homes in northern Wharton County were inundated with up to one foot of water. No injuries or property damage were associated with the event, but the storm did cause \$50,000 in property damage.
- August 30, 2001 – A series of upper-level disturbances produced heavy and rain and some severe weather across the southern portions of southeast Texas. Rainfall rates of one inch per hour up to 6 hours at a time were recorded in multiple counties, including Wharton County. Heavy rainfall caused numerous road closures throughout the county and led to \$75,000 in property damage. No injuries or fatalities were associated with the storm.
- September 1, 2001 – Widespread flooding occurred throughout southeastern Texas, including the western portion of Wharton County. The sheriff's office reported secondary roads flooded as a result of the storm. The event caused \$20,000 in property damage, but no injuries or fatalities were reported.
- July 14, 2002 – In the Town of Hungerford, intense rains caused several roads to be flooded and inundated two homes. No injuries or fatalities were reported, but property damage totaled \$25,000.
- September 7, 2002 – Flash flooding occurred in Wharton, leading to inundated homes within the city. The storm caused \$95,000 in property damages, but no injuries or fatalities were reported.
- November 17, 2003 – Severe weather occurred throughout southeastern Texas as a nearly stationary group of thunderstorms repeatedly developed in the area. Neighboring counties were significantly affected by tornadoes and thunderstorms, causing over 300 homes to be flooded. Property damage for the City of Wharton totaled \$15,000, as flooding occurred in and around the city limits. No injuries or fatalities were associated with the event.
- June 23, 2004 – Heavy rains led to flash flooding in Wharton and caused several rescues from inundated homes. The storm caused \$70,000 in property damage, but no injuries or fatalities were recorded.
- June 24, 2004 – Flash flooding in the City of Wharton led to several roads being inundated throughout the city. No injuries or fatalities were associated with the storm, but property damage totaled \$15,000.
- November 21, 2004 - Major widespread flooding occurred throughout the county, with evacuations in Louise and over 200 El Campo residents rescued by boat or high-water vehicles. Numerous roads and bridges were flooded and impassable, including two sections of Highway 59 between Wharton and El Campo and between El Campo and the Jackson County line. The event resulted in \$2.1 million of property damage, with 59 homes sustaining major damage and another 225 receiving minor damage. No injuries or fatalities were reported.
- May 23-25, 2015 – An extreme precipitation event occurred throughout the Central and South Texas regions over Memorial Day weekend. A large volume of precipitation fell within a relatively short period of time, resulting in damaging floodwaters throughout the region. According to NWS, observed rainfalls in Comal, Guadalupe, Hays, Comal, Travis, and Kerr Counties exceeded 6 inches within a 48-hour period. Areas within Blanco, Comal, and Kendall Counties received at least 8 inches within 48 hours, and a Blanco County rain gauge managed by LCRA recorded 9.41 inches of rain over the same time period. Wharton County received an average of 3 to 4 inches of precipitation throughout the county, according to NWS. On May 26, the Colorado River reached a peak flow of approximately 50,000 cubic feet per second (Figure 12-3), and reached an elevation of approximately


50 feet, exceeding its flood stage by approximately 11 feet (Figure 12-4). No flood damages were reported. There were no injuries or fatalities in Wharton County.

- April 17, 2016 – Known as the Tax Day Flood, heavy rains battered Wharton County and the surrounding areas beginning on April 17th, 2016 releasing as much as 17 inches of rain in the area. These storms triggered major flooding throughout the planning area and a disaster was declared for Wharton along with 15 other counties in Texas. Evacuations and school closures occurred throughout the planning area as a result of the flooding. In the City of Wharton, the Colorado River passed its flood stage of 39 feet to 48.29 feet in the early hours of April 22nd according to the USGS Gauge in the City of Wharton. These high waters lead to mandatory evacuations along its route. In East Bernard and Boling, the San Bernard River passed its flood stage reaching a gauge height of 35.54 feet according to the USGS Gauge near the town of Boling.
- Aug 25-29, 2017 – An extreme Hurricane event occurred throughout the Central and Upper Texas Coastline over the Labor Day holiday. A large volume of precipitation fell within a relatively short period of time, resulting in damaging floodwaters throughout the region. According to NWS, observed rainfalls totals of 40 inches in less than 48 hours with a new North American rainfall total record of 51.88 inches in the Cedar Bayou area of Houston. Total rainfall in Wharton County was measured in the range of 6 to 30 inches generally ranging having lower rainfall totals in the western portion and higher totals in the eastern portion. On Aug. 31, the Colorado River reached a peak flow of approximately 92,700 cubic feet per second at the City of Wharton USGS Gauge and reached a gauge height of approximately 50.46 feet. Extensive flood damages were reported with large portions of the City of Wharton, East Bernard, and Wharton County inundated with floodwaters for days.



Note: From USGS

Figure 12-4. Colorado River Flood Stage Near the City of Wharton During Hurricane Harvey



Note: From USGS

12.2.2 Location

The Lower Colorado Watershed runs centrally through the middle of Wharton County. Most of the eastern half of the county is covered by the San Bernard Watershed. The Navidad Watershed covers the northwestern section while the East Matagorda Bay Watershed covers the southwestern, and eastern sections of Wharton County. Due to its relatively flat topography, few substantial waterways contribute to the Colorado River or Tres Palacios River and instead empty into Matagorda Bay or the Gulf of Mexico. The San Bernard River and other significant creeks, including Jones Creek, Caney Creek, East Mustang, and West Mustang serve as conduits for many bayous and sloughs throughout Wharton County.

Many small, private dams exist throughout the county and participating cities, primarily for agricultural water supply. The one large-scale water supply reservoir in the County (The LCRA Lane City Reservoir) has no natural drainage area to it but rather is filled by a pump station along the Colorado River, and acts as an elevated water supply storage. There are no major flood control reservoirs or dams in the County but it is worth noting that the highland lake reservoirs in the Austin area can have impacts to flood risk in Wharton County due to releases. The LCRA has indicated that their flood control releases from the highland lakes can only reasonably be managed down to Columbus, TX, which is well upstream of Wharton County. This means that the LCRA cannot guarantee the impacts of flood releases from their reservoirs in Wharton County.

In addition to the riverine flooding, the HMP update area also may experience urban flooding caused by urbanization which can increase the run-off potential of an area. Due to its relatively small urban development, urban flooding is limited. Coastal flooding is typically a result of storm surge, wind-driven waves, and heavy rainfall produced by hurricanes, tropical storms, and other large coastal storms that

migrate northward from the Gulf of Mexico, but Wharton County has traditionally been out of the way of the effects of a coastal surge. Flood risk is also realized by agricultural practices in the County. More row crops and fewer rice farms can result in additional flood risk.

The floodplain boundary extents for most of the creeks, streams, rivers, and lakes in Wharton County and the participating communities have been mapped by FEMA during its Map Modernization Program (circa 2006). Current FIRMs are available countywide and have an effective date of 12/21/2017. The main difference between the 2006 MapMod floodplains and the 2017 updates was the addition of detailed mapped along the San Bernard River. The resulting FIRMs provide an official depiction of flood hazard risks and risk premium zones for each community and properties located within it. While the FEMA digital flood data is recognized as the official flood maps, more recent flood studies have been performed by the County and Cities including the modeling of 14 watersheds under the 2010 Wharton County Drainage Master Plan and the more recent Tri-County Study of the Lower Colorado River. These two additional flood risk datasets have not been submitted to FEMA for review but they are considered locally to be the best available data. It should be noted that riverine flooding, stormwater flooding, and flood-related losses often do occur outside of delineated SFHAs.

Wharton County and the participating communities have 214,850 acres in the 100-year floodplain and 249,960 acres in the 500-year floodplain. Table 12-2 shows the distribution of the acreage across the participating jurisdictions in the planning area.

| TABLE 12-2. ACREAGE IN THE 100-YEAR AND 500-YEAR FLOODPLAIN BY JURISDICTION | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Jurisdiction | Area (acres) | |
| | 100-Year | 500-Year |
| City of East Bernard | 652 | 1,069 |
| City of El Campo | 2,450 | 2,600 |
| City of Wharton | 2,888 | 4,130 |
| Unincorporated Area | 208,860 | 242,161 |
| Wharton County Total | 214,850 | 249,960 |

Figure 12-5 shows the SFHAs in Wharton County. Figures 12-6 through 12-8 show the SFHAs for each participating community.

Figure 12-5. Special Flood Hazard Areas in Wharton County and Participating Communities





Figure 12-6. Special Flood Hazard Areas in the City of East Bernard



East Bernard, TX - FEMA Flood Zones

Source: FEMA Map Service Center



0 0.5 1 2 Miles

Legend

City

East Bernard

County Boundary

FEMA FloodZone

A,

AE,

AE, FLOODWAY

X, 0.2 PCT ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD HAZARD

Figure 12-7. Special Flood Hazard Areas in the City of El Campo






Figure 12-8. Special Flood Hazard Areas in the City of Wharton



City of Wharton, TX - FEMA Flood Zones

Source: FEMA Map Service Center



Legend

City

- Wharton
- County Boundary

FEMA FloodZone

- A,
- AE,
- AE, FLOODWAY
- X, 0.2 PCT ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD HAZARD

12.2.3 Frequency

Seasonal flooding on the Colorado River and San Bernard River has increased over time due to increase rainfall events and weather patterns. Flash floods are still considered to be highly likely to occur with nearly a 45% chance of occurrence in any given year. This probability is based on the 29 events over 67 years reported in the NCDC Storm Events Database and other historical records (local knowledge and news sources). Based on historical analysis, Wharton County unincorporated area can expect an event every 3-4 years year and has the same frequency and probability for future events. The City of El Camp, East Bernard, and Wharton can expect an event every 10 years. These communities also have the same frequency and probability for future events.

12.2.4 Severity

Based on the 100-Year HAZUS-MH probabilistic event scenario for Wharton County and participating communities, the magnitude/severity of flooding is severe. The 100-Year HAZUS-MH flood scenario estimates more than 12,928 residents will be displaced and will seek temporary lodging in public shelters. Overall significance is considered severe.

The intensity and magnitude of a flood event are also determined by the depth of floodwaters. Table 12-3 describes the type of risk and potential magnitude of an event in relation to water depth. The water depths shown in Table 12-3 are estimated based on elevation data above mean sea level.

| TABLE 12-3. EXTENT SCALE – WATER DEPTH | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| SEVERITY | WATER DEPTH (feet) | DESCRIPTION |
| BELOW FLOOD STAGE | 0 to 5 | Water begins to exceed the low sections of banks and the lowest sections of the floodplain. |
| ACTION STAGE | 5 to 10 | Flow is well into the floodplain. Minor low-land flooding reaches low areas of the floodplain. Livestock should be moved from low-lying areas. |
| FLOOD STAGE | 10 to 15 | Homes are threatened and properties downstream of river flows or in low-lying areas begin to flood. |
| MODERATE FLOOD STAGE | 15 to 20 | At this stage, the lowest homes downstream flood. Roads and bridges in the floodplain flood severely and are dangerous to motorists. |
| MAJOR FLOOD STAGE | 20 and Above | Major flooding approaches homes in the floodplain. Primary and Secondary roads and bridges are severely flooded and very dangerous. Major flooding extends well into the floodplain, destroying property, equipment, and livestock. |

The range of flood intensity that Wharton County and the participating communities experience is high, even for the 100-Year flood events. This ranges from 0 feet to 10 feet in most areas. Even though most of the depths place the participating communities at the ‘action stage’ as shown in Table 12-3, the Colorado and San Bernard River can experience flooding past the flood stage with over 40 feet as shown in Figures 12-3 and 12-4. Based on historical occurrences, the planning area could experience an average of 5-10 inches of water within a 24-hour period. Figure 12-9 to Figure 12-12 shows the flood depths for the area.

Figure 12-9. Flood Depths in Wharton County and Participating Communities




Figure 12-10. Flood Depths in the City of East Bernard




Figure 12-11. Flood Depths in the City of El Campo





Figure 12-12. Flood Depths in the City of Wharton



12.2.5 Warning Time

Due to the sequential pattern of meteorological conditions needed to cause serious flooding, it is unusual for a flood to occur without warning. Warning times for floods can be between 24 and 48 hours. Flash flooding can be less predictable. It should be noted however that during very extreme flooding improved flood warning is needed. This was realized during Hurricane Harvey, as the overflows from the Colorado River at Glenn Flora were not expected at the volume that they occurred. This unexpected volume resulted in a flash flood risk along the upper watersheds of Peach Creek, Baughman Slough, and Caney Creek. High-velocity flow occurred and inundated the City of Wharton and numerous rural residential neighborhoods in the County. Improved flood warning is needed along the Colorado River and the San Bernard River as very large floods can make these watersheds behave in less predictable ways.

12.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

The most problematic secondary hazard for flooding is bank erosion, which in some cases can be more harmful than actual flooding. This is especially true in the upper courses of rivers with steep gradients, where floodwaters may pass quickly and without much damage, but scour the banks, edging properties closer to the floodplain or causing them to fall in. Flooding is also responsible for hazards such as landslides when high flows over-saturate soils on steep slopes, causing them to fail. Hazardous materials spills are also a secondary hazard of flooding if storage tanks rupture and spill into streams, rivers, or storm sewers. Significant channel geomorphology/erosive forces were observed post Hurricane Harvey, primarily along the Colorado River. Significant bank erosion from this event resulted in the loss of cropland and degradation of the highly sandy soils along the Colorado River.

12.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

The use of historical hydrologic data has long been the standard of practice for designing and operating water supply and flood protection projects. For example, historical data are used for flood forecasting models. This method of forecasting assumes that the climate of the future will be similar to that of the period of the historical record. However, the hydrologic record cannot be used to predict changes in frequency and severity of extreme climate events such as floods. Going forward, model calibration or statistical relation development must happen more frequently, new forecast-based tools must be developed, and a standard of practice that explicitly considers the ever-changing climate must be adopted. Climate change has always been occurring, to varying degrees, and it has a direct impact on water resources, and resource managers have observed the following:

Historical hydrologic patterns should not be solely relied upon to forecast the future. A false sense of confidence had been developed over the years based on the premise the natural forces are a constant, but observations of the data clearly illustrate that these natural forces are constantly changing and records are only a snapshot as to what could likely happen but are by no means a solid source for future predictions.

Precipitation and runoff patterns continue to change, highlight uncertainty for water supply and quality, flood management, and ecosystem functions.

Due to the current warming patterns observed (and assuming they continue in an upward trajectory), it is safe to assume that more extreme climatic events will become more frequent. This assumption is based on the fact that warmer summers near the equator will produce more and likely larger tropic depressions that will in turn produce more and likely larger hurricanes. Until a global cooling cycle begins again, these more extreme weather patterns should be expected.

As hydrology changes, what is currently considered a 100-year flood may strike more often, leaving many communities at greater risk. Planners will need to factor a new level of safety into the design, operation, and regulation of flood protection facilities such as dams, floodways, bypass channels, and levees, as well as the design of local sewers and storm drains.

12.5 EXPOSURE

The Level 2 HAZUS-MH protocol was used to assess the risk and vulnerability to flooding in the planning area. The model used U.S. Census data at the block level and calculated floodplain data, which has a level of accuracy acceptable for planning purposes. Where possible, the generated HAZUS-MH flood depth data was enhanced using revised FEMA flood depth grids for the area. The HAZUS-MH default inventory (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs) data was used.

12.5.1 Population

Population counts of those living in the floodplain in the planning area were generated by census block demographic data (2010 U.S. Census data) that intersect with the 100-year and 500-year floodplains identified on FIRMs. The methodology used to generate population estimates intersected census block demographic data, coupled with population centroids, and overlaid this data with the identified floodplains and then aggregating the resulting data to the community boundaries. Using this approach, it was estimated that the exposed population for the planning area within the 100-year floodplain or SFHA is 12,632 (30.6% of the total county population). In the 500-year floodplain, it is estimated that 17,820 people countywide live within the mapped non-SFHA areas (43.2% of the total county population).

12.5.2 Property

Present Land Use

Table 12-4 and Table 12-5 show the present land uses in the 100-year and 500-year floodplains for the entire planning area.

Structures in the Floodplain

Table 12-6 and Table 12-7 summarize the total area and number of structures in the floodplain by participating community. The updated HAZUS-MH model inventory data estimated that there are 6,125 structures within the 100-year floodplain and 8,462 structures within the 500-year floodplain. In the 100-year floodplain, 38% of these structures are in unincorporated areas and 96% are residential.

**TABLE 12-4.
PRESENT LAND USE IN THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN**

| Present Use Classification | Area (acres) | | | | Wharton County Total | % of Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | City of East Bernard | City of El Campo | City of Wharton | Unincorporated Area | | |
| Barren Land (Rock/Sand/Clay) | 0 | 3 | 12 | 722 | 737 | 0.3 |
| Cultivated Crops | 4 | 417 | 436 | 81,607 | 82,464 | 36.9 |
| Deciduous Forest | 79 | 32 | 189 | 18,577 | 18,877 | 8.4 |
| Developed High Intensity | 0 | 62 | 83 | 20 | 165 | 0.1 |
| Developed, Low Intensity | 18 | 345 | 512 | 726 | 1,601 | 0.7 |
| Developed, Medium Intensity | 3 | 178 | 229 | 129 | 539 | 0.2 |
| Developed, Open Space | 67 | 908 | 894 | 7,761 | 9,630 | 4.3 |
| Evergreen Forest | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1,498 | 1,505 | 0.7 |
| Emergent Wetlands | 35 | 0 | 16 | 6,120 | 6,171 | 2.8 |
| Grassland/Herbaceous | 10 | 97 | 84 | 1,890 | 2,081 | 0.9 |
| Mixed Forest | 30 | 0 | 6 | 3,593 | 3,629 | 1.6 |
| Open Water | 0 | 0 | 33 | 2,973 | 3,006 | 1.3 |
| Pasture/Hay | 105 | 177 | 252 | 55,513 | 56,047 | 25.1 |
| Shrub/Scrub | 23 | 94 | 109 | 12,461 | 12,687 | 5.7 |
| Woody Wetlands | 286 | 2 | 27 | 24,244 | 24,559 | 11.0 |
| Wharton County Total | 662 | 2,315 | 2,887 | 217,834 | 223,698 | 100 |

**TABLE 12-5.
PRESENT LAND USE IN THE 500-YEAR FLOODPLAIN**

| Present Use Classification | Area (acres) | | | | | % of Total |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | City of East Bernard | City of El Campo | City of Wharton | Unincorporated Area | Wharton County Total | |
| Barren Land (Rock/Sand/Clay) | 0 | 3 | 12 | 752 | 767 | 0.3 |
| Cultivated Crops | 98 | 418 | 539 | 99,092 | 100,147 | 38.5 |
| Deciduous Forest | 96 | 32 | 202 | 20,285 | 20,615 | 7.9 |
| Developed High Intensity | 6 | 70 | 155 | 31 | 262 | 0.1 |
| Developed, Low Intensity | 55 | 387 | 799 | 883 | 2,124 | 0.8 |
| Developed, Medium Intensity | 19 | 194 | 406 | 167 | 786 | 0.3 |
| Developed, Open Space | 144 | 971 | 1,310 | 9,490 | 11,915 | 4.6 |
| Evergreen Forest | 2 | 0 | 7 | 1,646 | 1,655 | 0.6 |
| Emergent Wetlands | 58 | 0 | 16 | 7,129 | 7,203 | 2.8 |
| Grassland/Herbaceous | 14 | 101 | 120 | 2,155 | 2,390 | 0.9 |
| Mixed Forest | 33 | 0 | 6 | 3,947 | 3,986 | 1.5 |
| Open Water | 0 | 0 | 35 | 3,075 | 3,110 | 1.2 |
| Pasture/Hay | 228 | 181 | 353 | 64,368 | 65,130 | 25.0 |
| Shrub/Scrub | 48 | 103 | 134 | 13,954 | 14,239 | 5.5 |
| Woody Wetlands | 287 | 2 | 39 | 25,422 | 25,750 | 9.9 |
| Wharton County Total | 1,088 | 2,462 | 4,133 | 252,396 | 260,080 | 100 |

TABLE 12-6.
STRUCTURES AND POPULATION IN THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN

| | Residential | Commercial | Other* | Total Structures Affected** | Total Population Affected |
|-----------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| City of East Bernard | 48 | 0 | 5 | 52 | 286 |
| City of El Campo | 1,445 | 34 | 95 | 1,574 | 2,971 |
| City of Wharton | 2,006 | 17 | 144 | 2,167 | 4,562 |
| Unincorporated Area | 2,227 | 18 | 86 | 2,331 | 5,109 |
| Wharton County Total | 5,726 | 69 | 330 | 6,125 | 12,928 |

Notes:

*Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications.

**Total Structures were obtained from the TNRIS address point database, which was used to ratio HAZUS-MH results.

TABLE 12-7.
STRUCTURES AND POPULATION IN THE 500-YEAR FLOODPLAIN

| | Residential | Commercial | Other* | Total Structures Affected | Total Population Affected |
|-----------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| City of East Bernard | 231 | 7 | 7 | 245 | 635 |
| City of El Campo | 1,622 | 113 | 23 | 1,757 | 3,547 |
| City of Wharton | 3,331 | 252 | 72 | 3,655 | 7,002 |
| Unincorporated Area | 2,677 | 93 | 34 | 2,805 | 5,869 |
| Wharton County Total | 7,861 | 466 | 136 | 8,462 | 17,053 |

Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and education classifications.

Exposed Value

Table 12-8 and Table 12-9 summarize the estimated value of exposed buildings in the planning area in the 100-year and 500-year floodplains. The updated HAZUS-MH model inventory data estimated \$2.0 billion worth of building and contents exposure to the 100-year flood. This represents 31% of the total assessed value of the planning area. Approximately \$2.8 billion worth of building-and-contents exposure was estimated to be exposed to the 500-year flood. This represents 44% of the total assessed value of the planning area.

TABLE 12-8.
VALUE OF STRUCTURES IN THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN

| Jurisdiction | Value Exposed (\$) | | | Total Assessed Value (\$) | % of Total Assessed Value |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Structure | Contents | Total | | |
| City of East Bernard | 13,301,489 | 3,275,557 | 16,577,046 | 429,246,000 | 4 |
| City of El Campo | 383,802,678 | 278,394,738 | 662,197,416 | 2,269,332,000 | 29 |
| City of Wharton | 408,373,186 | 252,532,095 | 660,905,280 | 1,535,539,000 | 43 |
| Unincorporated Area | 414,288,194 | 243,281,751 | 657,569,945 | 2,204,334,000 | 30 |
| Wharton County Total | 1,219,765,547 | 777,484,140 | 1,997,249,687 | 6,438,451,000 | 31 |

TABLE 12-9.
VALUE OF STRUCTURES IN THE 500-YEAR FLOODPLAIN

| Jurisdiction | Value Exposed (\$) | | | Total Assessed Value (\$) | % of Total Assessed Value |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Structure | Contents | Total | | |
| City of East Bernard | 53,262,488 | 25,333,643 | 78,596,131 | 429,246,000 | 18 |
| City of El Campo | 401,939,340 | 283,960,947 | 685,900,287 | 2,269,332,000 | 30 |
| City of Wharton | 800,430,202 | 499,594,782 | 1,300,024,984 | 1,535,539,000 | 85 |
| Unincorporated Area | 486,185,767 | 280,847,837 | 767,033,603 | 2,204,334,000 | 35 |
| Wharton County Total | 1,741,817,797 | 1,062,027,202 | 2,831,555,006 | 6,438,451,000 | 44 |

12.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Table 12-10 and Table 12-11 summarize the critical facilities and infrastructure in the 100-year and 500-year floodplains of the planning area. Details are provided in the following sections.

**TABLE 12-10.
CRITICAL FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN**

| | City of East Bernard | City of El Campo | City of Wharton | Unincorporated Area | Wharton County Total |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Medical and Health | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Government Functions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Police/Fire Station | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Schools | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Hazardous Materials | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 8 |
| Bridges | 0 | 17 | 18 | 226 | 261 |
| Water Storage | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Wastewater | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Power | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Communications | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Transportation | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Dams | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Airports | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

**TABLE 12-11.
CRITICAL FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE 500-YEAR FLOODPLAIN**

| | City of East Bernard | City of El Campo | City of Wharton | Unincorporated Area | Wharton County Total |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Medical and Health | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Government Functions | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Police/Fire Station | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Schools | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Hazardous Materials | 1 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 11 |
| Bridges | 0 | 17 | 23 | 234 | 274 |
| Water Storage | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Wastewater | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Power | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Communications | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Transportation | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Dams | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Airports | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

Utilities and Infrastructure

It is important to identify who may be at risk if infrastructures are damaged by flooding. Roads or railroads that are blocked or damaged can isolate residents and can prevent access throughout the county, including emergency service providers needing to get to vulnerable populations or to make repairs.

Bridges washed out or blocked by floods or debris also can cause isolation. Water and sewer systems can be flooded or backed up, causing health problems. Underground utilities can be damaged. Levees can fail or be overtopped, inundating the land that they protect. The following sections describe specific types of critical infrastructure.

Roads

The major roads in the planning area that pass through the 100-year floodplain and thus are exposed to flooding are U.S. Highway 59 and State Highways 60 and 71. In severe flood events, these roads can be blocked or damaged, preventing access to some areas. This was experienced recently post Hurricane Harvey, where large portions of US 59 and Hwy 60 were flooded for days and were impassable. This prevented the moving of goods and also greatly inhibited emergency access throughout Wharton County and the Cities within.

Bridges

Flooding events can significantly impact road bridges. These are important because often they provide the only ingress and egress to some neighborhoods. Countywide, 261 bridges are in or cross over the 100-year floodplain.

Water and Sewer Infrastructure

Water and sewer systems can be affected by flooding. Floodwaters can back up drainage systems, causing localized flooding. Culverts can be blocked by debris from flood events, also causing localized urban flooding. Floodwaters can get into drinking water supplies, causing contamination. Sewer systems can be backed up, causing wastewater to spill into homes, neighborhoods, rivers, and streams.

12.5.4 Environment

Flooding is a natural event, and floodplains provide many natural and beneficial functions. Nonetheless, with human development factored in, flooding can impact the environment in negative ways. Migrating fish can wash into roads or over levees into flooded fields, with no possibility of escape. Pollution from roads, such as oil, and hazardous materials can wash into rivers and streams. During floods, these can settle onto normally dry soils, polluting them for agricultural uses. Human development such as bridge abutments and levees, and logjams from timber harvesting can increase stream bank erosion, causing rivers and streams to migrate into non-natural courses.

12.6 VULNERABILITY

Many of the areas exposed to flooding may not experience serious flooding or flood damage. This section describes vulnerabilities in terms of population, property, infrastructure, and environment. The vulnerability analysis was performed at the census-block level. This methodology is likely to overestimate impacts from both the modeled 100-year and 500-year flood events as it is assumed that both structures and the population are centered over the centroid of each census block. To mitigate this, Texas Natural Resources Information System (TNRIS) 911 address points for specific structures were utilized to provide a more accurate estimate of actual building locations relative to the floodplain. These 911 structure counts were used to provide a weighted adjustment relative to the census block centroid structure counts to help provide a more accurate estimate of flood risk.

12.6.1 Population

A geographic analysis of demographics (countywide) using the default HAZUS-MH model data (2010 U.S. Census demographics) identified populations vulnerable to the flood hazard as follows. These numbers are calculated assuming that the population/households are evenly distributed over the census blocks.

- **Economically Disadvantaged Populations**—It is estimated that approximately 10.4% of the population within the 100-year floodplain are economically disadvantaged. Economically disadvantaged is defined as having household incomes of \$20,000 or less.
- **Population over 65 Years Old**—It is estimated that approximately 13.7% of the population in the 100-year floodplain are over 65 years old.
- **Population under 16 Years Old**—It is estimated that approximately 27.5% of the population in the 100-year floodplain are under 16 years of age.

The following impacts on persons and households in Wharton County were estimated for the 100-year and 500-year flood events through the Level 2 HAZUS-MH analysis:

- During a 100-year flood event
 - Displaced population = 2,742
 - Persons requiring short-term shelter = 5,976
- During a 500-year flood event
 - Displaced population = 2,875
 - Persons requiring short-term shelter = 6,250

12.6.2 Property

HAZUS-MH calculates direct losses to structures from flooding by looking at the depth of flooding and the type of structure. Using historical flood insurance claim data, HAZUS-MH estimates the percentage of direct damage to structures and their contents by applying established damage functions to an inventory. Other losses often coincide with direct losses but for purposes of this analysis, these indirect losses are not accounted for. For this analysis, the default inventory data provided with HAZUS-MH was used. The analysis is summarized in Table 12-12 for the 100-year flood event. It is estimated that there would be up to \$177 million in total direct flood loss from a 100- year flood event in the planning area. This represents 8.9% of the total exposure to the 100-year flood for the county. Losses are estimated to be \$291 million in total direct flood losses from a 500- year flood event, representing 10.3% of the exposure to the 500-year event for the county (Table 12-13).

| TABLE 12-12. LOSS ESTIMATES FOR THE 100-YEAR FLOOD EVENT | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Loss (\$) | | | Exposed Value (\$) | % of Total Exposed Value |
| | Structure | Contents | Total | | |
| City of East Bernard | 9,014,000 | 5,952,000 | 14,966,000 | 16,577,046 | 90.3 |
| City of El Campo | 14,793,000 | 14,642,000 | 29,435,000 | 662,197,416 | 4.4 |
| City of Wharton | 16,589,000 | 15,098,000 | 31,687,000 | 660,905,280 | 4.8 |
| Unincorporated Area | 58,779,000 | 42,233,000 | 101,012,000 | 657,569,945 | 15.4 |
| Wharton County Total | 99,175,000 | 77,925,000 | 177,100,000 | 1,997,249,687 | 8.9 |

**TABLE 12-13.
LOSS ESTIMATES FOR THE 500 YEAR FLOOD EVENT**

| Jurisdiction | Loss (\$) | | | Exposed Value (\$) | % of Total Exposed Value |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| | Structure | Contents | Total | | |
| City of East Bernard | 15,990,000 | 11,335,000 | 27,352,000 | 78,596,131 | 34.8 |
| City of El Campo | 41,358,000 | 44,440,000 | 85,798,000 | 685,900,287 | 12.5 |
| City of Wharton | 24,427,000 | 23,955,000 | 48,382,000 | 1,300,024,984 | 3.7 |
| Unincorporated Area | 75,255,000 | 54,586,000 | 129,841,000 | 767,033,603 | 16.9 |
| Wharton County Total | 157,030,000 | 134,316,000 | 291,346,000 | 2,831,555,006 | 10.3 |

National Flood Insurance Program

Table 12-14 lists flood insurance statistics (from 1979 to May 2017) that help identify vulnerability in the planning area. Wharton County and the Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton participate in the NFIP.

**TABLE 12-14.
NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM STATISTICS**

| Jurisdiction | Initial FIRM Effective Date | Claims | Value of Claims Paid |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| City of East Bernard | 4/5/2006 | 106 | \$9,191,473 |
| City of El Campo | 6/4/1980 | 215 | \$4,039,874 |
| City of Wharton | 9/19/1982 | 620 | \$29,872,224 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4/18/1983 | 122 | \$5,065,400 |
| Wharton County Total | 04/05/2006 * | 1063 | \$48,168,970 |

Notes:

FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map

*Effective date of initial countywide Flood Insurance Study

From FEMA Flood Loss Statistics

Properties constructed after a FIRM has been adopted are eligible for reduced flood insurance rates. Such structures are less vulnerable to flooding since they were constructed after regulations and codes were adopted to decrease vulnerability. Properties built before a FIRM is adopted are more vulnerable to flooding because they do not meet code or are located in hazardous areas. The first Flood Hazard Boundary Map (FHBM) for the City of El Campo was available in 1974, the City of Wharton in 1976, and Wharton County in 1974.

The following information from flood insurance statistics is relevant to reducing flood risk:

- The use of flood insurance in the planning area is less than the national average

- The average claim paid in Wharton County (1978 to June 2015) is approximately \$17,515, well below the national average

Wharton County's continued NFIP compliance is detailed in their floodplain management program and the Flood Prevention Order, (2001 as amended) that is enforced by the County's Permitting and Inspection Department. The Floodplain Administrator is a Certified Floodplain Manager (CFM). The County has instituted the following higher floodplain management standards: 1) Detention ponds are required in new subdivisions, 2) Elevation certificate is required prior to pouring the lowest floor and when the structure is complete, 3) Floodplain permits are cross-referenced to 911 Addresses, and 4) One foot of freeboard is required above existing base flood elevation (BFE). The County has several mitigation actions such as improve drainage infrastructure throughout the county; update and adopt new Flood Insurance Study and FIRM; adopt a higher standard for riverine flood damage ordinances; join the CRS program; implement a Wharton County Flood Warning/Monitoring System; drainage master plan as listed in Table 22-2. These measures are intended to reduce the future flood risks in the SFHA and continue the County's good standing with NFIP.

The **City of East Bernard's** floodplain management program is detailed in the Standard for Floodplain Management and it is enforced by the City Secretary. The City has contracted with Wharton County to manage its floodplain management. The City requires one foot of freeboard above existing the BFE for construction in the 100-year floodplain. The City plans to initiate mitigation actions such as adopt a stormwater drainage plan and ordinance and improve drainage throughout the City as listed in Table 22-2.

The **City of El Campo's** floodplain management program is part of Chapter 10 of the City of El Campo Design Manual, Buildings and Building Regulations, this is enforced by the Public Works Department. The Floodplain Administrator is a CFM. The City has instituted the following higher floodplain management standards: 1) In Zone X, new development must be 18 inches above the natural grade or 12 inches above the crown of the nearest street, 2) Elevation certificate is required before framing/pouring the lowest floor and after construction is complete, and prior to the certificate of occupancy, and 3) No development is permitted in the floodway. The mitigation actions in Table 22-2 states that the City intends to improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city, adopt a new freeboard ordinance to reduce the flood risk to structures, and update the drainage master plan.

The **City of Wharton's** floodplain management program is the Standard for Floodplain Management and is enforced by the Code Enforcement Department. The Floodplain Administrator is a CFM. The City has instituted the following higher floodplain management standards: 1) In Zone X, new construction must be one foot above the curb or adjacent grade whichever is higher, 2) Detention is required to mitigate fill/development, 3) Drainage plan is required for new development that meets Wharton County Drainage Criteria, and. 4) Elevation certificate is required prior to forming, when construction is complete, and prior to the certificate of occupancy. The mitigation actions in Table 22-2 states that the City intends to clean and repair storm drains, increase freeboard requirements for permitting structures in the floodplain, implement a watershed ordinance for new development, minimize the impact of flooding by installing berms and levees where appropriate, develop flood-reduction / stream restoration/channelization projects to ensure adequate drainage/diversion of stormwater, conduct an acquisition and relocation, elevation and "demo-rebuild" of flood-prone structures, update/implement Drainage Master Plan, and improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city.

All the municipal planning partners are informed of the training schedule for their Floodplain Administrators through the Texas Colorado River Floodplain Coalition (TCRFC) and the TWDB and attend continuing education seminars and classes on a yearly basis.

Repetitive Loss

A repetitive loss property is defined by FEMA as an NFIP-insured property that has experienced any of the following since 1978, regardless of any changes in ownership:


- Four or more paid losses in excess of \$1,000
- Two paid losses in excess of \$1,000 within any rolling 10-year period
- Three or more paid losses that equal or exceed the current value of the insured property

Repetitive loss properties make up only 1% to 2% of flood insurance policies in force nationally, yet they account for 40% of the nation's flood insurance claim payments. In 1998, FEMA reported that the NFIP's 75,000 repetitive loss structures have already cost \$2.8 billion in flood insurance payments and that numerous other flood-prone structures remain in the floodplain at high risk. The government has instituted programs encouraging communities to identify and mitigate the causes of repetitive losses. A recent report on repetitive losses by the National Wildlife Federation found that 20% of these properties are outside any mapped 100-year floodplain. The key identifiers for repetitive loss properties are the existence of flood insurance policies and claims paid by the policies.

FEMA-sponsored programs, require participating communities to identify repetitive loss areas. A repetitive loss area is the portion of a floodplain holding structures that FEMA has identified as meeting the definition of repetitive loss. Identifying repetitive loss areas helps to identify structures that are at risk but are not on FEMA's list of repetitive loss structures because no flood insurance policy was in force at the time of loss. Figure 12-13 shows the location of repetitive loss properties in Wharton County and the participating communities.

The City of East Bernard has one residential repetitive loss property. The City of El Campo has nine residential repetitive loss properties. The City of Wharton has 12 residential repetitive loss properties. Wharton County's unincorporated area has 11 residential repetitive loss properties.

Figure 12-13. Repetitive Loss Properties in Wharton County



12.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

HAZUS-MH was used to estimate the flood loss potential to critical facilities exposed to the flood risk. Using depth/damage function curves to estimate the percent of damage to the building and contents of critical facilities, HAZUS-MH correlates these estimates into an estimate of functional down-time (the estimated time it will take to restore a facility to 100% of its functionality). This helps to gauge how long the planning area could have limited usage of facilities deemed critical to flood response and recovery.

The HAZUS-MH critical facility analysis found that, on average, critical facilities would receive some damage to structure and contents during a 100-year or 500-year flood event. Countywide, both the 100-year and 500-year flood scenarios would result in moderate damage (10 to 50%) to one police station, one hospital, and two schools. Significant functionality would be lost during these events.

12.6.4 Environment

The environment vulnerable to flood hazards is the same as the environment exposed to the hazard. Loss estimation platforms such as HAZUS-MH are not currently equipped to measure the environmental impacts of flood hazards. The best gauge of the vulnerability of the environment would be a review of damage from past flood events. Loss data that segregates damage to the environment was not available at the time of this plan. Capturing this data from future events could be beneficial in measuring the vulnerability of the environment for future updates.

12.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

Wharton County and its planning partners are equipped to handle future growth within flood hazard areas. All municipal planning partners have plans and policies that address frequently flooded areas. All partners have committed to linking their plans to this hazard mitigation plan update. This will create an opportunity for sound watershed-wide land-use decisions and floodplain management practices as future growth impacts flood hazard areas.

Additionally, all municipal planning partners are participants in the NFIP and have adopted flood damage prevention ordinances in response to its requirements. All municipal planning partners have committed to maintaining their good standing under the NFIP through initiatives identified in Section 6.9, Chapter 7, Section 12.6.2, and Table 22-2.

Urban flooding issues that contribute to flash floods are also a concern in more highly developed areas in Wharton County. Jurisdictions in the county are required to develop a stormwater permitting program as mandated by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. This program will help jurisdictions apply effective mitigation measures for stormwater runoff.

The recent dam modernization program on LCRA's dams meets required design safety standards to resist the water load and pressure of the PMF is a step in the right direction. There is, however, always some residual risk and it is expected that the emergency action plans for the dams will be maintained so the appropriate responses can be exercised in case of a dam failure.

12.8 SCENARIO

An intense, short-duration storm could move slowly across the planning area creating significant flash floods with little or no warning. Injuries or fatalities may result if residents are caught off guard by the flood event. Stormwater systems could be overwhelmed and significant flooding could impact a

substantial portion of structures within the planning area. Transportation routes could be cut off due to floodwaters, isolating portions of the planning area. These impacts may last after the floodwater recedes as flash floods in the area have been known to cause extensive damage to roadway infrastructure. Areas that have recently experienced wildfires would contribute to the extent of flooding impacts.

12.9 ISSUES

The major issues for flooding are the following:

- Flash flooding that occurs with little or no warning will continue to impact the planning area.
- The duration and intensity of storms contributing to flooding issues may increase due to climate change.
- Flooding may be exacerbated by other hazards, such as wildfires.
- Damages resulting from a flood may impact tourism, which may have significant impacts on the local economy.
- The promotion of flood insurance as a means of protecting private property owners from the economic impacts of frequent flood events should continue.

Chapter 13.

HURRICANES AND TROPICAL STORMS

| HURRICANE AND TROPICAL STORM RANKING | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| Wharton County | High |
| City of East Bernard | High |
| City of El Campo | High |
| City of Wharton | High |

| DEFINITIONS | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Hurricane | A tropical cyclone with maximum sustained surface winds (using the U.S. 1-minute average) of 64 knot (kt) (74 miles per hour [mph]) or more. |
| Tropical Storm | A tropical cyclone with maximum sustained surface wind speed (using the U.S. 1-minute average) ranges from 34 kt (39 mph) to 63 kt (73 mph). |
| Tropical Depression | A tropical cyclone with maximum sustained surface wind speed (using the U.S. 1-minute average) ranges from 4 kt (39 mph) to 63 kt (73 mph). |

13.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND


13.1.1 Hurricanes and Tropical Storms

Tropical cyclones are classified into three main categories (per intensity): hurricanes, tropical storms, and tropical depressions. Tropical cyclones that affect Texas form in the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic Ocean. Hurricanes are any closed circulation developed around a low-pressure center in which the winds rotate. Winds rotate counter-clockwise in the Northern Hemisphere and clockwise in the Southern Hemisphere. A tropical cyclone refers to any such circulation that develops over tropical waters. The key energy source for a tropical cyclone is the release of latent heat from the condensation of warm water. Their formation requires a low-pressure disturbance, warm sea surface temperature, the rotational force from the spinning of the earth, and the absence of wind shear in the lowest 50,000 feet of the atmosphere. Such storms can have diameters that span thousands of miles and sustain winds that approach 200 miles an hour.

Hurricanes are areas of disturbed weather in the tropics with closed isobars and strong and very pronounced rotary circulation. An area of clear weather called an “eye” is present in the center of the circulation. To qualify as a hurricane, the wind speed must reach 74 miles per hour (mph) or more. Hurricanes are classified based on wind speed and the potential damage they cause. Thunderstorm rain resulting in urban flooding, battering wave action, intense sea level rise, localized coastal erosion, and significant winds are associated with hurricanes.

A tropical storm is a tropical cyclone in which the maximum sustained surface wind speeds range from 39 to 73 mph. At this time the tropical cyclone is assigned a name. During this time, the storm itself becomes more organized and begins to become more circular, resembling a hurricane. Figure 13-1 illustrates historical hurricane tracks affecting the entire study area.

Figure 13-1. Historical Hurricane Paths Affecting Wharton County



Notes: From NOAA IBTrACS Version 4

13.1.2 Hurricane and Tropical Storm Classifications

Hurricanes are classified according to the Saffir-Simpson Hurricane Wind Scale from Category 1 to Category 5 by sustained wind intensity. Table 13-1 lists a description of each category.

| TABLE 13-1. SAFFIR SIMPSON HURRICANE WIND SCALE | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| Category | Sustained Winds (miles per hour) | Types of Damage Due to Hurricane Winds |
| 1 | 74-95 | Very dangerous winds will produce some damage: Well-constructed frame homes could have damage to roofs, shingles, vinyl siding, and gutters. Large branches of trees will snap and shallowly rooted trees may be toppled. Extensive damage to power lines and poles likely will result in power outages that could last a few to several days. |
| 2 | 96-110 | Extremely dangerous winds will cause extensive damage: Well-constructed frame homes could sustain major roof and siding damage. Many shallowly rooted trees will be snapped or uprooted and block numerous roads. Near-total power loss is expected with outages that could last from several days to weeks. |
| 3 (Major) | 111-129 | Devastating damage will occur: Well-built framed homes may incur major damage or removal of roof decking and gable ends. Many trees will be snapped or uprooted, blocking numerous roads. Electricity and water will be unavailable for several days to weeks after the storm passes. |
| 4 (Major) | 130-156 | Catastrophic damage will occur: Well-built framed homes can sustain severe damage with loss of most of the roof structure and/or some exterior walls. Most trees will be snapped or uprooted and power poles downed. Fallen trees and power poles will isolate residential areas. Power outages will last weeks to possibly months. Most of the area will be uninhabitable for weeks or months. |
| 5 (Major) | 157 or higher | Catastrophic damage will occur: A high percentage of framed homes will be destroyed, with total roof failure and wall collapse. Fallen trees and power poles will isolate residential areas. Power outages will last for weeks to possibly months. Most of the area will be uninhabitable for weeks or months. |
| Notes: Other non-hurricane classifications are tropical storms (39-73 miles per hour) and tropical depressions (0-38 miles per hour) From NOAA – National Hurricane Center and Central Pacific Hurricane Center | | |

13.2 HAZARD PROFILE

While hurricanes pose the greatest threat to life and property, tropical storms and depressions also can be devastating. Floods from heavy rains and severe weather, such as tornadoes, can cause extensive damage and loss of life. For example, Tropical Storm Allison produced over 40 inches of rain in the Houston area in 2001, causing approximately \$5 billion in damage and multiple fatalities.

13.2.1 Past Events

Due to Wharton County and participating communities' interior location (approximately 60 miles inland), it is not exposed directly to hurricanes. The hurricanes usually fade and downgrade to tropical storms or tropical depressions as they move away from the coast. According to NOAA, Wharton County and participating communities have been in the direct track of at least 13 tropical cyclones ranging from


tropical depressions to hurricanes. A record count of the seven different hurricane categories within this time period shows four measured Category 1 hurricane conditions, one Category 2 hurricane condition, one Category 4 hurricane condition, five tropical depression conditions, and eight tropical storm conditions. Events whose tracks do not make landfall in Wharton County and participating communities can still have catastrophic consequences on the study area. Notable hurricane, tropical storm, and depression landfalls and other tropical cyclones with serious effects on the study area documented by NOAA between 1851 and 2020 for Wharton County are described below:

- September 19, 1854 (Unnamed Category 1 Hurricane) – Maximum wind speeds were approximately 80 mph.
- June 24, 1880 (Unnamed Tropical Storm) – Maximum wind speeds were approximately 46 mph.
- October 17, 1938 (Unnamed Tropical Storm) – Maximum wind speeds were approximately 40 mph.
- September 19, 1963 (Hurricane Cindy) – Maximum wind speeds were approximately 29 mph. Hurricane Cindy impacted Wharton County as a tropical depression.
- September 6, 1973 (Tropical Storm Delia) – Maximum wind speeds were approximately 46 mph.
- September 6, 1980 (Tropical Storm Danielle) – Maximum wind speeds were approximately 46 mph.
- June 16 to 17, 2015 (Tropical Storm Bill) – Tropical Storm Bill made landfall on Matagorda Island, Matagorda County, Texas at 11:45 am. Its maximum sustained wind speed at landfall was 60 mph. Tropical Storm Bill moved inland and was downgraded to a tropical depression at 1:00 am on June 17. After spending three days over land as a tropical depression, Bill finally transitioned into a post-tropical cyclone on the afternoon of June 20 over eastern Kentucky. Although Bill brought coastal flooding and gusty winds to the Texas Coast at landfall, its primary impact was rainfall flooding. Peak rainfall totals from Bill were: 13.28 inches near El Campo, Texas; 12.53 inches near Healdton, Oklahoma; and 11.77 inches near Ganado, Texas. A Flash Flood Watch was issued for Wharton County. Approximately 11.59 inches of rain was recorded in areas west of El Campo. Approximately 10 to 15 inches of rain fell in 24 hours in several areas of the county. Several flooding problems were reported.
- August 24 to 29, 2017 (Hurricane Harvey) – Hurricane Harvey made landfall along the Texas coast near Port Aransas on August 25 as category 4. Harvey maintained tropical intensity the entire time while inland over the Texas coastal bend and southeast Texas. Flooding from Harvey caused serious damage to Wharton County. Four days after Harvey the Colorado and San Bernard rivers overflowed. The water stayed high for days, cresting at 50.5 feet on the Colorado River, and flooded more than one in three homes in the county.

13.2.2 Location

A recorded event can occur anywhere in the HMP update area, moving inland from the Gulf of Mexico. Figure 13-2 illustrates historical hurricane paths affecting Wharton County and participating communities. Most of these hurricane events become tropical depressions or tropical storms by the time they reach the participating communities. Some however make landfall as major hurricanes.

Figure 13-2. Historical Tropical Storms and Hurricanes Directly Affecting Wharton County



Note: From NOAA IBTrACS Version 4


13.2.3 Frequency

Tropical storms are an annual event occurring from May through November in either the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic Ocean. The peak of the Atlantic hurricane season is in early- to mid-September. On average, approximately seven storms reach hurricane intensity each year. Hurricanes appear to be less frequent during La Niña periods and more prevalent during strong El Niño periods. El Niño, and La Niña, its counterpart, refer to climate conditions in the Pacific Ocean that influence weather patterns in Texas. El Niño is associated with warmer sea surface temperatures and high air pressure systems, while La Niña is associated with cooler ocean temperatures and low air pressure systems. These changes in water temperature and air pressure systems occur in somewhat regular intervals, with El Niño periods having longer durations. Figure 13-3 illustrates the return period in years for hurricanes passing within 50 nautical miles of various locations, where damage can still occur from high-intensity events. Wharton and participating communities have had 59 tropical events between 1851 to 2020.

Future Probability

Thirteen tropical events followed a path through Wharton County. An event with a track through the community is unlikely. However, Wharton and participating communities experienced the effects of 59 tropical events. A tropical event that could affect the community occurs approximately every three years.

Figure 13-3: Estimated Return Period in Years for Hurricanes Passing Within 50 Nautical Miles of Various Locations



Note: From National Hurricane Center and Central Pacific Hurricane Center – Tropical Cyclone Climatology

13.2.4 Severity

Historic events indicate that a hurricane will affect Wharton County and participating communities as a lower category hurricane, thunderstorm, tropical depression, or related weather event (high winds, hail). These hazards are discussed in more detail in Chapter 14.

13.2.5 Warning Time

Meteorologists can often predict the likelihood and path of a hurricane or tropical storm. Meteorologists can give several days of warning before a storm. However, meteorologists cannot predict the exact time of onset or severity of the storm. At times, warning for the onset of severe weather may be limited. People generally rely on weather forecasts from the City of Wharton.

13.3 SECONDARY EVENTS

Secondary events associated with a hurricane reaching Wharton County and participating communities are similar to that of a tropical storm, depression, or related weather event (such as wind, hail, or lightning). By the time a hurricane reaches Wharton County and participating communities, it will be more closely classified as a secondary weather thunderstorm event (such as wind, hail, or lightning). These are the secondary events of a hurricane or tropical event. Even after the high winds subside, floods brought on by the heavy rainfalls can be dangerous. As a hurricane or tropical storm moves inland and begins to break up, the storm remnants can drop 6 to 12 or more inches of rain, resulting in extensive damage and loss of life. The most significant secondary hazards associated with severe local storms are floods, falling and downed trees, and downed power lines. Landslides occur when the soil on slopes becomes oversaturated and fails. Fires can occur as a result of lightning strikes. High winds from the storm can turn debris into flying projectiles. Debris carried by high winds can also result in injury or damage to property. The lack of proper management of trees may exacerbate damage from high winds. The damage to the infrastructure and land of Wharton County and participating communities may impact tourism; for example, damage may impact the Polka Festival hosted by the City of El Campo each year.

13.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

It's unclear whether climate change will increase or decrease the frequency of hurricanes and tropical storms, but warmer ocean surface temperatures and higher sea levels are expected to intensify their impacts. Hurricanes are subject to various climate change related influences. Warmer sea surface temperatures could intensify tropical storms' wind speeds, potentially delivering more damage if they make landfall. Based on sophisticated computer modeling, scientists expect hurricane speeds to increase by up to 10% and precipitation to increase by 10 to 15%. In the past 10 years, the average Atlantic hurricane season has had an increased probability of named storms and hurricanes with an average of two more named storms and one more hurricane.

In addition, sea-level rise is likely to make future coastal storms, including hurricanes, more damaging. Globally averaged, sea level is expected to rise by 1 to 4 feet during the next century, which will amplify coastal storm surge. For example, sea-level rise intensified the impact of Hurricane Sandy, which caused an estimated \$65 billion in damages in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut in 2012. Much of this damage was related to coastal flooding (Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, no date).

13.5 EXPOSURE

Property, population, and the natural environment are all exposed to hurricanes and tropical storms, however, by the time such an event reaches Wharton County, it will be more closely classified as a tropical storm, depression, or related event (such as hail, high winds, or lightning). The entire population of the planning area would be affected by the tropical storm or tropical depression to some degree. Business interruption could keep people from working, road closures could isolate populations, and loss of functions of utilities could impact populations that suffered no direct damage from an event. Table 13-2 lists the exposed structures and population to hurricanes, tropical storms, and tropical depressions per participating community.

| TABLE 13-2 EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|------------|------------------|------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 909 | 62 | 43 | 1,014 | 2,272 |
| City of El Campo | 4,465 | 352 | 200 | 5,017 | 11,602 |
| City of Wharton | 3,299 | 321 | 138 | 3,758 | 8,832 |
| Unincorporated Area | 6,799 | 210 | 181 | 7,190 | 18,574 |
| Wharton County Total | 15,472 | 945 | 562 | 16,979 | 41,280 |
| Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications. | | | | | |

13.6 VULNERABILITY

The Level 1 HAZUS-MH protocol was used to assess the vulnerability of the planning area to hurricanes and tropical storms. The model used U.S. Census data at the tract level and modeled storms initiated in the Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, Gulf of Mexico, and eastern and central Pacific Ocean. The HAZUS-MH default data (updated with 2010 Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs) were used.

HAZUS-MH calculates losses to structures from hurricanes by looking at wind speeds, winds tracks, and amount of precipitation. Using historical storm data, HAZUS-MH estimates probabilistic storm scenarios. The historic storm database contains precomputed wind fields and storm tracks for Category 3, 4, and 5 landfalling hurricanes from 1900 to 2018. For this analysis, a probabilistic HAZUS-MH hurricane scenario was selected for the County. Since HAZUS does not allow for a hurricane analysis specific to a city limit, thus the loss estimates for each city were weighted based on the flood loss estimates presented in Chapter 12 of this report. Table 13-4 lists annualized loss estimates for the 100-year probabilistic event scenario. Peak gust wind speeds for the 100-year probabilistic scenario are between 99 mph to 116 mph (Figure 13-4). Approximately 10% of the buildings (mostly residential) are expected to sustain moderate damages for this scenario. The annualized economic loss estimated for this probabilistic hurricane scenario (for Wharton County) is approximately \$10.5 million.

Table 13-3 lists the vulnerable population per participating community. Table 13-4. list the impact in terms of dollar losses.

| TABLE 13-3 MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Youth Population (< 16) | % of Total Population | Elderly Population (> 65) | % of Total Population | Economically Disadvantage (Income < \$20,000) | % of Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 638 | 28.07 | 342 | 15.05 | 129 | 5.68 |
| City of El Campo | 3402 | 29.33 | 1648 | 14.21 | 992 | 8.55 |
| City of Wharton | 2317 | 26.23 | 1288 | 14.58 | 1251 | 14.17 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4,715 | 25.39 | 2,741 | 14.76 | 1,537 | 8.28 |
| Wharton County Total | 11,072 | 26.82 | 6,019 | 14.58 | 3,910 | 9.47 |

| TABLE 13-4. LOSS ESTIMATES FOR HURRICANE EVENT | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Annualized Loss (\$) | | | Exposed Value* (\$) | % of Total Exposed Value |
| | Structure | Contents | Total | | |
| City of East Bernard | 675,219 | 187,178 | 862,178 | 429,246,000 | 0.2 |
| City of El Campo | 1,746,449 | 584,169 | 2,330,618 | 2,269,332,000 | 0.1 |
| City of Wharton | 1,031,494 | 345,024 | 1,376,517 | 1,535,539,000 | 0.1 |
| Unincorporated Area | 3,177,838 | 1,101,629 | 4,279,467 | 2,204,334,000 | 0.2 |
| Wharton County Total | 6,631,000 | 2,218,000 | 8,849,000 | 6,438,451,000 | 0.14 |
| Note: *Exposed Value is equal to the total Assessed Value in each community. | | | | | |

Vulnerability Narrative

All participating communities are equally at risk to hurricanes, tropical storms, and tropical depressions. The extent of a hurricane event for each jurisdiction is described below.


- City of East Bernard** - Probabilistic Peak Wind Gusts for the City of East Bernard are approximately 99–116 mph. Approximately 6.5% of the City of East Bernard’s housing is manufactured homes. These are more vulnerable to high winds from an event. Property along drainage areas that have not been cleaned out are more prone to flooding. Communities that do not implement Emergency Response Plans or identify and educate vulnerable areas increase their risk. Residents unaware of their risk or the hazards associated with hurricanes are less able to effectively prepare or respond.

- **City of El Campo** - Probabilistic Peak Wind Gusts for the City of El Campo are approximately 99–116 mph. Approximately 6.1% of the City of El Campo’s housing is manufactured homes. These are more vulnerable to high winds from an event. Any ungrounded structures or property could become flying debris causing further damage to properties in the area. Residents unable to receive notification, those in communities without emergency alert systems, are more at risk. Structures built without the benefit of building requirements designed to minimize the risk of property damage are more vulnerable as well.
- **City of Wharton** - Probabilistic Peak Wind Gusts for the City of Wharton are approximately 99–116 mph. Approximately 8.9% of the City of Wharton’s housing is manufactured homes. These are more vulnerable to high winds from an event. If an event were to impact critical facilities, such as emergency response facilities and schools, many residents could be negatively affected and response times could increase. Property along drainage areas that have not been cleaned out are more prone to flooding. Communities that do not have mitigation measures and funding sources in place increase their risk as well.
- **Wharton County (Unincorporated Area)** - Probabilistic Peak Wind Gusts for Wharton County Unincorporated Areas range between approximately 99-116 mph. Approximately 19.9% of the County’s Unincorporated Area’s housing is manufactured homes. These are more vulnerable to high winds from an event. Properties throughout the HMP update area located along the Colorado River are vulnerable to wave action erosion and flooding caused by high winds and intense rainfall. Communities that do not provide shelters for vulnerable residents increase their risk. Critical facilities such as emergency response and medical facilities could be impacted by an event increasing response times. These response times would be longer for rural residents, especially if major thoroughfares such as US 59 were impacted. Communities that do not monitor and implement improvements needed to roadways increase their vulnerability to these impacts.

Community Perception of Vulnerability

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this HMP update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

Figure 13-4. 100-Year Probabilistic Peak Wind Gusts for Wharton County



13.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

The threat of tropical storms is constant in Texas. From the Gulf of Mexico coastline to Central Texas, the adverse effects of tropical storms and hurricanes will be felt. Tropical storms and hurricanes may cause billions of dollars in damages. Hurricane trends change yearly and future trends are difficult to predict. Colorado State University released their 2021 hurricane season outlook predicted that an above-average hurricane season is likely. This outlook calls for 17 named storms, 8 hurricanes, and 3 major hurricanes. However, Global Weather Oscillations Inc., a leading hurricane cycle prediction company, predicts 17 named storms, 9 hurricanes, 5 major hurricanes. Therefore, communities and community leaders need to remain alert and informed of seasonal predictions and developments.

13.8 SCENARIO

A worst-case scenario would be for a very large and severe hurricane to make landfall at the Texas Gulf Coast of Matagorda County and move inland through Wharton County. Such a powerful storm at landfall would have significant impacts in Wharton County and beyond. This storm could cause severe flooding, tornadoes, and wind damage to infrastructure throughout the county. This could significantly slow emergency response time and cause public utilities to be offline for weeks. A large storm would leave a large path of damage across South and Central Texas, straining resources throughout the county and state.

13.9 ISSUES

Important issues associated with a tropical storm in Wharton County and the participating communities include the following:

- The older building stock in the planning area is built to low code standards or none at all. These structures could be highly vulnerable to severe weather events such as hurricanes and tropical storms.
- The redundancy of the power supply must be evaluated.
- The potential for isolation after a severe storm event is high.
- Flash flooding that occurs with little or no warning will continue to impact the planning area.
- The promotion of flood insurance as a means of protecting private property owners from the economic impacts of frequent flood events should continue.
- Roads and bridges blocked by debris or otherwise damaged might isolate populations.
- Warning time may not be adequate for residents to seek appropriate shelter or such shelter may not be widespread throughout the planning area.
- The impacts of climate change on the frequency and severity of hurricanes and tropical storms are not well understood.

Chapter 14.

LIGHTNING, HAIL, & WIND

| LIGHTNING, HAIL, AND WIND RANKING | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|
| | Lightning | Hail | Wind |
| Wharton County | Low | Medium | Low |
| City of East Bernard | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| City of El Campo | Medium | Medium | High |
| City of Wharton | Low | Low | Low |

| <u>DEFINITIONS</u> | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Severe Local Storm | Small-scale atmospheric systems, including tornadoes, thunderstorms, windstorms, ice storms, and snowstorms. These storms may cause a great deal of destruction and even death, but their impact is generally confined to a small area. Typical impacts are on transportation infrastructure and utilities. |
| Thunderstorm | A storm featuring heavy rains, strong winds, thunder, and lightning, typically about 15 miles in diameter and lasting about 30 minutes. Hail and tornadoes are also dangers associated with thunderstorms. Lightning is a serious threat to human life. Heavy rains over a small area in a short time can lead to flash flooding. |
| Windstorm | A storm featuring violent winds. Windstorms tend to damage ridgelines that face the wind. |

14.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND


A thunderstorm is a rain event that includes thunder, wind, hail, and lightning. A thunderstorm is classified as “severe” when it contains one or more of the following: hail with a diameter of one inch or greater, winds gusting in excess of 50 kt (57.5 mph), or tornadoes. For this hazard mitigation plan, each component of a thunderstorm (lightning, hail, and winds) will be profiled below. Thunderstorms, as a whole, are not a Texas State Hazard per the Texas State Mitigation Plan Update 2018. ‘Thunderstorm’ is used in this section as a descriptive term to qualify hail, wind, and lightning atmospheric events. Thunderstorms are described below for general reference information and not a profiled hazard.

Three factors cause thunderstorms to form: moisture, rising unstable air (air that keeps rising when disturbed), and a lifting mechanism to provide the disturbance. The sun heats the surface of the earth, which warms the air above it. If this warm surface air is forced to rise (hills or mountains can cause rising motion, as can the interaction of warm air and cold air or wet air and dry air) it will continue to rise as long as it weighs less and stays warmer than the air around it. As the air rises, it transfers heat from the surface of the earth to the upper levels of the atmosphere (the process of convection). The water vapor it contains begins to cool and it condenses into a cloud. The cloud eventually grows upward into areas where the temperature is below freezing. Some of the water vapor turns to ice and some of it turns into water droplets. Both have electrical charges. Ice particles usually have positive charges, and rain droplets usually have negative charges. When the charges build up enough, they are discharged in a bolt of

lightning, which causes the sound waves we hear as thunder. Thunderstorms have three stages (see Figure 14-1):

- The **developing stage** of a thunderstorm is marked by a cumulus cloud that is being pushed upward by a rising column of air (updraft). The cumulus cloud soon looks like a tower (called towering cumulus) as the updraft continues to develop. There is little to no rain during this stage but occasional lightning. The developing stage lasts about 10 minutes.
- The thunderstorm enters the **mature stage** when the updraft continues to feed the storm, but precipitation begins to fall out of the storm, and a downdraft begins (a column of air pushing downward). When the downdraft and rain-cooled air spread out along the ground, they form a gust front or a line of gusty winds. The mature stage is the most likely time for hail, heavy rain, frequent lightning, strong winds, and tornadoes. The storm occasionally has a black or dark green appearance.
- Eventually, a large amount of precipitation is produced and the updraft is overcome by the downdraft beginning the **dissipating stage**. On the ground, the gust front moves out a long distance from the storm and cuts off the warm moist air that was feeding the thunderstorm. Rainfall decreases in intensity, but lightning remains a danger.

Figure 14-1. Thunderstorm Life Cycle



There are four types of thunderstorms:

- **Single-Cell Thunderstorms**—Single-cell thunderstorms usually last 20 to 30 minutes. A true single-cell storm is rare because the gust front of one cell often triggers the growth of another. Most single-cell storms are not usually severe, but a single-cell storm can produce a brief severe weather event. When this happens, it is called a pulse severe storm.
- **Multi-Cell Cluster Storm**—A multi-cell cluster is the most common type of thunderstorm. The multi-cell cluster consists of a group of cells, moving as one unit, with each cell in a different phase of the thunderstorm life cycle. Mature cells are usually found at the center of the cluster and dissipating cells at the downwind edge. Multi-cell cluster storms can produce moderate-size hail, flash floods, and weak tornadoes. Each cell in a multi-cell cluster lasts only about 20 minutes; the multi-cell cluster itself may persist for several hours. This type of storm is usually more intense than a single-cell storm.

- **Multi-Cell Squall Line**—A multi-cell line storm, or squall line, consists of a long line of storms with a continuous well-developed gust front at the leading edge. The line of storms can be solid, or there can be gaps and breaks in the line. Squall lines can produce hail up to golf ball size, heavy rainfall, and weak tornadoes, but they are best known as the producers of strong downdrafts. Occasionally, a strong downburst will accelerate a portion of the squall line ahead of the rest of the line. This produces what is called a bow echo. Bow echoes can develop with isolated cells as well as squall lines. Bow echoes are easily detected on the radar but are difficult to observe visually.
- **Super-Cell Storm**—A super-cell is a highly organized thunderstorm that poses a high threat to life and property. It is similar to a single-cell storm in that it has one main updraft, but the updraft is extremely strong, reaching speeds of 150 to 175 mph. Super-cells are rare. The main characteristic that sets them apart from other thunderstorms is the presence of rotation. The rotating updraft of a super-cell (called a mesocyclone when visible on radar) helps the super-cell to produce extreme weather events, such as giant hail (more than 2 inches in diameter), strong downbursts of 80 mph or more, and strong to violent tornadoes.

14.1.1 Lightning

Lightning is an electrical discharge between positive and negative regions of a thunderstorm. A lightning flash is composed of a series of strokes with an average of about four. The length and duration of each lightning stroke vary but typically average about 30 microseconds.

Lightning is one of the more dangerous and unpredictable weather hazards in the United States and Texas. Each year, lightning is responsible for deaths, injuries, and millions of dollars in property damage, including damage to buildings, communications systems, power lines, and electrical systems. Lightning also causes forest and brush fires as well as deaths and injuries to livestock and other animals. According to the NOAA, lightning strikes the U.S about 25 million times and on average kills 49 people and injures hundreds more each year. The latest data available from the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) show that there were an average of 22,600 fires between 2007 and 2011. These fires caused an average of nine civilian deaths and \$451 million in direct property damage per year, according to the NFPA. The impact of lightning can be direct or indirect. People or objects can be directly struck, or damage can occur indirectly when the current passes through or near it.

Intra-cloud lightning is the most common type of discharge. This occurs between oppositely charged centers within the same cloud. Usually, it takes place inside the cloud and looks from the outside of the cloud like a diffuse brightening that flickers. However, the flash may exit the boundary of the cloud, and a bright channel can be visible for many miles.


Although not as common, cloud-to-ground lightning is the most damaging and dangerous form of lightning. Most flashes originate near the lower-negative charge center and deliver a negative charge to the earth. However, a minority of flashes carry a positive charge to earth. These positive flashes often occur during the dissipating stage of a thunderstorm's life. Positive flashes are also more common as a percentage of total ground strikes during the winter months. This type of lightning is particularly dangerous for several reasons. It frequently strikes away from the rain core, either ahead or behind the thunderstorm. It can strike as far as 5 or 10 miles from the storm in areas that most people do not consider to be a threat. Positive lightning also has a longer duration, so fires are more easily ignited. And, when positive lightning strikes, it usually carries a high peak electrical current, potentially resulting in greater damage.

The ratio of cloud-to-ground and intra-cloud lightning can vary significantly from storm to storm. Depending upon cloud height above ground and changes in electric field strength between cloud and earth, the discharge stays within the cloud or makes direct contact with the earth. If the field strength is highest in the lower regions of the cloud, a downward flash may occur from cloud to earth. Using a network of lightning detection systems, NOAA monitors a yearly average of 25 million strokes of lightning from the cloud-to-ground. Figure 14-2 shows the lightning flash density for the nation. U.S. lightning statistics compiled by NOAA between 2006 and 2019 indicate that most lightning incidents occur during the summer months of June, July, and August.

Figure 14-2. Average Annual National Lightning Density

Average U.S. total lightning density, 2015–2019

1,084,890,070 events detected



Note: From Vaisala-National Lightning Detecting Network


14.1.2 Hail

Hail occurs when updrafts in thunderstorms carry raindrops upward into extremely cold areas of the atmosphere where they freeze into ice. Figure 14-3 shows the hail path across the nation. Recent studies suggest that super-cooled water may accumulate on frozen particles near the back-side of a storm as they are pushed forward across and above the updraft by the prevailing winds near the top of the storm. Eventually, the hailstones encounter downdraft air and fall to the ground.

Hailstones grow two ways: by wet growth or dry growth. In wet growth, a tiny piece of ice is in an area where the air temperature is below freezing, but not super cold. When the tiny piece of ice collides with a super-cooled drop, the water does not freeze on the ice immediately. Instead, liquid water spreads across tumbling hailstones and slowly freezes. Since the process is slow, air bubbles can escape, resulting in a layer of clear ice. Dry growth hailstones grow when the air temperature is well below freezing and the water droplet freezes immediately as it collides with the ice particle. The air bubbles are “frozen” in place, leaving cloudy ice.

Hailstones can have layers like an onion if they travel up and down in an updraft, or they can have few or no layers if they are “balanced” in an updraft. One can tell how many times a hailstone traveled to the top of the storm by counting its layers. Hailstones can begin to melt and then re-freeze together, forming large and very irregularly shaped hail. NWS classifies hail as non-severe and severe based on hail diameter size. Descriptions and diameter sizes are provided in Table 14-1.

Figure 14-3. National Hail Paths




Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center

| TABLE 14-1. NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE HAIL SEVERITY | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Severity | Description | Hail Diameter Size |
| Non-Severe Hail Does not typically cause damage and does not warrant severe thunderstorm warning from National Weather Service. | Pea | 1/4" |
| | Plain M&M Candy | 1/2" |
| | Penny | 3/4" |
| | Nickel | 7/8" |
| Severe Hail Research has shown that damage occurs after hail reaches around one inch in diameter and larger. Hail of this size will trigger a severe thunderstorm warning from National Weather Service. | Quarter | 1" (severe) |
| | Half Dollar | 1 1/4" |
| | Walnut/Ping Pong Ball | 1 1/2" |
| | Golf Ball | 1 3/4" |
| | Hen Egg/Lime | 2" |
| | Tennis Ball | 2 1/2" |
| | Baseball | 2 3/4" |
| | Teacup/Large Apple | 3" |
| | Grapefruit | 4" |
| | Softball | 4 1/2" |
| | Computer CD-DVD | 4 3/4" - 5" |

NOAA's National Severe Storms Laboratory used historical data to estimate the daily probability of hail occurrences across the U.S., regardless of storm magnitude. Figure 14-4 shows the average number of hail days per year. The density per 25 square miles in the map's legend indicates the probable number of hail days for each 25 square mile cell within the contoured zone that can be expected over a similar period of record. It should be noted that the density number does NOT indicate the number of events that can be expected across the entire zone on the map.

Figure 14-4. Mean Number of Hail > 1.00" Days per Year Within 25 miles of a Point (1986-2015)




Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center WCM

14.1.3 Wind

Damaging winds are classified as those exceeding 60 mph. Figure 14-5 shows the wind zones in the nation. NOAA's Storm Events Database has a strong wind inventory from 1955 to 2020. Figure 14-6 shows the thunderstorm wind paths from 1955 to 2019. According to NOAA's National Severe Storm Laboratory (NSSL), damage from such winds accounts for half of all severe weather reports in the lower 48 states and is more common than damage from tornadoes. Wind speeds can reach up to 100 mph and can produce a damage path extending for hundreds of miles. There are seven types of damaging winds:


- **Straight-line winds**—Any thunderstorm wind that is not associated with rotation; this term is used mainly to differentiate from tornado winds. Most thunderstorms produce some straight-line winds as a result of outflow generated by the thunderstorm downdraft.
- **Downdrafts**—A small-scale column of air that rapidly sinks toward the ground.
- **Downbursts**—A strong downdraft with horizontal dimensions larger than 2.5 miles resulting in an outward burst or damaging winds on or near the ground. Downburst winds may begin as a microburst and spread out over a wider area, sometimes producing damage similar to a strong tornado. Although usually associated with thunderstorms, downbursts can occur with showers too weak to produce thunder.
- **Microbursts**—A small concentrated downburst that produces an outward burst of damaging winds at the surface. Microbursts are generally less than 2.5 miles across and short-lived, lasting only 5 to 10 minutes, with maximum wind speeds up to 168 mph. There are two kinds of microbursts: wet and dry. A wet microburst is accompanied by heavy precipitation at the surface. Dry microbursts, common in places like the high plains and the intermountain west, occur with little or no precipitation reaching the ground.
- **Gust front**—A gust front is the leading edge of rain-cooled air that clashes with warmer thunderstorm inflow. Gust fronts are characterized by a wind shift, temperature drop, and gusty winds out ahead of a thunderstorm. Sometimes the winds push up the air above them, forming a shelf cloud or detached roll cloud.
- **Derecho**—A derecho is a widespread thunderstorm wind caused when new thunderstorms form along the leading edge of an outflow boundary (the boundary formed by horizontal spreading of thunderstorm-cooled air). The word “derecho” is of Spanish origin and means “straight ahead.” Thunderstorms feed on the boundary and continue to reproduce. Derechos typically occur in summer when complexes of thunderstorms form over plains, producing heavy rain and severe wind. The damaging winds can last a long time and cover a large area.
- **Bow Echo**—A bow echo is a linear wind front bent outward in a bow shape. Damaging straight-line winds often occur near the center of a bow echo. Bow echoes can be 200 miles long, last for several hours, and produce extensive wind damage at the ground.
- NOAA's NSSL used historical data to estimate the daily probability of wind occurrences across the U.S., regardless of storm magnitude. Figure 14-7 shows the estimates for damaging winds with 50 kts or greater. The density per 25 square miles in the map's legend indicates the probable number of winds for each 25 square mile cell within the contoured zone that can be expected over a similar period of record. It should be noted that the density number does NOT indicate the number of events that can be expected across the entire zone on the map.

Figure 14-5. National Wind Zones




Note: From FEMA - Taking Shelter from The Storm

Figure 14-6. National High Wind Paths



Note: Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center

Figure 14-7. National Annual High Wind Days



Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center

14.2 HAZARD PROFILE

14.2.1 Past Events

Lightning


Data from the National Lightning Detection Network ranked Texas first in the nation (excluding Alaska and Hawaii) with respect to the number of cloud-to-ground lightning flashes in 2020. In 2020 Texas recorded 33,816,168 cloud-to-ground lightning strikes. The majority of lightning events occur in the Eastern part of the state with the highest total lightning density occurring in the central plains. In 2020 there were a total of 385,629 lightning strikes in Wharton County. The 5-year average for lightning events in Wharton County was 6 to 8 flashes per km² per year as shown in Figure 14-2.

Figure 14-8 shows state-by-state lightning deaths between 1959 and 2020. Texas ranks second for the number of deaths at 234. Texas has a 0.25 death rate per million people from lightning strikes according to 1959 to 2017 data published by NWS.

Table 14-2 lists the documented lightning events for Wharton County and participating communities as documented by the National Climatic Data Center Storm Events Database as well as locally available data. There were no reported injuries or fatalities from lightning in Wharton County between 1996 and 2020.

| TABLE 14-2. HISTORIC LIGHTNING EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY (1996-2020) | | | |
|--|------------|-----------------------|-------|
| Location | Date | Estimated Damage Cost | |
| | | Property | Crops |
| East Bernard | 05/10/2006 | \$20,000 | \$0 |
| East Bernard | 05/10/2006 | \$25,000 | \$0 |
| El Campo | 05/27/2009 | \$15,000 | \$0 |
| Note: From http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/stormevents | | | |

Figure 14-8. Lightning Fatalities in the U.S. (1959-2020)



Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center

Hail

The National Centers for Environmental Information Storm Events Database lists 80 hail events in Wharton County and participating communities between 1955 and 2020. Severe hail events (hail size > 1.00”) are noted in Table 14-3. None of these events resulted in injuries or deaths. Events listed as Wharton County, Wharton, Countywide, or County in Table 14-3 affected large portions of the HMP update area. Large systems may have affected additional jurisdictions. These are also included in Table 14-3. Specific events for the participating communities are described below.

Event Descriptions

City of East Bernard – The City of East Bernard had 6 events from 1955 to 2020. Three significant events are described below.

- On April 2, 2000, quarter-sized hail was reported in East Bernard and at Spanish Camp.
- On April 2, 2013, a severe thunderstorm produced quarter to golf ball-sized hail.
- On May 3, 2019, a severe thunderstorm produced quarter-sized hail along with some wind gusts and tornado damage.

City of El Campo – The City of El Campo had 9 events from 1955 to 2020. Three significant events are described below.

- On March 30, 2002, Emergency Management and Sheriff witnessed baseball-sized hail at State Highway 59 and FM 1163, with one-inch hail covering the ground.
- On December 12, 2002, there was 0.75-inch hail reported in the El Campo area.
- On April 11, 2004, golf ball-size hail was reported by residents in El Campo.

City of Wharton – The City of Wharton had 20 events from 1955 to 2020. Three significant events are described below.

- On September 9, 1997, severe roof and car damage was reported from 1.25-inch hail.
- On April 11, 2004, quarter-size hail in Wharton was reported.
- On June 13, 2006, golf ball-size hail was reported on County Road 120.

Wharton County (Unincorporated Areas) - Wharton County Unincorporated Areas had 44 significant events from 1955 to 2020. Three significant events are described below.

- On February 10, 1985 thunderstorm winds blew over a trailer in Mackay, located near Wharton. ¾ inch hail fell also.
- On April 15, 2015, a passing southwestern shortwave disturbance produced quarter-sized hail which damaged an agricultural field in Danevang near the intersection of CR 407 and CR 414.
- On December 5, 2016, a late-night severe thunderstorm produced quarter-sized to golf ball-sized hail in Dinsmore near County Roads 123 and 154.

TABLE 14-3.
HISTORIC HAIL EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY AND PARTICIPATING
COMMUNITIES
(1960-2014)

| Location | Date | Hail Size | <u>Estimated Damage Cost</u> | | Injuries | Deaths |
|--------------|------------|-----------|------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|
| | | | Property | Crops | | |
| WHARTON CO. | 06/25/1962 | 1.75 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON CO. | 10/30/1969 | 2 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON CO. | 05/09/1981 | 1.75 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON CO. | 06/07/1985 | 1.75 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON CO. | 07/23/1989 | 1 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| East Bernard | 04/22/1995 | 1 | \$1,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 05/11/1996 | 1.75 | \$5,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| EGYPT | 06/20/1996 | 4.5 | \$5,000,000 | \$5,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 04/25/1997 | 1.75 | \$10,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| HUNGERFORD | 04/25/1997 | 1.75 | \$10,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 09/09/1997 | 1 | \$3,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 09/09/1997 | 1.25 | \$15,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| EL CAMPO | 06/05/1998 | 1.75 | \$10,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| LOUISE | 06/05/1998 | 2 | \$10,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| LOUISE | 05/02/1999 | 1.75 | \$40,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| DANEVANG | 05/02/1999 | 1.75 | \$40,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| EAST BERNARD | 04/02/2000 | 1 | \$15,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| EAST BERNARD | 08/02/2000 | 1 | \$25,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| HILLJE | 03/30/2002 | 1 | \$10,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| LOUISE | 03/30/2002 | 1.75 | \$20,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| EL CAMPO | 03/30/2002 | 2.75 | \$50,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 03/13/2003 | 1 | \$6,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 03/13/2003 | 1 | \$6,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE 14-3.
HISTORIC HAIL EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY AND PARTICIPATING
COMMUNITIES
(1960-2014)

| Location | Date | Hail Size | <u>Estimated Damage Cost</u> | | Injuries | Deaths |
|--------------|------------|-----------|------------------------------|-------|----------|--------|
| | | | Property | Crops | | |
| WHARTON | 03/13/2003 | 1.75 | \$9,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| EAST BERNARD | 04/07/2003 | 1.75 | \$4,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| PIERCE | 04/11/2004 | 1 | \$5,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| EL CAMPO | 04/11/2004 | 1.75 | \$20,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 04/11/2004 | 1.75 | \$20,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| BOLING | 05/14/2006 | 1.75 | \$20,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 06/13/2006 | 1.75 | \$15,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 03/06/2008 | 1.75 | \$3,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 06/19/2008 | 1 | \$9,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| BOLING | 06/21/2008 | 1.75 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| EAST BERNARD | 01/09/2012 | 1.5 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 04/02/2013 | 1 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| WHARTON | 04/02/2013 | 1.5 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| DINSMORE | 04/02/2013 | 1.5 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| DON TOL | 04/02/2013 | 1.75 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| DANEVANG | 04/16/2015 | 1 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| DINSMORE | 12/05/2016 | 1.75 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| NEW TAITON | 02/26/2019 | 1 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| EAST BERNARD | 05/03/2019 | 1 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |

Notes:

The table may list more events than are shown on related figures since some recorded events do not include specific geographic (GIS-enabled data) coordinates for precise graphical representation.

From NOAA Storm Events Database

Winds

High winds occur year-round in Wharton County and participating communities. In the spring and summer, which are generally warm and humid in Texas, high winds often accompany severe thunderstorms. The varying topography in the area has the potential for continuous and sudden high wind gusts. The northern winds are a fairly common wintertime phenomenon in Southern Texas. These winds develop in well-defined areas and can be quite strong with resulting drastic drops in air temperatures. Atmospheric conditions are expected to continue unchanged with windstorms remaining a perennial occurrence. Winds of 0 to near 200 mph are possible in the planning area.

Although these high winds may not be life-threatening, they can disrupt daily activities, cause damage to buildings and structures, and increase the potential damage of other hazards. Wind resource information is shown in Figure 14-9 as a proxy for typical wind speeds. Wind resource information is estimated by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) to identify areas that are suitable for wind energy applications. The wind resource is expressed in terms of wind power classes, ranging from Class 1 (lowest) to Class 7 (highest). Each class represents a range of mean wind power density or approximate mean wind speed at specified heights above the ground (in this case, 50 meters above the ground surface). Table 14-4 identifies the mean wind power density and speed associated with each classification. Figure 14-9 shows the wind power class potential density for Wharton County and participating communities classified as “Poor.” Significant wind events for Wharton County and participating communities are highlighted below. They are also listed in Table 14-5. None of these events resulted in injuries or deaths.

Event Descriptions

City of East Bernard – The City of East Bernard had 8 events from 1955 to 2020. Three significant events are described below.

- June 5, 2011, Law enforcement reported severe thunderstorm winds at over 59 mph in the City of East Bernard. Three injuries were reported.
- On April 16, 2015 trees were downed and there was damage to a barn on the east end of CR 272 near the San Bernard River.
- On June 6, 2019 houses were damaged in the East Bernard area close to Highway 60.

City of El Campo – The City of El Campo had 14 events from 1955 to 2020. Three significant events are described below.

- On April 18, 2009, trees and power lines were blown down near the community of New Taiton.
- On February 14, 2017 power lines were downed near the intersection of West Norris Street and West Loop Street.
- On April 7, 2019 thunderstorm winds downed two trees with two of them blocking roadways and cause \$2,000 worth of crop damage.

City of Wharton – The City of Wharton had 24 significant events from 1955 to 2020. Three significant events are described below.

- On February 1, 2011, downed trees blocked roadways at the intersection of Avenue A and Texas, Cornell and Elm, and in the 800 block of North Alabama in the City of Wharton.

- On April 26, 2015, a late afternoon severe thunderstorm developed and produced damaging wind gusts and hail. The Thunderstorm wind gust was near the intersection of FM 961 and Highway 71.
- On January 19, 2019, a strong cold front wind caused damage to a barn and a shed.

Wharton County (Unincorporated Areas) - Wharton County Unincorporated Areas had 39 significant events from 1955 to 2014. Three significant events are described below.


- On August 26, 2009, a severe thunderstorm produced strong winds that blew down a billboard on Business 59 near Louise.
- On April 26, 2015, a severe thunderstorm wind in Iago tore off a part of a mobile home roof on FM 1301.
- On June 6, 2019, there was trailer damage, trees were uprooted, 2x4's were wedged into the ground and there was debris on power lines near Spanish Camp.

| TABLE 14-4. WIND POWER CLASS AND SPEED | | | |
|---|------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Rank | Wind Power Class | Wind Power Density at 50 meters (W/m ²) | Wind Speed at 50 meters (mph) |
| Poor | 1 | 0-200 | 0-12.5 |
| Marginal | 2 | 200-300 | 12.5-14.3 |
| Fair | 3 | 300-400 | 14.3-15.7 |
| Good | 4 | 400-500 | 15.7-16.8 |
| Excellent | 5 | 500-600 | 16.8-17.9 |
| Outstanding | 6 | 600-800 | 17.9-19.7 |
| Superb | 7 | 800-2000 | 19.7-26.6 |
| Note: Mph Miles per hour W/m ² Watts per square meter From National Renewable Energy Laboratory | | | |

Historical severe weather data from the NCDC Storm Events Database lists thunderstorm wind events in Wharton County and participating communities between 1955 and December 2020, as shown in Table 14-5. This table was supplemented with local knowledge and news articles of events affecting the participating communities.

The NCDC database as well as locally available datasets list no dust devil or dust storm events for the participating communities. There were several documented tornadoes in Wharton County and participating communities in the 1950 to 2020 time period. These tornadoes are discussed in Chapter 15. Events listed as Wharton County, Wharton, Countywide, or County in Table 14-5 affected large portions of the HMP update area. Large systems may have affected additional jurisdictions.

Figure 14-9. Texas Wind Power



Note: From NREL National Wind Technology Center

TABLE 14-5.
HISTORIC WIND-RELATED EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY AND
PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES
(1950-2014)

| Location | Date | Peak Wind Speed (knots) | <u>Estimated Damage Cost</u> | | Injuries | Deaths |
|----------------|------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------|----------|--------|
| | | | Property | Crops | | |
| Wharton County | 04/20/1985 | 52 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton County | 05/04/1991 | 91 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton County | 02/22/1992 | 52 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton County | 09/03/1992 | 70 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton County | 06/11/1995 | 52 | \$400,000 | \$10,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Pierce | 04/11/1997 | 55 | \$5,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pierce | 12/23/1997 | 50 | \$3,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| El Campo | 08/31/1999 | 65 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hungerford | 03/30/2002 | 60 | \$3,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 12/23/2002 | 52 | \$35,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 12/23/2002 | 52 | \$35,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| El Campo | 12/30/2002 | 60 | \$10,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 12/30/2002 | 60 | \$12,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| El Campo | 07/24/2003 | 52 | \$0 | \$0 | 1 | 0 |
| Boling | 06/23/2004 | 50 | \$75,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 08/11/2004 | 50 | \$10,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Glen Flora | 11/23/2004 | 65 | \$15,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 03/19/2005 | 52 | \$8,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Countywide | 05/08/2005 | 64 | \$200,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 04/21/2006 | 55 | \$3,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hungerford | 10/12/2006 | 50 | \$1,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 10/16/2006 | 58 | \$2,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| El Campo | 03/12/2007 | 50 | \$8,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Danevang | 03/12/2007 | 50 | \$3,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 03/31/2007 | 52 | \$5,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 06/03/2007 | 65 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Louise | 02/11/2008 | 56 | \$5,000 | \$0 | 1 | 0 |
| El Campo South | 04/18/2008 | 56 | \$10,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 06/19/2008 | 55 | \$2,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| East Bernard | 06/29/2008 | 51 | \$9,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE 14-5.
HISTORIC WIND-RELATED EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY AND
PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES
(1950-2014)

| Location | Date | Peak Wind Speed (knots) | <u>Estimated Damage Cost</u> | | Injuries | Deaths |
|--|------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------|----------|--------|
| | | | Property | Crops | | |
| Hungerford | 06/29/2008 | 51 | \$5,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| El Campo Airport | 04/18/2009 | 52 | \$2,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Taiton | 06/25/2009 | 60 | \$35,000 | \$10,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Newgulf | 08/12/2009 | 52 | \$1,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Louise | 08/26/2009 | 55 | \$6,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 06/08/2010 | 52 | \$10,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 02/01/2011 | 56 | \$5,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 05/12/2011 | 50 | \$15,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| East Bernard | 06/05/2011 | 52 | \$0 | \$0 | 3 | 0 |
| East Bernard | 09/29/2011 | 50 | \$3,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hungerford | 04/02/2012 | 61 | \$30,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hungerford | 06/07/2012 | 52 | \$5,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Magnet | 05/10/2013 | 60 | \$5,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hungerford | 05/26/2014 | 61 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| East Bernard | 04/16/2015 | 52 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| El Campo | 04/17/2015 | 52 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 04/26/2015 | 61 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iago | 04/26/2015 | 56 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hungerford | 05/26/2015 | 60 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| El Campo | 02/14/2017 | 52 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane City | 02/25/2018 | 50 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton | 01/19/2019 | 50 | \$3,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| El Campo | 04/07/2019 | 57 | \$0 | \$2,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Spanish Camp | 06/06/2019 | 53 | \$17,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| East Bernard | 06/06/2019 | 52 | \$11,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Notes: The table may list more events than are shown on related figures since some recorded events do not include specific geographic (GIS-enabled data) coordinates for precise graphical representation. From NCDC | | | | | | |

14.2.2 Location

Severe weather events have the potential to happen anywhere in the planning area. Figure 6-6 shows the distribution of average precipitation over the planning area.

Lightning

The entire extent of Wharton County and participating communities are exposed to some degree of lightning hazard, though exposed points of high elevation have a significantly higher frequency of occurrence. Since lightning can occur at any location, all of the communities could experience lightning

events throughout their respective jurisdictions. There were three lightning damage events recorded by the NOAA Storm Events Database from 1996 to 2020 in the HMP update area. These events were located near the Cities of East Bernard and El Campo (Figure 14-10). The City of Wharton did not have any lightning events recorded by the NOAA Storm Events Database during this period. There were no new lightning-related data from local sources for the 1996 to 2020 time period. The events are described below:


Hail

The entire extent of Wharton County and participating communities are exposed to the hailstorm hazard. Previous instances of hail events in the county are shown in Figure 14-11. Figure 14-11 does not show all hail events shown on Table 14-3 because not all tabular data had geographic locations. Only events listed with GIS data were mapped. Non-GIS-supported events were included in the table to provide more data for participating communities.

Winds


The entire extent of Wharton County and participating communities are exposed to high winds. Storms have the ability to cause damage over 100 miles from the center of storm activity. Wind events are most damaging to heavily wooded areas. Winds impacting walls, doors, windows, and roofs, may cause structural components to fail. Previous occurrences of damaging high winds and the locations that they occurred are shown in Figure 14-12. Previous occurrences of damaging high winds and their respective locations are shown in Figure 14-12. Figure 14-12 does not show all wind events on Table 14-5 because not all tabular data had geographic coordinates. Only events listed with GIS data were mapped. Non-GIS-supported events were included in the table to provide more data for participating communities.

Figure 14-10. Lightning Events in Wharton County (1996-2020)




Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center

Figure 14-11. Hail Events in Wharton County (1955-2019)



Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center

Figure 14-12. Damaging Wind Events in Wharton County (1955-2019)



Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center

14.2.3 Frequency

Lightning

To date, there have been three reported lightning strikes resulting in property damage in Wharton County and participating communities. Texas ranks as second of the highest in lightning fatalities in the nation. Wharton County and all participating communities have approximately 25 to 37 lightning flashes per square mile per year and a thunderstorm lightning event is considered “High”. This frequency statistics applies to all Wharton County and participating communities.

Hail

Based on a record of 42 hailstorm events over a 65-year period, significant hail (>1”) occurs approximately every other year on average and is considered likely. Since hail events can happen anywhere throughout the HMP update area, each participating community has the same frequency and probability for future events (once every 1 to two years). Based on historical records, the City of East Bernard can expect future events to have hail up to 1.75” in diameter hail. Based on historical records, the City of El Campo can expect future events up to 2.75” in diameter hail. Based on historical records, the City of Wharton can expect future events up to 1.75” in diameter hail. Based on historical records, Wharton County Unincorporated area can expect hail up to 2” in diameter. All participating jurisdictions can expect an event every 1 to 2 years in the future.

Winds

Based on 36 events in 65 years, a damaging high-wind (> 50 MPH) event occurs approximately every other year on average in Wharton County and participating communities and is considered likely. Since wind events can happen anywhere throughout the HMP update area, each participating community has the same frequency and probability for future events (once every one to two years).

14.2.4 Severity

Lightning

Based on the information in this hazard profile, the risk of a damaging lightning event in Wharton County and participating communities is likely, but the magnitude/severity of thunderstorms is limited. The number of reported injuries from lightning is likely to be low, and county infrastructure losses are expected to be limited each year.

Hail

Severe hailstorms can be quite destructive. In the United States hail related insured losses between 2000 and 2019 averaged between \$8 billion and \$14 billion a year, according to Aon. Within Texas, over the last 55 years, there’s been \$1.8 billion damage to property and crops. Between 2017-2019 there were a total of 192,988 hail loss claims. The property damage can be as minimal as a few broken shingles to the total destruction of buildings.

The top five states generating hail damage claims were Texas (637,977 claims); Colorado (380,066 claims); Nebraska (161,374 claims); Minnesota (150,673 claims) and Illinois (150,416 claims). Much of the damage inflicted by hail is to crops. Even relatively small hail can shred plants to ribbons in a matter of minutes. Vehicles, roofs of buildings and homes, and landscaping are the other things most commonly damaged by hail. Hail has been known to cause injury to humans and occasionally has been fatal.

A significant hail event occurred on June 20, 1996, in Egypt (an unincorporated community in northern Wharton County). Grapefruit-sized hail fell in Egypt, significantly damaging the roofs and windows of 30 to 40% of homes. Trees snapped and many cars were considered total losses. The event resulted in a significant agricultural loss (1,000 acres of sorghum, 2,000 acres of corn, and 1,000 acres of soybeans were destroyed) and caused over \$10 million in property and crop damages.

Based on the information in this hazard profile, the severity of hail storms is moderate and the overall significance is medium. Wharton County and participating communities have an overall limited to medium risk to this hazard: The economy of Wharton County and participating communities will be affected usually by less than a day to not more than 1 week. Additionally, up to 25% of people and property can be affected. The overall significance is considered medium: moderate potential impact.

High Winds

High winds, often accompanying severe thunderstorms, can cause significant property and crop damage, threaten public safety, and have adverse economic impacts from business closures and power loss. Wind storms in Wharton County participating communities are rarely life-threatening but do disrupt daily activities, cause damage to buildings, and structures, and increase the potential for other hazards, such as wildfires. Winter winds can result in damage and close highways due to ice and blowing snow. Winds can also cause trees to fall, particularly those killed by insects or wildfire, creating a hazard to property or those outdoors.

Based on the information in this hazard profile, the magnitude/severity of high winds is considered limited. The overall significance of the hazard is considered low, with minimal potential impact. The economy of Wharton County and participating communities will be affected usually by less than a day to not more than 1 week. Additionally, up to 25% of people and property can be affected.

14.2.5 Warning Time

Meteorologists can often predict the likelihood of a severe storm. This can give several days of warning time. However, meteorologists cannot predict the exact time of onset or severity of the storm. Some storms may come on more quickly and have only a few hours of warning time. Weather forecasts for the planning area are reliable. However, at times, the warning for the onset of severe weather may be limited.


14.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

The most significant secondary hazards associated with severe local storms are floods, falling and downed trees, landslides, and downed power lines. Rapidly melting snow combined with heavy rain can overwhelm both natural and man-made drainage systems, causing overflow and property destruction. Erosion can occur when the soil on slopes becomes oversaturated and fails. Fires can occur as a result of lightning strikes. Many locations in the region have minimal vegetative ground cover and the high winds can create a large dust storm, which becomes a hazard for travelers and a disruption for local services. High winds in the winter can turn a small amount of snow into a complete whiteout and create drifts in roadways. Debris carried by high winds can also result in injury or damage to property. Wildland fire can be accelerated and rendered unpredictable by high winds, which creates a dangerous environment for firefighters.

14.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Climate change presents a significant challenge for risk management associated with severe weather. The frequency of severe weather events has increased steadily over the last century. The number of weather-related disasters during the 1990s was four times that of the 1950s and cost 14 times as much in economic losses. Historical data shows that the probability of severe weather events increases in a warmer climate (see Figure 14-13). The changing hydrograph caused by climate change could have a significant impact on the intensity, duration, and frequency of storm events. All of these impacts could have significant economic consequences.

Figure 14-13. Severe Weather Probabilities in Warmer Climates



14.5 EXPOSURE

The primary data source was the HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 Census Data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), augmented with state and federal data sets, NOAA National Climatic Data Center Storm Event Database, as well as data from local sources.

14.5.1 Population

It can be assumed that the entire planning area is exposed to some extent to lightning, high wind, and hail events. Certain areas are more exposed due to geographic location and local weather patterns. Populations with large stands of trees or overhead power lines may be more susceptible to wind damage and blackout, while populations in low-lying areas are at risk for possible flooding. It is not uncommon for residents living in more remote areas of the county to be isolated after such events. Table 14-6 lists the vulnerable population for the participating communities.

14.5.2 Property

According to the HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), there are 16,979 buildings within the census blocks that define the planning area with an asset replaceable value of \$3.9 billion (excluding contents). About 91% of these buildings (and 75% of the building value) are associated with residential housing. Other types of buildings in this report include agricultural, education, religious, and governmental structures. See Table 14-6 below.

It is estimated that most of the residential structures were built without the influence of a structure building code with provisions for wind loads. Wind pressure can create a direct and frontal assault on a structure, pushing walls, doors, and windows inward. Conversely, passing currents can create lift and suction forces that act to pull building components and surfaces outward. The effects of winds are magnified in the upper levels of multi-story structures. As positive and negative forces impact the

building's protective envelope (doors, windows, and walls), the result can be roof or building component failures and considerable structural damage.

All of these buildings are considered to be exposed to lightning, wind, and hail hazards, but structures in poor condition or particularly vulnerable locations (located on hilltops or exposed open areas) may risk the most damage. The frequency and degree of damage will depend on specific locations.

| TABLE 14-6 EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|------------|------------------|------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 909 | 62 | 43 | 1,014 | 2,272 |
| City of El Campo | 4,465 | 352 | 200 | 5,017 | 11,602 |
| City of Wharton | 3,299 | 321 | 138 | 3,758 | 8,832 |
| Unincorporated Area | 6,799 | 210 | 181 | 7,190 | 18,574 |
| Wharton County Total | 15,472 | 945 | 562 | 16,979 | 41,280 |
| Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications. | | | | | |

14.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

All critical facilities within the planning area are exposed to lightning, high winds, and hail. Those facilities within the floodplain (Chapter 12) are exposed to flooding associated with thunderstorms. Additional facilities on higher ground may be particularly exposed to wind damage, lightning, or damage from falling trees. The most common problems associated with these weather events are the loss of utilities. Downed power lines can cause blackouts, leaving large areas isolated. Phone, water, and sewer systems may not function. Roads may become impassable due to secondary hazards such as flooding.

14.5.4 Environment

The environment is highly exposed to lightning, high winds, and hail. Natural habitats such as streams and trees risk major damage and destruction. Prolonged rains can saturate soils and lead to slope failure. Flooding events can produce river channel migration or damage riparian habitat. Lightning can start wildfires, particularly during a drought.

14.6 VULNERABILITY

Because lightning, hail, and wind cannot be directly modeled in HAZUS-MH, annualized losses were estimated using GIS-based analysis, historical data analysis, and statistical risk assessment methodology. Event frequency, severity indicators, expert opinions, and historical local knowledge of the region were used for this assessment.

14.6.1 Population

Vulnerable populations are the elderly, low-income or linguistically isolated populations, people with life-threatening illnesses, and residents living in areas that are isolated from major roads. Power outages can

be life-threatening to those dependent on electricity for life support. Isolation of these populations is a significant concern. These populations face isolation and exposure during thunderstorms, wind, lightning, and hail events and could suffer more secondary effects of the hazard. Outdoor recreational users in the area may also be more vulnerable to severe weather events. Table 14-7 shows vulnerable populations per participating jurisdiction.

| TABLE 14-7 MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Youth Population (< 16) | % of Total Population | Elderly Population (> 65) | % of Total Population | Economically Disadvantage (Income< \$20,000) | % of Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 638 | 28.07 | 342 | 15.05 | 129 | 5.68 |
| City of El Campo | 3402 | 29.33 | 1648 | 14.21 | 992 | 8.55 |
| City of Wharton | 2317 | 26.23 | 1288 | 14.58 | 1251 | 14.17 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4,715 | 25.39 | 2,741 | 14.76 | 1,537 | 8.28 |
| Wharton County Total | 11,072 | 26.82 | 6,019 | 14.58 | 3,910 | 9.47 |

14.6.2 Property

All property is vulnerable during thunderstorms, lightning, wind, and hail events, but properties in poor condition or particularly vulnerable locations may risk the most damage. Generally, damage is minimal and goes unreported. Those on hillsides and ridges may be more prone to wind damage. Those that are located under or near overhead lines or large trees may be damaged in the event of a collapse.

Loss estimations for the lightning, wind, and hail hazards are not based on damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, loss estimates were developed representing projected damages (annualized loss) on reported damages and exposed values. Historical events, statistical analysis, and probability factors were applied to the counties and communities reported damages and exposed values to create an annualized Table 14-8 through Table 14-10 lists the property loss estimates for lightning, hail, and wind events. Annualized losses of ‘negligible’ are less than \$50 annually. Negligible loss hazards are still included despite minimal annualized losses because of the potential for a high-value damaging event.

| TABLE 14-8. LOSS ESTIMATES FOR HAIL EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY AND PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES | | | |
|---|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value | Annualized Loss | Annualized Loss Percentage |
| City of East Bernard | \$262,048,000 | \$692 | <0.01 |
| City of El Campo | \$1,343,990,000 | \$1,908 | <0.01 |
| City of Wharton | \$915,074,000 | \$1,569 | <0.01 |
| Unincorporated Area | \$1,371,697,000 | \$157,723 | <0.01 |
| Wharton County Total | \$3,892,809,000 | \$161,892 | <0.01 |

| TABLE 14-9. LOSS ESTIMATES FOR LIGHTNING EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY AND PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value | Annualized Loss | Annualized Loss Percentage |
| City of East Bernard | \$262,048,000 | Negligible | <0.01 |
| City of El Campo | \$1,343,990,000 | Negligible | <0.01 |
| City of Wharton | \$915,074,000 | Negligible | <0.01 |
| Unincorporated Area | \$1,371,697,000 | Negligible | <0.01 |
| Wharton County Total | \$3,892,809,000 | Negligible | <0.01 |

| TABLE 14-10. LOSS ESTIMATES FOR WIND EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY AND PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES | | | |
|--|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value | Annualized Loss | Annualized Loss Percentage |
| City of East Bernard | \$262,048,000 | \$2,431 | <0.01 |
| City of El Campo | \$1,343,990,000 | \$1,800 | <0.01 |
| City of Wharton | \$915,074,000 | \$1,923 | <0.01 |
| Unincorporated Area | \$1,371,697,000 | \$9,508 | <0.01 |
| Wharton County Total | \$3,892,809,000 | \$15,508 | <0.01 |

Vulnerability Narrative

All participating communities are equally at risk of lightning, hail, and wind events. Table 14-7 lists the vulnerable population per community. Table 14-8 to Table 14-10 lists the estimated annualized losses in dollars for each participating community. All participating communities are vulnerable to communication problems. This applies to both residents of the communities, such as Early Warning Systems, and between emergency personnel. Resources such as the implementation of Emergency Notification Systems and NOAA “All Hazard” Radios would decrease the vulnerability of each jurisdiction.

City of East Bernard -

- *Lightning* – Properties with thick vegetation and large trees or those built under no or insufficient building codes are more susceptible to negative impacts of a lightning event. Residents unaware of the risks or hazards associated with lightning increase their vulnerability as well.
- *Hail* – The maximum hail size recorded for the City is 1.75 inches (golf ball-size hail) and can cause extensive damage to windows, glass roofs, as well as the bodywork of vehicles. Mobile homes and older residential areas are more prone to damages from an event. Residents uninformed on the hazards associated with hail will be more vulnerable to its impacts.
- *Wind* – Based on historical events, significant wind events have been recorded within The City at over 55-63 mph. Approximately 6.5% of the City of East Bernard’s housing are manufactured homes. Older residential areas as well as manufactured home subdivisions, houses, and structures not securely anchored to foundations are most vulnerable to wind damages. Furthermore, areas with dead trees and vegetation that are not regularly cleared are more prone to wind damages. Both of these (loose structures and dead vegetation) can become flying/falling hazards in a wind event. Recorded reports of these events were most prevalent around US 90.

Community Perception of Vulnerability in the City of East Bernard

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for the City of East Bernard. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

City of El Campo -

- *Lightning* – Properties built without sufficient building codes or with large trees or thick brush are more vulnerable to a damaging lightning event. Residents not aware or unable to afford preventive actions or corrective responses to a lightning event are more vulnerable as well.
- *Hail* – The maximum hail size recorded for El Campo was 2.75 inches (baseball-size hail) and can cause damage to roofing tiles, facades, metal cladding, window frames, and poses a risk of serious injury. Older homes may experience more damages as they have been exposed to the elements longer and may not have been built with as stringent building codes. Manufactured homes are less resilient to natural disasters, such as hail, and are more vulnerable to feeling the effects of a damaging hail event. Cars left in the open are subject to damages from hail events as well.
- *Wind* – Based on historical events, the most significant wind event recorded for the City of El Campo was between 55 -63. Approximately 6.1% of the City’s housing are manufactured homes. Older residential areas as well as manufactured home subdivisions, houses, and structures not securely anchored to foundations are most vulnerable to wind damages. Furthermore, areas with dead trees and vegetation that are not regularly cleared are more prone to wind damages. Both of these (loose structures and dead vegetation) can become flying/falling hazards in a wind event. Residents unaware of oncoming severe weather through a community alert system are more vulnerable as well.

Community Perception of Vulnerability in the City of El Campo

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for the City of El Campo. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

City of Wharton-

- *Lightning* – Properties with large trees or thick brush are more vulnerable to a damaging lightning event. Communities unaware of the areas of higher risk, such as structures built in the absence of sufficient codes, are more at risk.
- *Hail* – The maximum hail size recorded for Wharton was 1.75 inches (golf ball-size hail). This hail size can cause damage to glass windows and roofs as well as the bodywork of cars and aircraft. Manufactured homes are less resilient to natural disasters, such as hail, and are more vulnerable to feeling the effects of a damaging hail event.
- *Wind* – Based on historical events, the most significant wind events recorded for the City of Wharton were over 75 mph. Approximately 8.9% of the of the City of Wharton’s housing are manufactured homes. Older residential areas as well as manufactured home subdivisions, houses, and structures not securely anchored to foundations are most vulnerable to wind damages. Furthermore, areas with dead trees and vegetation that are not regularly cleared are more prone to wind damages. Both of these (loose structures and dead vegetation) can become flying/falling hazards in a wind event.

Community Perception of Vulnerability in the City of Wharton

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for the City of Wharton. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

Wharton County (Unincorporated Area) -

- *Lightning* – Emergency service facilities and infrastructures such as area schools, police and fire departments, and government buildings are vulnerable to lightning strikes. A power outage at one of these facilities could negatively impact residents and increase and complicate emergency response efforts. Rural areas are a greater distance from emergency responders and face longer response times. Properties with large trees and underbrush are also more vulnerable to lightning strikes and fires.
- *Hail* – The maximum hail size recorded for the Unincorporated Areas of Wharton County was 4.5 inches (grapefruit size hail) in Egypt which caused significant damage to roofs and windows. On average, severe hail events can cause extensive damage to windows, glass roofs, as well as the bodywork of vehicles. Older homes may experience more damages as they have been exposed to the elements longer.
- *Wind* – Based on historical events, the most significant wind events recorded for the Unincorporated Areas of Wharton County were over 75 mph. Approximately 19.9% of the of the HMP update area's housing are manufactured homes. Wharton rural areas may experience longer emergency response times if an event were to occur due to their distance from services. Older residential areas as well as manufactured home subdivisions, houses, and structures not securely anchored to foundations are most vulnerable to wind damages. Furthermore, areas with dead trees and vegetation that are not regularly cleared are more prone to wind damages. Both of these (loose structures and dead vegetation) can become flying/falling hazards in a wind event.

Community Perception of Vulnerability in Wharton County Unincorporated Areas

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this HMP update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

14.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Incapacity and loss of roads are the primary transportation failures resulting from lightning, wind, and hail and are mostly associated with secondary hazards. Erosion caused by heavy prolonged rains can block roads. High winds can cause significant damage to trees and power lines, blocking roads with debris, incapacitating transportation, isolating population, and disrupting ingress and egress. Of particular concern are roads providing access to isolated areas and to the elderly. Prolonged obstruction of major routes due to debris or floodwaters can disrupt the shipment of goods and other commerce. Large, prolonged storms can have negative economic impacts on an entire region. Severe windstorms and downed trees can create serious impacts on power and above-ground communication lines. Loss of electricity and phone connection would leave certain populations isolated because residents would be unable to call for assistance. Lightning events in the participating communities can have destructive effects on power and information systems. Failure of these systems would have cascading effects throughout the county and could disrupt critical facility functions.

14.6.4 Environment

The vulnerability of the environment to severe weather is the same as the exposure, discussed in Section 14.5.4

14.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

All future development will be affected by severe storms. The ability to withstand impacts lies in sound land-use practices and consistent enforcement of codes and regulations for new construction. The planning partners have already adopted the International Building Code for construction within this region. This code is equipped to deal with the impacts of severe weather events. Land-use policies identified in master plans and enforced through zoning code and the permitting process also address many of the secondary impacts of the severe weather hazard. With these tools, the planning partnership is well equipped to deal with future growth and the associated impacts of severe weather.

14.8 SCENARIO

Although severe local storms are infrequent, impacts can be significant, particularly when secondary hazards of flood and erosion occur. A worst-case event would involve prolonged high winds, an intense hail event, and a lightning strike at a critical facility (such as an emergency service station) during a thunderstorm. Such an event would have both short-term and longer-term effects. Initially, schools and roads would be closed due to power outages caused by high winds and downed tree obstructions. In more rural areas, some subdivisions could experience limited ingress and egress. Prolonged rain could produce flooding, overtopped culverts with ponded water on roads, and landslides on steep slopes. Flooding could further obstruct roads and bridges, further isolating residents.

14.9 ISSUES

Important issues associated with severe weather in the planning area include the following:

The older building stock in the planning area is built to low code standards or none at all. These structures could be highly vulnerable to severe weather events such as windstorms.

- The redundancy of the power supply must be evaluated.
- The capacity for backup power generation is limited.
- The potential for isolation after a severe storm event is high.
- There is limited information available for local weather forecasts.
- The lack of proper management of trees may exacerbate damage from high winds.

Chapter 15.

TORNADO

| TORNADO RANKING | |
|----------------------|--------|
| Wharton County | Medium |
| City of East Bernard | High |
| City of El Campo | Low |
| City of Wharton | Medium |

DEFINITIONS

Tornado A violently rotating column of air touching the ground, usually attached to the base of a thunderstorm. Winds of a tornado may reach 300 miles per hour and damage paths can be in excess of 1 mile wide and 50 miles long. Most are on the ground for less than 15 minutes. They are measured using the Fujita Scale (ranging from F0 to F5), or the Enhanced Fujita Scale.

15.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

The visible sign of a tornado is the dust and debris that is caught in the rotating column made up of water droplets. Tornadoes are the most violent of all atmospheric storms. Tornadoes can be induced by hurricanes and thunderstorms. The following are common ingredients for tornado formation:

- Very strong winds in the mid and upper levels of the atmosphere
- Clockwise turning of the wind with height (i.e., from the southeast at the surface to west aloft)
- Increasing wind speed in the lowest 10,000 feet of the atmosphere (i.e., 20 mph at the surface and 50 mph at 7,000 feet)
- Very warm, moist air near the ground with unusually cooler air aloft
- A forcing mechanism such as a cold front or leftover weather boundary from a previous shower or thunderstorm activity

Tornadoes can form from individual cells within severe thunderstorm squall lines. They also can form from an isolated super-cell thunderstorm. Weak tornadoes can sometimes occur from the air that is converging and spinning upward, with little more than a rain shower occurring in the vicinity.

In 2007, NWS began rating tornadoes using the Enhanced Fujita Scale (EF-Scale). The EF-Scale is a set of wind estimates (not measurements) based on damage. It uses 3-second gusts estimated at the point of damage based on a judgment of 8 levels of damage to the 28 indicators listed in Table 15-1. These estimates vary with height and exposure. Standard measurements are taken by weather stations in openly exposed areas. Table 15-2 describes the EF-Scale ratings.

With a yearly average of 1,253 tornadoes, the U.S. experiences more tornadoes than any other country. The peak of the tornado season is April through June, with the highest concentration of tornadoes in the central U.S. Figure 15-1 shows the annual average number of tornadoes between 2000 and 2010. Texas

experienced an average of 155 tornado events annually in that period. Texas ranks first among the 50 states in both the frequency of tornadoes and the number of lethal tornadoes. When these statistics are compared to other states by the frequency per 10,000 square miles, Texas ranks tenth in the U.S. “Tornado Alley” is a nickname given to an area in the southern plains of the central United States that consistently experiences a high frequency of tornadoes each year. Tornadoes in this region typically happen in late spring and occasionally the early fall. The Gulf Coast area has a separate tornado region nicknamed "Dixie Alley" with a relatively high frequency of tornadoes occurring in the late fall (October through December).

NOAA’s NSSL used historical data to estimate the daily probability of tornado occurrences across the U.S., regardless of tornado magnitude. Figure 15-2 shows the estimates. The density per 25 square miles in the map’s legend indicates the probable number of tornadoes for each 25 square mile cell within the contoured zone that can be expected over a similar period of record. This density number does NOT indicate the number of events that can be expected across the entire zone on the map.

**TABLE 15-1.
ENHANCED FUJITA SCALE DAMAGE INDICATORS**


| No. Damage Indicator | No. Damage Indicator |
|---|---|
| 1 Small barns, farm outbuildings | 15 School – one-story elementary (interior or exterior halls) |
| 2 One or two-family residences | 16 School – junior or senior high school |
| 3 Single-wide mobile home | 17 Low-rise (1-4 story) building |
| 4 Double-wide mobile home | 18 Mid-rise (5-20) building |
| 5 Apartment, condo, townhouse (3 stories or less) | 19 High-rise (over 20 stories) building |
| 6 Motel | 20 Institutional building (hospital, government, or university) |
| 7 Masonry apartment or motel | 21 Metal building system |
| 8 Small retail building (fast food) | 22 Service station canopy |
| 9 Small professional (doctor office, bank) | 23 Warehouse (tilt-up walls or heavy timber) |
| 10 Strip mall | 24 Transmission line tower |
| 11 Large shopping mall | 25 Free-standing tower |
| 12 Large, isolated (big box) retail building | 26 Free standing pole (light, flag, luminary) |
| 13 Automobile showroom | 27 Tree – hardwood |
| 14 Automobile service building | 28 Tree – softwood |
| Note: From NOAA-NWS | |

TABLE 15-2.
THE FUJITA SCALE AND ENHANCED FUJITA SCALE

| Fujita (F) Scale | | | Derived | | Operational Enhanced Fujita (EF) Scale | |
|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|--|----------------------|
| F Number | Fastest ¼ mile (mph) | 3-second gust (mph) | EF Number | 3-second gust (mph) | EF Number | 3-second gusts (mph) |
| 0 | 40-72 | 45-78 | 0 | 65-85 | 0 | 65-85 |
| 1 | 73-112 | 79-117 | 1 | 86-109 | 1 | 86-110 |
| 2 | 113-157 | 118-161 | 2 | 110-137 | 2 | 111-135 |
| 3 | 158-207 | 162-209 | 3 | 138-167 | 3 | 136-165 |
| 4 | 208-260 | 210-261 | 4 | 168-199 | 4 | 166-200 |
| 5 | 261-318 | 262-317 | 5 | 200-234 | 5 | Over 200 |


Note: From NOAA-NWS

Figure 15-1. Annual Average Number of Tornadoes in the U.S. (2000-2019)



Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Events Database

Figure 15-2. Total Annual Threat of Tornado Events in the U.S. (1986-2015)



Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center WCM

15.2 HAZARD PROFILE

15.2.1 Past Events

Table 15-3 lists tornadoes in Wharton County recorded by the NOAA Storm Events Center from 1950 to 2020. Figure 15-3 shows the location of NOAA documented tornado paths between 1955 and 2019. As can be seen from the map, most of the tornadoes occur in the spring season, with a few in the fall.

| TABLE 15-3. HISTORIC TORNADO EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY (1950-2020) | | | | | |
|--|------------|----------|--------|----------|---------------------------|
| Location | Date | Category | Deaths | Injuries | Estimated Property Damage |
| Wharton County | 12/2/1953 | F2 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 5/23/1955 | F2 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| Wharton County | 8/30/1955 | F1 | 0 | 5 | \$ - |
| Wharton County | 8/21/1959 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| Wharton County | 6/24/1960 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 11/22/1961 | F3 | 0 | 1 | \$ - |
| Wharton County | 6/15/1964 | F2 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 4/14/1966 | F2 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| Wharton County | 9/19/1967 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 9/20/1967 | | 0 | 2 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 9/20/1967 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 30.00 |
| Wharton County | 9/20/1967 | | 1 | 1 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 9/20/1967 | | 0 | 1 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 9/21/1967 | | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 6/23/1968 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 250.00 |
| Wharton County | 6/23/1968 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 250.00 |
| Wharton County | 6/23/1968 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 250.00 |
| Wharton County | 10/23/1970 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 10/23/1970 | F2 | 0 | 0 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 10/23/1970 | F2 | 0 | 0 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 3/20/1972 | F2 | 0 | 0 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 6/13/1973 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 7/14/1976 | | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| Wharton County | 11/8/1977 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 12/13/1977 | F1 | 0 | 1 | \$ 250,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 4/22/1978 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 1/20/1979 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 1/31/1983 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 250,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 8/18/1983 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 30.00 |

**TABLE 15-3.
HISTORIC TORNADO EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY
(1950-2020)**


| Location | Date | Category | Deaths | Injuries | Estimated Property Damage |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Wharton County | 1/14/1991 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 250,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 1/14/1991 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 1/14/1991 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 1/14/1991 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 5/4/1991 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 250,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 8/7/1991 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| Wharton County | 11/19/1992 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 11/19/1992 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 11/19/1992 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| Wharton County | 11/21/1992 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 11/21/1992 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 250,000.00 |
| Wharton County | 11/21/1992 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Egypt | 4/7/1993 | F2 | 0 | 0 | \$ 50,000.00 |
| Egypt | 3/13/1995 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 100,000.00 |
| El Campo | 8/12/1996 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 40,000.00 |
| Wharton | 4/11/1997 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 20,000.00 |
| El Campo | 6/21/1997 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Hungerford | 3/30/2002 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| Wharton | 3/30/2002 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 50,000.00 |
| Boling | 9/7/2002 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 75,000.00 |
| Egypt | 7/7/2003 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 18,000.00 |
| Wharton | 10/9/2003 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 15,000.00 |
| El Campo | 11/17/2003 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 1,000.00 |
| El Campo | 11/17/2003 | F0 | 0 | 2 | \$ 8,000.00 |
| Pierce | 11/17/2003 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 2,000.00 |
| Wharton | 11/17/2003 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| Boling | 11/17/2003 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 20,000.00 |
| Danevang | 4/6/2004 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| El Campo | 4/6/2004 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| Wharton | 6/8/2004 | F1 | 0 | 6 | \$ 300,000.00 |
| Wharton | 6/8/2004 | F1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 100,000.00 |
| Danevang | 6/23/2004 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 55,000.00 |
| Wharton | 11/23/2004 | F0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| Spanish Camp | 6/28/2010 | EF0 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| Newgulf | 2/23/2016 | EF0 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |
| Wharton JCT | 2/14/2017 | EF0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 10,000.00 |
| Egypt | 8/26/2017 | EF0 | 0 | 0 | \$ - |

| TABLE 15-3. HISTORIC TORNADO EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY (1950-2020) | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Location | Date | Category | Deaths | Injuries | Estimated Property Damage |
| East Bernard | 8/26/2017 | EF0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 50,000.00 |
| East Bernard | 8/27/2017 | EF1 | 0 | 0 | \$ 300,000.00 |

15.2.2 Location


Recorded tornadoes in the planning area are typically average-sized and short-lived. They can occur anywhere in Wharton County and participating communities. Figure 15-4 shows tornado activity documented by NOAA from 1950-2019. Figure 15-5 shows the location of previous tornado events in Wharton County and participating communities from 1950 to 2019.

Figure 15-3. Tornado Paths in the U.S. (1955-2019)




Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center

Figure 15-4. Total Tornadoes in the U.S (1950-2019)



Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Events Database

Figure 15-5. Tornado Events in Wharton County (1950-2019)



Note: From NOAA/NWS Storm Prediction Center

15.2.3 Frequency

Tornadoes may occur in any month and at any hour of the day, but they occur with the greatest frequency during the late spring and early summer months, and between the hours of 4:00 pm and 8:00 pm. From 1951 to 2011, nearly 62.7% of all Texas tornadoes occurred within the three months of April, May, and June, with almost one-third of the total tornadoes occurring in May.

Table 15-3 lists 33 recorded tornadoes rated F1 or higher between 1950 and 2020. Therefore, on average, a significant tornado occurs in the HMP update area once every two years. Since tornado events can occur anywhere throughout the HMP update area, each participating community has the same frequency and probability of future events (once every two years). Based on previous events, all participating jurisdictions can expect future tornado events up to a category F3.

15.2.4 Severity

Tornadoes are potentially the most dangerous of local storms. If a major tornado were to strike within the populated areas of Wharton County and the participating communities, the damage could be widespread. Businesses could be forced to close for an extended period or permanently, fatalities could be high, many people could be homeless for an extended period, and routine services such as telephone or power could be disrupted. Buildings may be damaged or destroyed. Historically, tornadoes have not typically been severe or caused damage in the planning area.

15.2.5 Warning Time

The NOAA Storm Prediction Center issues tornado watches and warnings for Wharton County. Watches and warnings are described below:

- Tornado Watch - Tornadoes are possible. Remain alert for approaching storms. Watch the sky and stay tuned to NOAA weather radio, commercial radio, or television for information.
- Tornado Warning - A tornado has been sighted or indicated by weather radar. Take shelter immediately.

Once a warning has been issued, residents may have only a matter of seconds or minutes to seek shelter.

15.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Tornadoes may cause loss of power if utility service is disrupted. Additionally, fires may result from damages to natural gas infrastructure. Hazardous materials may be released if a structure is damaged that houses such materials or if such material is in transport.

15.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Climate change impacts on the frequency and severity of tornadoes are unclear. According to the Center for Climate Change and Energy Solutions, “Researchers are working to better understand how the building blocks for tornadoes – atmospheric instability and wind shear – will respond to global warming. It is likely that a warmer, moister world would allow for more frequent instability. However, it is also likely that a warmer world would lessen chances for wind shear. Recent trends for these quantities in the

Midwest during the spring are inconclusive. It is also possible that these changes could shift the timing of tornadoes or regions that are most likely to be hit” (Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, no date).

15.5 EXPOSURE

Because tornadoes cannot be directly modeled in HAZUS-MH, annualized losses were estimated using GIS-based analysis, historical data analysis, and statistical risk assessment methodology. Event frequency, severity indicators, expert opinions, and historical knowledge of the region were used for this assessment. The primary data source was the updated HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs) augmented with state and federal data sets as well as the NOAA National Climatic Data Center Storm Event Database.

15.5.1 Population

It can be assumed that the entire planning area is exposed to tornadoes to some extent. Certain areas are more exposed due to geographic location (rural areas of the county) and local weather patterns.

15.5.2 Property

According to the HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), there are 16,979 buildings within the census blocks that define the planning area with an asset replaceable value of \$3.9 billion (excluding contents). About 91% of these buildings (and 75% of the building value) are associated with residential housing. Other types of buildings in this report include agricultural, education, religious, and governmental structures. See hazard loss tables for community-specific total assessed numbers (e.g., Table 15-6).

Properties at lower elevations are more likely to be exposed to tornadoes. Table 15-4 list the exposed structures and population for each participating community.

| TABLE 15-4 EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|------------|------------------|------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 909 | 62 | 43 | 1,014 | 2,272 |
| City of El Campo | 4,465 | 352 | 200 | 5,017 | 11,602 |
| City of Wharton | 3,299 | 321 | 138 | 3,758 | 8,832 |
| Unincorporated Area | 6,799 | 210 | 181 | 7,190 | 18,574 |
| Wharton County Total | 15,472 | 945 | 562 | 16,979 | 41,280 |
| Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications. | | | | | |

15.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

All critical facilities (see Figure 6-8 and Figure 6-9) are likely vulnerable to tornadoes. The most common problems associated with this hazard are utility loss. Downed power lines can cause blackouts, leaving

large areas isolated. Phone, water, and sewer systems may not function. Roads may become impassable due to downed trees or other debris.

15.5.4 Environment

Environmental features are exposed to tornado risk, although damages are generally localized to the path of the tornado.

15.6 VULNERABILITY

15.6.1 Population

Vulnerable populations are the elderly, low-income, or linguistically isolated populations, people with life-threatening illnesses, and residents living in areas that are isolated from major roads. Power outages can be life-threatening to those dependent on electricity for life support. Isolation of these populations is a significant concern. These populations face isolation and exposure after tornado events and could suffer more secondary effects of the hazard.

Individuals caught in the path of a tornado who are unable to seek appropriate shelter are especially vulnerable. This may include individuals who are out in the open, in cars, or who do not have access to basements, cellars, or safe rooms. See Table 15-5 for the population most vulnerable to tornado events per jurisdiction.

| TABLE 15-5 MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Youth Population (< 16) | % of Total Population | Elderly Population (> 65) | % of Total Population | Economically Disadvantage (Income< \$20,000) | % of Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 638 | 28.07 | 342 | 15.05 | 129 | 5.68 |
| City of El Campo | 3402 | 29.33 | 1648 | 14.21 | 992 | 8.55 |
| City of Wharton | 2317 | 26.23 | 1288 | 14.58 | 1251 | 14.17 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4,715 | 25.39 | 2,741 | 14.76 | 1,537 | 8.28 |
| Wharton County Total | 11,072 | 26.82 | 6,019 | 14.58 | 3,910 | 9.47 |

15.6.2 Property

All property is vulnerable during tornado events, but properties in poor condition or in particularly vulnerable locations (rural areas) may risk the most damage.

Loss estimations for tornadoes are not based on damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, loss estimates were developed representing projected damages (annualized

loss) on historical events, statistical analysis, and probability factors. These were applied to the exposed value of the county and communities to create an annualized loss. Table 15-6 lists the loss estimates.

| TABLE 15-6. LOSS ESTIMATES FOR TORNADO EVENTS | | | |
|--|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value | Annualized Loss | Annualized Loss Percentage |
| City of East Bernard | \$262,048,000 | \$5,000 | <0.01 |
| City of El Campo | \$1,343,990,000 | \$7,429 | <0.01 |
| City of Wharton | \$915,074,000 | \$986 | <0.01 |
| Unincorporated Area | \$1,371,697,000 | \$26,512 | 0.03 |
| Wharton County Total | \$3,892,809,000 | \$596,375 | 0.01 |

Vulnerability Narrative

The vulnerability of tornado events per jurisdiction is described below.

- **City of East Bernard** - Approximately 6.5% of the City of East Bernard's housing is manufactured homes. This type of housing is more vulnerable to a tornado event. Loose structures and non-secured objects, such as dead trees and thick underbrush, can become flying projectiles in an event. If an event were to impact critical facilities, such as area schools or government facilities, services could be greatly limited and residents would be negatively impacted. Facilities without an alternate power source increase their risk. Residents unaware of their risk or the hazards of tornadoes are less able to effectively protect themselves.
- **City of El Campo** - Approximately 6.1% of the City of El Campo's housing is manufactured homes. Tornadoes can easily destroy poorly constructed buildings and mobile homes. Loose structures and non-secured objects, such as vehicles, dead trees, and thick underbrush, can become flying projectiles in an event. Older homes constructed without the use of building codes are vulnerable as well. If an event were to strike emergency service centers or key transportation routes, such as the local police and fire stations or TX 195, emergency response times would be limited. Residents unaware of the threat of an event, such as with neighborhood alert systems, are more at risk as well.
- **City of Wharton** - Tornadoes can easily destroy poorly constructed buildings and mobile homes. Approximately 8.9% of the City of Wharton's housing is manufactured homes. Loose structures, non-secured objects, and debris, such as boats, dead trees, and thick underbrush, can become flying projectiles during an event. If an event were to damage major access roads such as US 90, emergency services would have limited accessibility. If a tornado were to impact critical facilities, such as police or fire departments, service to residents would be delayed. Communities who have not identified the areas of higher risk or who have implemented mitigation planning to incorporate measures to ensure the functionality of these facilities in the event of a tornado are more vulnerable as well.
- **Wharton County (Unincorporated Area)** - Approximately 19.9% of Wharton County's Unincorporated Area's housing is manufactured homes. Tornadoes can easily destroy poorly

constructed buildings and mobile homes. Dead trees, branches, and non-secured structures can become flying projectiles during a tornado, placing people and property at a greater risk. Response times to rural communities and residents would be greater if major thoroughfares, such as US 59, and emergency response facilities, such as police and fire departments, were impacted by an event, especially in rural areas. Communities not identifying and implementing improvements to roadways and crossings in need of maintenance increase these risks.

Community Perception of Vulnerability

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this HMP update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

15.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Tornadoes can cause significant damage to trees and power lines, block roads with debris, incapacitate transportation, isolate populations, and disrupt ingress and egress. Of particular concern are roads providing access to isolated areas and to the elderly. Any facility that is in the path of a tornado is likely to sustain damage.

15.6.4 Environment

Environmental vulnerability will typically be the same as exposure (discussed in Section 15.5.4); however, if tornadoes impact facilities that store hazardous material, areas impacted by material releases may be especially vulnerable.

15.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

All future development will be affected by tornadoes, particularly development that occurs at lower elevations. Development regulations that require safe rooms, basements, or other structures that reduce risk to people would decrease vulnerability. Tornadoes that cause damage are uncommon in the county, so mandatory regulations may not be cost-effective.

15.8 SCENARIO

If an F3 or higher tornado were to hit populated areas of the county, substantial damage to property and loss of life could result. The likelihood of injuries and fatalities would increase if warning time was limited before the event or if residents were unable to find adequate shelter. Damage to critical facilities and infrastructure would likely include loss of power, water, sewer, gas, and communications. Roads and bridges could be blocked by debris or otherwise damaged. The most serious damage would be seen in the direct path of the tornado, but secondary effects could impact the rest of the county through loss of government services and interruptions in the transportation network. Debris from the tornado would need to be collected and properly disposed of. Such an event would likely have substantial negative effects on the local economy.

15.9 ISSUES

Important issues associated with a tornado in the planning area include the following:

- The older building stock in the planning area is built to low code standards or none at all. These structures could be highly vulnerable to tornadoes.
- The redundancy of the power supply must be evaluated.
- The capacity for backup power generation is limited.
- Roads and bridges blocked by debris or otherwise damaged might isolate populations.
- Warning time may not be adequate for residents to seek appropriate shelter or such shelter may not be widespread throughout the planning area.
- The impacts of climate change on the frequency and severity of tornadoes are not well understood.
- Building codes may need to be updated so buildings can withstand strong wind loads or provisions may be added for tornado shelters in high-risk areas.

Chapter 16.

WILDFIRE

| WILDFIRE RISK RANKING | |
|-----------------------|--------|
| Wharton County | Medium |
| City of East Bernard | Low |
| City of El Campo | Low |
| City of Wharton | Low |

| DEFINITIONS | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Conflagration | A fire that grows beyond its original source area to engulf adjoining regions. Wind, extremely dry or hazardous weather conditions, excessive fuel buildup, and explosions are usually the elements behind a wildfire conflagration. |
| Interface Area | An area susceptible to wildfires and where wildland vegetation and urban or suburban development occur together. An example would be smaller urban areas and dispersed rural housing in forested areas. |
| Wildfire | Fires that result in uncontrolled destruction of forests, brush, field crops, grasslands, and real and personal property in non-urban areas. Because of their distance from firefighting resources, they can be difficult to contain and can cause a great deal of destruction. |

16.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

According to the *2000 National Fire Plan*, the wildland fire risk is now considered by authorities as “the most significant fire service problem of the Century.”

A wildfire is any uncontrolled fire occurring on undeveloped land that requires fire suppression. Wildfires can be ignited by lightning or by human activity such as smoking, campfires, equipment use, and arson.

Fire hazards present a considerable risk to vegetation and wildlife habitats. Short-term loss caused by a wildfire can include the destruction of timber, wildlife habitat, scenic vistas, and watersheds. Long-term effects include smaller timber harvests, reduced access to affected recreational areas, and destruction of cultural and economic resources and community infrastructure. Vulnerability to flooding increases due to the destruction of watersheds. The potential for significant damage to life and property exists in areas designated as wildland urban interface (WUI) areas, where development is adjacent to densely vegetated areas.

Texas has seen a huge increase in the number of wildfires in the past 30 years. During the 15-year period between 2005 and 2020, Texas Forest Service (TFS) reports that over 150,00 wildfires have consumed more than nine million acres in Texas. More and more people are placing their homes in woodland settings in or near forests, rural areas, or remote mountain sites. Many of these homes are nestled along ridgelines, cliff-edges, and other classic fire-interface hazard zones. There, homeowners enjoy the beauty of the environment but they also face the very real danger of wildfire.

Years of fire suppression has significantly disturbed natural fire occurrences—nature’s renewal process. The result has been the gradual accumulation of understory and canopy fuels to levels of density that can feed high-energy, intense wildfires and further increase hazards from and exposure to interface problems.

Fire Protection in Wharton County

Fire protection in Wharton County is divided between eight volunteer fire departments – Boling Fire Department, Danevang Volunteer Fire Department (VFD), East Bernard VFD, El Campo VFD, Glen Flora VFD, Hungerford VFD, Louise VFD, and Wharton VFD, as well as TFS, Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). More information about these divisions is provided in Table 16-1. The TFS administers the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) to reduce related risks to life, property, and the environment. It's Fire Control Department provides leadership in wildland fire protection for state and private lands in Texas.

| TABLE 16-1. FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES IN WHARTON COUNTY AND PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES | | | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | Unincorporated Areas | City of East Bernard | City of El Campo | City of Wharton |
| Local Volunteer Fire Department | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| National Park Service | Yes | No | No | No |
| Bureau of Land Management | Yes | No | No | No |
| Texas Commission on Environmental Quality | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Texas Forest Service | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| AgriLife | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Texas Parks and Wildlife Department | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Texas Interagency Coordination Center | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Yes | No | No | No |
| U.S. Forest Service | Yes | No | No | No |


Vegetation Classes in Wharton County

General vegetation for Wharton County and Participating Communities is described in Table 16-2 and Figure 16-1. The most common vegetation class in the county is grassland (comprising approximately 82.8% of the acreage in the county).

TABLE 16-2.
VEGETATION CLASSES IN WHARTON COUNTY AND PARTICIPATING
COMMUNITIES

| Class | Area (acres) | % of Total Land Area |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Barren Land (Rock/Sandy/Clay) | 821 | 0.1 |
| Deciduous Forest | 21,538 | 3.1 |
| Developed Land | 35,685 | 5.1 |
| Evergreen Forest | 16,931 | 2.4 |
| Grassland | 579,761 | 82.8 |
| Wetlands | 26,445 | 3.8 |
| Mixed Forest | 12,757 | 1.8 |
| Water | 6,452 | 0.9 |
| Total | 700,390 | 100 |
| Source: U.S. Geological Survey: National Land Cover Database | | |

Figure 16-1. Vegetation Types in Wharton County



Note: From U.S. Geological Survey: National Land Cover Database

16.2 HAZARD PROFILE


16.2.1 Past Events

Figure 16-2 shows the locations of wildfire recorded by state and local fire department records from 2005 to 2015 collected by the Texas Wildlife Risk Assessment Portal (TxWRAP). Fires larger than fifty acres are listed in Table 16-3. The locations of wildfire noted in Table 16-3 as well as all others recorded by TxWRAP in Wharton County and participating communities are shown in Figures 16-3 through 16-5.

**TABLE 16-3.
HISTORIC WILDFIRE EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY AND PARTICIPATING
COMMUNITIES
(50+ ACRES) (2005-2015)**


| Fire ID | Name | Cause | Start Date | Acres |
|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|-------|
| 156472 | 16800 FM 1300 | Debris burning | 1/12/2008 | 100 |
| 156492 | 600 CR 301 | Debris burning | 1/13/2008 | 75 |
| 156487 | 3100 CR 414 | Miscellaneous | 1/13/2008 | 50 |
| 156690 | 2100 CR 310 | Debris burning | 4/6/2008 | 50 |
| 156771 | 1000 FM 441 | Debris burning | 5/15/2008 | 50 |
| 156942 | 13346 CR 394 (Fire) | Debris burning | 8/10/2008 | 300 |
| 159915 | 11400 CR 365 | Equipment use | 10/1/2008 | 60 |
| 163929 | 2413 CR 408 | Debris burning | 11/27/2008 | 100 |
| 170207 | 3644 CR 410 | Debris burning | 12/6/2008 | 60 |
| 176710 | 12309 CR 360 | Debris burning | 1/2/2009 | 75 |
| 176796 | 300 CR 219 | Debris burning | 1/18/2009 | 100 |
| 176799 | 15400 FM 102 | Debris burning | 1/19/2009 | 100 |
| 176800 | 13600 CR 360 | Debris burning | 1/20/2009 | 50 |
| 176809 | 5900 FM 1161 | Debris burning | 1/24/2009 | 75 |
| 176818 | 2886 CR 475 | Miscellaneous | 1/30/2009 | 50 |
| 193180 | 3900 CR 377 | Debris burning | 3/21/2009 | 50 |
| 218780 | 1455 CR 450 | Miscellaneous | 8/17/2009 | 100 |
| 247366 | 587 FM 2546 | Debris burning | 3/5/2010 | 50 |
| 339788 | East Bernard Fire | Miscellaneous | 8/18/2011 | 200 |
| Note: From TFS-TxWRAP | | | | |

Figure 16-2. Wildfire Ignitions in Wharton County (2005-2015)




Note: From TFS-TxWRAP

Figure 16-3. Wildfires in the City of East Bernard (2005-2015)




Note: From TFS-TxWRAP

Figure 16-4. Wildfires in the City of El Campo (2005-2015)



Note: From TFS-TxWRAP

Figure 16-5. Wildfires in the City of Wharton (2005-2015)



Note: From TFS-TxWRAP

16.2.2 Location

According to the TFS CWPP, 80% of wildfires in Texas occur within two miles of a community. These wildfires pose a threat to life and property. There are approximately 14,000 communities in Texas that have been identified as “at-risk” for potentially devastating fires.

Wildfire Ignition Density is the likelihood of a wildfire starting based on historical ignition patterns. Figure 16-6 shows the wildfire ignition density in Wharton County.

Texas is one of the fastest-growing states in the nation. Much of this growth is occurring in the WUI area, where structures and other human improvements meet and mix with undeveloped wildland or vegetative fuels. Population growth within the WUI substantially increases the risk of wildfires. For Wharton County, based on TxWRAP data and 2010 Census data from HAZUS-MH, an estimated 19,216 people or 47% of the total county population (41,280) live within the WUI. The WUI layer reflects housing density depicting where humans and their structures meet or intermix with wildland fuels. Figure 16-7 Shows the Wharton County housing density within the WUI.


The TxWRAP report for Wharton County and the participating communities map the WUI Response Index, which is a rating of the potential impact of a wildfire on people and their homes. The key input, WUI, reflects housing density (houses per acre) consistent with Federal Register National standards (Figure 16-7). The TxWRAP report states that the location of people living in the WUI and rural areas is essential for defining potential wildfire impacts on people and homes. Figure 16-8 shows the WUI Response Index for Wharton County.

According to the TxWRAP report for Wharton County, the wildfire Values Response Index (VRI) layer reflects a rating of the potential impact of a wildfire on values or assets. The VRI is an overall rating that combines the impact ratings for WUI (housing density) and Pine Plantations (pine age) into a single measure. VRI combines the likelihood of a fire occurring (threat) with those areas of most concern that are adversely impacted by fire to derive a single overall measure of wildfire risk. Figure 16-9 shows the VRI for Wharton County.

The TxWRAP report for Wharton County maps the Community Protection Zones (CPZ), which represent those areas considered the highest priority for mitigation planning activities. CPZs are based on an analysis of the “Where People Live” housing density data and surrounding fire behavior potential. “Rate of Spread” data is used to determine the areas of concern around populated areas that are within a 2-hour fire spread distance. Figure 16-10 shows the demarcation of CPZs in Wharton County and the participating communities.


Finally, wildfire threat or Wildfire Hazard Potential (WHP) is the likelihood of a wildfire occurring or burning into an area. The threat is calculated by combining multiple landscape characteristics including surface and canopy fuels, fire behavior, historical fire occurrences, weather observations, terrain conditions, and other factors. Figure 16-11 through Figure 16-14 maps the WHP for Wharton County and the participating communities and each partner community as identified in the Wildfire Hazard Potential for the United States (270-m), Version 2020 (3rd Edition), containing data from 1992 to 2015. On its own, WHP is not an explicit map of wildfire threat or risk, but when paired with spatial data depicting highly valued resources and assets such as structures, it can approximate relative wildfire risk to those specific resources and assets. WHP is also not a forecast or wildfire outlook for any particular season, as it does not include any information on current or forecasted weather or fuel moisture conditions. It is instead intended for long-term strategic fuels management and is appropriate for regional, county, or local protection mitigation or prevention planning.

Figure 16-6. Wharton County and Participating Communities Wildfire Ignition Density




Note: From TFS -TxWRAP

Figure 16-7. Wharton County and Participating Communities Wildland Urban Interface




Note: From TFS-TxWRAP

Figure 16-8. Wharton County and Participating Communities Wildland Urban Interface Response Index




Note: From Source: TFS-TxWRAP

Figure 16-9. Wharton County Wildfire Values Response Index and Participating Communities




Note: From TFS-TxWRAP

Figure 16-10. Wharton County Wildfire Community Protection Zones and Participating Communities




Note: From TFS-TxWRAP

Figure 16-11. Wharton County Wildfire Hazard Potential




Note: From Dillon et. al. 2020

Figure 16-12. City of East Bernard Wildfire Hazard Potential




Note: From Dillon et. al. 2020

Figure 16-13. City of El Campo Wildfire Hazard Potential



Note: From Dillon et. al. 2020

Figure 16-14. City of Wharton Wildfire Hazard Potential




Note: From Dillon et. al. 2020

16.2.3 Frequency

Analysis of TFS data indicates there is a 93% chance that at least one wildfire will occur each year in Wharton County. Wildfires occur throughout the year and these fires are expected to be less than 50 acres in size based on locally reported historical data from 2005 to 2015.

The frequency of wildfire is closely related to drought behavior. As described by the National Integrated Drought Information System (NIDIS), the relationship is complex and has divergent impacts. The onset of a drought allows for the drying of fuels for wildfire after abundant growth, but prolonged drought can result in a lack of fuel due to the reduction of available fuels such as grasses. A correlation between drought and historical wildfire data following this pattern can be observed between the years of 2008 to 2012 in Figure 16-15.

Figure 16-15. Drought Level and Historical Wildfire Occurrences (Monthly) Correlation



Note: From NIDIS and TFS-TxWRAP

16.2.4 Severity

The overall significance of the hazard for the Wharton County Unincorporated area is considered high (event possible in the next year). The City of El Campo, East Bernard, and Wharton have an overall unlikely event significance (event probable in next 10 years). Based on the information in this hazard profile, and the widespread impacts, the magnitude/severity of severe wildfires is considered moderate. Moderate impact indicates there are few deaths or injuries; limited property damage; interruption of essential facilities and services; or economic impact of Wharton County and the participating communities.

16.2.5 Warning Time

Wildfires are often caused by humans, intentionally or accidentally. There is no way to predict when one might break out. Because fireworks often cause brush fires, extra diligence is warranted around the Fourth of July when the use of fireworks is highest. Dry seasons and droughts are factors that greatly increase fire likelihood. Dry lightning may trigger wildfires. Severe weather can be predicted, so special attention can be paid during weather events that may include lightning. Reliable NWS lightning warnings are available on average 24 to 48 hours before a significant electrical storm.

If a fire does break out and spreads rapidly, residents may need to evacuate within days or hours. A fire's peak burning period generally is between 10:00 a.m. and sundown according to the USDA Fire Service. Once a fire has started, fire alerting is reasonably rapid in most cases. The rapid spread of cellular and two-way radio communications in recent years has further contributed to a significant improvement in warning time.

16.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Wildfires can generate a range of secondary effects, which in some cases may cause more widespread and prolonged damage than the fire itself. Fires can cause direct economic losses in the reduction of harvestable timber and indirect economic losses in reduced tourism. Wildfires cause the contamination of reservoirs, destroy transmission lines, and contribute to flooding. They strip slopes of vegetation, exposing them to greater amounts of runoff. This in turn can weaken soils and cause failures on slopes. Major landslides can occur several years after a wildfire. Most wildfires burn hot and for long durations that can bake soils, especially those high in clay content, increasing the imperviousness of the ground. This increases the runoff generated by storm events, thus increasing the chance of flooding.

16.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Fire in western ecosystems is affected by climate variability, local topography, and human intervention. Climate change has the potential to affect multiple elements of the wildfire system: fire behavior, ignitions, fire management, and vegetation fuels. Hot, dry spells create the highest fire risk. Increased temperatures may intensify wildfire danger by warming and drying out vegetation. When climate alters fuel loads and fuel moisture, forest susceptibility to wildfires changes. Climate change also may increase winds that spread fires. Faster fires are harder to contain, and thus are more likely to expand into residential neighborhoods.

Historically, drought patterns in the West and Midwest are related to large-scale climate patterns in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. The El Niño–Southern Oscillation in the Pacific varies on a 5- to 7-year cycle, the Pacific Decadal Oscillation varies on a 20- to 30-year cycle, and the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation varies on a 65- to 80-year cycle. As these large-scale ocean climate patterns vary in relation to each other, drought conditions in the U.S. shift from region to region.

Climate scenarios project summer temperature increases between 2 and 5 degrees Celsius (°C) (35.6 to 41°F) and precipitation decreases of up to 15% by 2100. Such conditions would exacerbate summer drought and further promote wildfires, releasing stores of carbon and further contributing to the buildup of greenhouse gases. Forest response to increased atmospheric carbon dioxide – the so-called “fertilization effect” – could also contribute to more tree growth and thus more fuel for fires, but the effects of carbon dioxide on mature forests are still largely unknown. High carbon dioxide levels should enhance tree recovery after fire and young forest regrowth, as long as sufficient nutrients and soil

moisture are available, although the latter is in question for many parts of the western United States because of climate change.

16.5 EXPOSURE

Since wildfire cannot be directly modeled in HAZUS-MH, annualized losses were estimated using GIS-based analysis and historical data analysis. Event frequency, severity indicators, and historical knowledge of the region were used for this assessment. The primary data source was the updated HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), augmented with TxWRAP and the USDA WHP data. Information for the exposure analyses provided in the sections below was based on data sources above.

16.5.1 Population

Population estimates within the WHP areas are shown in Table 16-4.

| TABLE 16-4. POPULATION WITHIN WILDFIRE RISK AREAS | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|------------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Non-Burnable* | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | Total in Risk Area |
| City of East Bernard | 1,182 | 1,037 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,038 |
| City of El Campo | 8,224 | 3,368 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,368 |
| City of Wharton | 6,195 | 2,376 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,376 |
| Unincorporated Area | 7,460 | 10,721 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,746 |
| Wharton County Total | 23,081 | 12,284 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12,410 |
| Note: * Non-Burnable classification includes developed lands, non-burnable agricultural fields, perennial snow or ice, bare ground, and permanent water areas | | | | | | | |

16.5.2 Property

Property damage from wildfires can be severe and can significantly alter entire communities. Table 16-5 through Table 16-9 display the number of structures in the various wildfire hazard zones within the planning area and their values. For all tables, property data are from the HAZUS-MH data inventory (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs).

| TABLE 16-5. | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| EXPOSURE AND VALUE OF STRUCTURES IN VERY LOW WILDFIRE RISK AREAS | | | | | |
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Buildings | Value Exposed (\$) | | | % of Total Assessed Value |
| | | Structure | Contents | Total | |
| City of East Bernard | 403 | 107,481,965 | 60,451,647 | 167,933,612 | 45.08 |
| City of El Campo | 1,291 | 360,861,843 | 241,169,279 | 602,031,121 | 28.11 |
| City of Wharton | 896 | 197,391,726 | 126,338,215 | 323,729,941 | 22.30 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4,677 | 888,421,153 | 536,458,014 | 1,424,879,168 | 57.62 |
| Wharton County Total | 7,267 | 1,554,156,688 | 964,417,155 | 2,518,573,843 | 39.12 |

| TABLE 16-6. | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| EXPOSURE AND VALUE OF STRUCTURES IN LOW WILDFIRE RISK AREAS | | | | | |
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Buildings | Value Exposed (\$) | | | % of Total Assessed Value |
| | | Structure | Contents | Total | |
| City of East Bernard | 1 | 100,154 | 50,411 | 150,565 | 0.04 |
| City of El Campo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Negligible |
| City of Wharton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Negligible |
| Unincorporated Area | 53 | 9,423,713 | 5,825,329 | 15,249,043 | 0.62 |
| Wharton County Total | 54 | 9,523,868 | 5,875,740 | 15,399,608 | 0.24 |

| TABLE 16-7. | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|----------|----------|---------------------------|
| EXPOSURE AND VALUE OF STRUCTURES IN MODERATE WILDFIRE RISK AREAS | | | | | |
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Buildings | Value Exposed (\$) | | | % of Total Assessed Value |
| | | Structure | Contents | Total | |
| City of East Bernard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of El Campo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of Wharton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unincorporated Area | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton County Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| TABLE 16-8. | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|----------|----------|---------------------------|
| EXPOSURE AND VALUE OF STRUCTURES IN HIGH WILDFIRE RISK AREAS | | | | | |
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Buildings | Value Exposed (\$) | | | % of Total Assessed Value |
| | | Structure | Contents | Total | |
| City of East Bernard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of El Campo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of Wharton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unincorporated Area | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton County Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| TABLE 16-9. EXPOSURE AND VALUE OF STRUCTURES IN VERY HIGH WILDFIRE RISK AREAS | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|----------|----------|---------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Buildings | Value Exposed (\$) | | | % of Total Assessed Value |
| | | Structure | Contents | Total | |
| City of East Bernard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of El Campo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of Wharton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unincorporated Area | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton County Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Present Land Use

Present land use for each wildfire risk area is described in Table 16-10.

| TABLE 16-10. LAND COVERAGE FOR WHARTON COUNTY PER WILDFIRE RISK CLASS | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------|----------|------|-----------|
| Present Land Cover Class | Wildfire Risk Class and Area (acres) | | | | |
| | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High |
| Barren Land (Rock/Sand/Clay) | 406 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deciduous Forest | 19,997 | 145 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| Developed Land | 17,313 | 147 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Evergreen Forest | 15,812 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grassland | 305,043 | 2,916 | 34 | 0 | 0 |
| Marshland | 24,141 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mixed Forest | 11,704 | 96 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Open Water | 2,770 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Note: From U.S. Geological Survey: National Land Cover Database | | | | | |

16.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Table 16-11 identifies critical facilities exposed to the wildfire hazard in the county.

**TABLE 16-11.
CRITICAL FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE PER WILDFIRE RISK CLASS**

| | Critical Facilities and Infrastructure per Wildfire Risk Class | | | | |
|----------------------|--|-----|----------|------|-----------|
| | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High |
| Medical and Health | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Government Functions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Protective Functions | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Schools | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hazardous Materials | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bridges | 203 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Water Storage | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wastewater | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Power | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Communications | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transportation | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dams | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Note: *Protective includes, Police, Fire Safety, and Emergency Operations Centers

16.5.4 Environment

Fire is a natural and critical ecosystem process in most terrestrial ecosystems, dictating in part the types, structure, and spatial extent of native vegetation. However, wildfires can cause severe environmental impacts:

- **Soil Erosion** – The protective covering provided by foliage and dead organic matter is removed, leaving the soil fully exposed to wind and water erosion. Accelerated soil erosion occurs, causing landslides and threatening aquatic habitats.
- **Spread of Invasive Plant Species** – Non-native woody plant species frequently invade burned areas. When weeds become established, they can dominate the plant cover over broad landscapes, and become difficult and costly to control.
- **Disease and Insect Infestations** – Unless diseased or insect-infested trees are swiftly removed, infestations and disease can spread to healthy forests and private lands. Timely active management actions are needed to remove diseased or infested trees.
- **Destroyed Endangered Species Habitat** – Catastrophic fires can have devastating consequences for endangered species.

- **Soil Sterilization** – Topsoil exposed to extreme heat can become water repellant, and soil nutrients may be lost. It can take decades or even centuries for ecosystems to recover from a fire. Some fires burn so hot that they can sterilize the soil.

Many ecosystems are adapted to historical patterns of fire occurrence. These patterns, called “fire regimes,” include temporal attributes (e.g., frequency and seasonality), spatial attributes (e.g., size and spatial complexity), and magnitude attributes (e.g., intensity and severity), each of which have ranges of natural variability. Ecosystem stability is threatened when any of the attributes for a given fire regime diverge from its range of natural variability.

16.6 VULNERABILITY

Structures, aboveground infrastructure, critical facilities, agricultural areas (crops and structures), and natural environments are all vulnerable to the wildfire hazard. There is currently no validated damage function available to support wildfire mitigation planning. Except as discussed in this section, vulnerable populations, property, infrastructure, and environment are assumed to be the same as described in the section on exposure.

16.6.1 Population

Smoke and air pollution from wildfires can be a severe health hazard, especially for sensitive populations, including children, the elderly, and those with respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. Smoke generated by wildfire consists of visible and invisible emissions that contain particulate matter (soot, tar, water vapor, and minerals), gases (carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxides), and toxins (formaldehyde, benzene). Emissions from wildfires depend on the type of fuel, the moisture content of the fuel, the efficiency (or temperature) of combustion, and the weather. Public health impacts associated with wildfire include difficulty in breathing, odor, and reduction in visibility.

Wildfires may also threaten the health and safety of those fighting the fires. First responders are exposed to the dangers from the initial incident and after-effects from smoke inhalation and heat stroke. The increasing demand for outdoor recreation places more people outside and in higher wildfire risk areas during holidays, weekends, and vacation periods.

16.6.2 Property

Loss estimations for wildfire hazards are not based on damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, loss estimates were developed representing projected damages (annualized loss) on historical events, statistical analysis, and probability factors. These were applied to the exposed values of the county and communities to create an annualized loss. Table 16-12 lists the loss estimates for the general building stock and contents for jurisdictions that have exposure to a wildfire risk category.

| TABLE 16-12. ANNUALIZED LOSS ESTIMATES FOR WILDFIRE EVENTS | | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value | Annualized Loss | Annualized Loss Percentage |
| City of East Bernard | \$107,582,119 | Negligible | <0.1 |
| City of El Campo | \$360,861,843 | \$435,994 | 0.1 |
| City of Wharton | \$197,391,726 | Negligible | <0.1 |
| Unincorporated Area | \$897,844,866 | \$602,341 | 0.1 |
| Wharton County Total | \$1,563,680,554 | \$1,038,335 | 0.1 |

Community Perception of Vulnerability

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this HMP update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

16.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Critical facilities of wood frame construction are especially vulnerable during wildfire events. In the event of a wildfire, there would likely be little damage to most infrastructure. Most roads and railroads would be without damage except in the worst scenarios. Power lines are the most at risk from wildfire because most poles are made of wood and susceptible to burning. Fires can create conditions that block or prevent access and can isolate residents and emergency service providers. Wildfire typically does not have a major direct impact on bridges, but it can create conditions in which bridges are obstructed. Many bridges in areas of high to moderate fire risk are important because they provide the only ingress and egress to large areas and in some cases to isolated neighborhoods.

16.6.4 Environment

Environmental vulnerability will typically be the same as exposure (as discussed in Section 16.5).

16.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

The threat of wildfire is a constant in Texas. From the East Texas Piney Woods to the Davis Mountains of West Texas, wildfires burn thousands, if not millions, of acres each year. Wildfires become especially dangerous when wildland vegetation begins to intermix with homes.

With more and more people living in the WUI, it is increasingly important for local officials to plan and prepare for wildfires. CWPPs are a proven strategy for reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfires and protecting lives and property.

TFS encourages Texas counties and communities to develop and adopt CWPPs to better prepare their region and citizens for wildfires. Planning for wildfires should take place long before a community is threatened. Once a wildfire ignites, the only option available to firefighters is to attempt to suppress the

fire before it reaches a community. A CWPP is unique in that it empowers communities to share the responsibility of determining the best strategies for protection against wildfire.

The Texas CWPP calls for communities to:

Know their environment (WUI), assets at risk, fire occurrence and behavior, and overall wildfire risks

Adopt mitigation strategies for wildfire prevention - fuels reduction to capacity building

Create and adopt recovery plan strategies

16.8 SCENARIO

A major conflagration in the planning area might begin with a wet spring, adding to fuels already present on the forest floor. Flash fuels would build throughout the spring. The summer could see the onset of insect infestation. A dry summer could follow the wet spring, exacerbated by dry hot winds. Carelessness with combustible materials or a tossed lit cigarette, or a sudden lightning storm could trigger a multitude of small isolated fires.

The embers from these smaller fires could be carried miles by hot, dry winds. The deposition zone for these embers would be deep in the forests and interface zones. Fires that start in flat areas move slower, but the wind still pushes them. It is not unusual for a wildfire pushed by wind to burn the ground fuel and later climb into the crown and reverse its track. This is one of many ways that fires can escape containment, typically during periods when response capabilities are overwhelmed. These new small fires would most likely merge. Suppression resources would be redirected from protecting the natural resources to saving more remote subdivisions.

The worst-case scenario would include an active fire season throughout Texas, spreading resources thin. Firefighting teams would be exhausted or unavailable. Many federal assets would be responding to other fires that started earlier in the season. While local fire districts would be extremely useful in the urban interface areas, they have limited wildfire capabilities or experience, and they would have a difficult time responding to the ignition zones. Even though the existence and spread of the fire is known, it may not be possible to respond to it adequately, so an initially manageable fire can become out of control before resources are dispatched.

To further complicate the problem, heavy rains could follow, causing flooding and landslides, and releasing tons of sediment into the Colorado River, San Bernard River, Tres Palacios River, and other creeks. This in turn could permanently change floodplains and damage sensitive habitat and riparian areas. Such a fire followed by rain could release millions of cubic yards of sediment into streams for years, creating new floodplains and changing existing ones. With the forests removed from the watershed, stream flows could easily double. Floods that could be expected every 50 years may occur every couple of years. With the streambeds unable to carry the increased discharge because of increased sediment, the floodplains and floodplain elevations would increase.

16.9 ISSUES

The major issues for wildfire are the following:

- Public education and outreach to people living in or near the fire hazard zones should include information about and assistance with mitigation activities such as defensible space, and advance identification of evacuation routes and safe zones.

- Wildfires could cause landslides as a secondary natural hazard.
- Climate change could affect the wildfire hazard.
- Future growth into interface areas should continue to be managed.
- Area fire districts need to continue to train on WUI events.
- Vegetation management activities should be enhanced.
- Regional consistency of higher building code standards should be adopted such as residential sprinkler requirements and prohibitive combustible roof standards.
- Fire department water supply in high-risk wildfire areas.
- Expand certifications and qualifications for fire department personnel. Ensure that all firefighters are trained in basic wildfire behavior, basic fire weather and that all company officers and chief level officers are trained in the wildland command and strike team leader level.
- Both the natural and man-made conditions that contribute to the wildland fire hazard are tending to exacerbate through time.
- Conservative forestry management practices have resulted in congested forests prone to fire and disease.
- The continued migration of inhabitants to remote areas of the county increases the probability of human-caused ignitions from vehicles, grills, campfires, and electrical devices.

Chapter 17.

WINTER WEATHER

| WINTER WEATHER RANKING | |
|------------------------|--------|
| Wharton County | Low |
| City of East Bernard | Medium |
| City of El Campo | Medium |
| City of Wharton | Medium |

| <u>DEFINITIONS</u> | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Freezing Rain | The result of rain occurring when the temperature is below the freezing point. The rain freezes on impact, resulting in a layer of glaze ice up to an inch thick. In a severe ice storm, an evergreen tree 60 feet high and 30 feet wide can be burdened with up to 6 tons of ice, creating a threat to power and telephone lines and transportation routes |
| Severe Local Storm | Small-scale atmospheric systems, including tornadoes, thunderstorms, windstorms, ice storms, and snowstorms. These storms may cause a great deal of destruction and even death, but their impact is generally confined to a small area. Typical impacts are on transportation infrastructure and utilities. |
| Winter/Ice Storm | A storm having significant snowfall, ice, or freezing rain; the quantity of precipitation varies by elevation. |

17.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

Winter/Ice storms can include heavy snow, ice, and blizzard conditions. Heavy snow can immobilize a region, stranding commuters, stopping the flow of supplies, and disrupting emergency and medical services. Accumulations of snow can collapse roofs and knock down trees and power lines. In rural areas, homes and farms may be isolated for days, and unprotected livestock may be lost. The cost of snow removal, damage repair, and business losses can have a tremendous impact on cities and towns.

Heavy accumulations of ice can bring down trees, electrical wires, telephone poles and lines, and communication towers. Communications and power can be disrupted for days until the damage can be repaired. Even small accumulations of ice may cause extreme hazards to motorists and pedestrians.

Some winter storms are accompanied by strong winds, creating blizzard conditions with blinding wind-driven snow, severe drifting, and dangerous wind chills. Strong winds with these intense storms and cold fronts can knock down trees, utility poles, and power lines. Blowing snow can reduce visibility to only a few feet in areas where there are no trees or buildings. Serious vehicle accidents can result in injuries and deaths.

Winter storms in Wharton County, including strong winds and ice conditions, can result in property damage, localized power and phone outages, and closures of streets, highways, schools, businesses, and nonessential government operations. People can also become isolated from essential services in their homes and vehicles. A winter storm can escalate, creating life-threatening situations when emergency


response is limited by severe winter conditions. Other issues associated with severe winter weather include hypothermia and the threat of physical overexertion that may lead to heart attacks or strokes. Snow and ice prevention as well as removal costs can impact budgets significantly.

17.1.1 Extreme Cold

Extreme cold often accompanies a winter storm or is left in its wake. It is most likely to occur in the winter months of December, January, and February. Prolonged exposure to the cold can cause frostbite or hypothermia and can become life-threatening. Infants and the elderly are most susceptible. Pipes may freeze and burst in homes or buildings that are poorly insulated or without heat. Extreme cold can disrupt or impair communications facilities.

In 2001, the NWS implemented an updated wind chill temperature index (see Figure 17-1). This index describes the relative discomfort or danger resulting from the combination of wind and temperature. The wind chill is based on the rate of heat loss from exposed skin caused by wind and cold. As the wind increases, it draws heat from the body, driving down skin temperature and eventually the internal body temperature.

Figure 17-1. National Weather Service Wind Chill Chart



Note: From Source: NOAA, NWS

A wind chill watch is issued by the NWS when wind chill warning criteria are possible in the next 12 to 36 hours. A wind chill warning is issued for wind chills of at least -25°F on plains and -35°F in mountains and foothills.

Table 17-1 contains a summary of temperature data related to extreme cold for Wharton County from NOAA weather stations. NOAA weather data consists of information collected from May 1904 to September 2011 by Pierce 1 E (USC00417020) weather station augmented with data from October 2011

to March 2021 from El Campo (USC00412786) weather station. These temperatures apply to all of Wharton County and participating communities.

**TABLE 17-1.
MINIMUM TEMPERATURE DATA SUMMARIES**

| Statistic | Years | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
|---|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Record Low Minimum | 1904-2021 | 4 | 8 | 18 | 28 | 30 | 50 | 51 | 40 | 42 | 27 | 10 | 7 |
| Record Low Maximum | 1904-2021 | 23 | 22 | 28 | 45 | 59 | 69 | 73 | 73 | 64 | 44 | 32 | 26 |
| Average Minimum | 1904-2021 | 42.0 | 44.5 | 50.5 | 57.9 | 65.1 | 70.7 | 72.4 | 72.1 | 68.1 | 58.9 | 49.8 | 43.5 |
| Average Days with a minimum 32 or Below | 1904-2021 | 6.7 | 3.8 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.7 | 5.0 |
| Notes: Temperatures are in degrees Fahrenheit From NOAA Weather Station (May 1904 – March 2021) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Few areas of Texas escape freezing weather in any winter. Wharton County and the participating communities receive little to no snow accumulations. More often than not, snow falling in the southern half of the state melts and does not stick to the surface; snow stays on the ground only once or twice every decade. Snowfall occurs at least once every winter in the northern half of Texas. During a winter event in the planning area, ice accumulations, as well as extreme cold, pose the most likely threat.

17.2 HAZARD PROFILE

17.2.1 Past Events

The National Climatic Data Center lists seven winter weather events that impacted Wharton County between 1996 and 2020. These events and estimated damage costs are outlined in Table 17-2. Wharton County does not experience severe winter weather events consistently, but winter storms can affect the HMP update area. Preliminary data on the historic winter storms that occurred in 2021 is included in this chapter. Since the winter events for Wharton County and participating communities occur on a zonal and regional scale, the winter events can be applied to all participating communities.

TABLE 17-2.
HISTORIC WINTER WEATHER EVENTS IN WHARTON COUNTY
(1996-2021)

| Location | Date | Event Type | Estimated Damage Cost | | | |
|----------------|------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------|----------|--------|
| | | | Property | Crops | Injuries | Deaths |
| Wharton (Zone) | 01/12/1997 | Ice Storm | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 1 |
| Wharton (Zone) | 12/24/2004 | Heavy Snow | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton (Zone) | 01/16/2007 | Ice Storm | \$4,000 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton (Zone) | 12/04/2009 | Winter Storm | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton (Zone) | 02/03/2011 | Ice Storm | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton (Zone) | 01/23/2014 | Winter Storm | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton (Zone) | 12/07/17 | Heavy Snow | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton (Zone) | 01/23/2014 | Winter Storm | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wharton (Zone) | 02/12/2021 | Ice Storm | \$0* | \$0* | 0* | 0* |
| Wharton (Zone) | 02/14/2021 | Winter Storm | \$0* | \$0* | 0* | 1* |

Notes:
*Preliminary Data as of April 13, 2021
From NOAA Storm Events

Winter Storm Outbreak 2021

In February 2021 three storm systems progressed through the United States. On Sunday, February 14, 2021, a strong arctic cold front progressing through the country reached Southeast Texas. This arctic cold front brought snow, sleet, and freezing rain into counties that had been previously unaffected by extreme winter weather. This cold front was the turning point in what would unfold into a historic winter event. For the next week, the state of Texas remained under a winter storm warning with the last hard freeze warning lifted on Saturday, February 20, 2021. The subfreezing temperatures affected the state's electricity infrastructure and left millions without power in dangerous conditions.

The historic winter temperatures created hazardous road conditions, cause at least 111 fatalities (as of April 13, 2021), overwhelmed the Texas power grid, and stressed state water supplies with many cities experiencing water outages, low pressure, and boil water notices.

Wharton and Participating Communities

Wharton county experienced below-freezing temperatures from February 14 to February 20. The lowest recorded temperature for Wharton and its participating communities was 10° F during the storm. There were hazardous road conditions and road closures throughout the remainder of the week.

Although Wharton County and its surrounding areas experienced less than 4" of snowfall on February 16, 2021, nearly 92% of all Wharton residents experienced power outages due to the extreme weather conditions in the rest of the State. As of April 13, 2021, there was one confirmed fatality in the County directly resulted from the subfreezing temperatures. A boil water notice was issued in the City of El Campo and the Boling Municipal Utility District. The City of Wharton did not issue a boil water notice

and only experienced low water pressure. Long-term analysis of this event and how it will affect hazard mitigation in the State of Texas will remain to be seen as data continues to be gathered.

17.2.2 Location

Wharton County and the participating communities are susceptible to severe winter storms; although severe winter weather or blizzard conditions are primarily in the form of freezing rain, sleet, or ice. Ice accumulation becomes a hazard by creating dangerous travel conditions. U.S. Highway 59 and State Highways 60 and 71 are important corridors to move people, supplies, and equipment into the region and to reach medical facilities outside of the counties. An accident on these roads can cause a major disruption in the flow of goods and services to the area. Wharton County is also susceptible to experiencing hazardous conditions due to extreme weather events in the State as a whole.

The record lows for Texas occur during October through March. According to data recorded by NWS between 1897 and 2014, the planning area experiences an average of 10 freezing days per year. The average first freeze in the HMP update area usually occurs in late November to early December and the last freeze occurs in late February to early March. In January 1940, Wharton County and participating communities experienced the coldest month on record with a mean temperature of about 42.6°F. The coldest recorded winter for the area was in 1979, with a mean temperature of about 46.2°F. Figure 6-4 shows the annual average minimum temperature distribution in Texas.

17.2.3 Frequency

Table 17-2 lists nine winter storms from 1996 to 2021. Therefore, on average a winter storm occurs in the county and participating communities once every 3 to 4 years. In this region, the first autumn freeze ordinarily occurs in early December, and the last frost date occurs in mid-March. On average cities in South Texas experience 10 to 20 freeze days per year. Winter events are usually zonal events and affect a large area, each participating community has the same frequency and probability of future events (once every 3 to 4 years). The strength and severity of future events will be likely in line with previous records as listed in Table 17-1 and Table 17-2. The strength and severity of the winter storm of 2021 is considered an outlier within the current record and the likelihood of its recurrence requires future observations of similar events.

17.2.4 Severity

The magnitude and severity of severe winter weather in Wharton County and the participating communities is low, resulting in minor injuries and illnesses; minimal property damage that does not severely threaten structural stability; or interruption of essential facilities and services for less than 48 hours. The reoccurrence of an extreme winter event such as the one experienced in 2021 is possible.

17.2.5 Warning Time

Meteorologists can often predict the likelihood of a severe winter storm. When forecasts are available, they can give several days of warning time. However, meteorologists cannot predict the exact time of onset or severity of the storm. Some storms may come on more quickly and have only a few hours of warning time.

17.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

The most significant secondary hazards associated with severe local storms are falling and downed trees, landslides, and downed power lines. There is also the threat of a disruption in the water supply distribution system and power outages. Heavy rain and icy conditions can overwhelm both natural and man-made drainage systems, causing overflow and property destruction. Landslides occur when the soil on slopes becomes oversaturated and fails. Additionally, the storms may result in closed highways and blocked roads. It is not unusual for motorists and residents to become stranded. Annually, icy conditions and frozen pipes cause damage to residences and businesses. Late-season winter events will typically cause some plant and crop damage.

17.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Climate change presents a significant challenge for risk management associated with severe weather. The frequency of severe weather events has increased steadily over the last century. Nationally, the number of weather-related disasters during the 1990s was four times that of the 1950s and cost 14 times as much in economic losses. Historical data shows that the probability of severe weather events increases in a warmer climate (see Figure 14-13). The changing hydrograph caused by climate change could have a significant impact on the intensity, duration, and frequency of storm events. All of these impacts could have significant economic consequences.

17.5 EXPOSURE

Because winter weather cannot be directly modeled in HAZUS-MH, annualized losses were estimated using GIS-based analysis, historical data analysis, and statistical risk assessment methodology. Event frequency, severity indicators, expert opinions, and historical knowledge of the region were used for this assessment. The primary data source was the updated HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs) augmented with state and federal data sets as well as the NOAA National Climatic Data Center Storm Event Database.

17.5.1 Population

It can be assumed that the entire planning area is exposed to severe winter weather events to some extent. Certain areas are more exposed due to geographic location and local weather patterns.

17.5.2 Property

According to the HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), there are 16,979 buildings within the census blocks that define the planning area with an asset replaceable value of almost \$3.9 billion (excluding contents). About 91% of these buildings (and 75% of the building value) are associated with residential housing. Other types of buildings in this report include agricultural, education, religious, and governmental structures. See hazard loss tables for community-specific total assessed numbers (e.g., Table 17-5). Table 17-3 lists the exposed structures and population for the participating communities.

Residents within a city or municipality are governed by building codes and ordinances. Buildings and land in unincorporated areas of the county are not governed by building codes. Because of the less stringent regulations, all of these buildings are considered to be exposed to severe winter weather, but

structures in poor condition or particularly vulnerable locations (located on hilltops or exposed open areas) may risk the most damage. The frequency and degree of damage to a building will depend on specific locations.

**TABLE 17-3
EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION**

| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
|-----------------------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------------|------------------|
| City of East Bernard | 909 | 62 | 43 | 1,014 | 2,272 |
| City of El Campo | 4,465 | 352 | 200 | 5,017 | 11,602 |
| City of Wharton | 3,299 | 321 | 138 | 3,758 | 8,832 |
| Unincorporated Area | 6,799 | 210 | 181 | 7,190 | 18,574 |
| Wharton County Total | 15,472 | 945 | 562 | 16,979 | 41,280 |

Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications.

17.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

All critical facilities are likely exposed to winter weather events. The most common problems associated with this hazard are utility loss. Downed power lines can cause blackouts, leaving large areas isolated. Phone, water, and sewer systems may not function. Roads may become impassable due to ice or snow. Ice accumulation on roadways can create dangerous driving conditions. Several county roads are available to move people and supplies throughout the region.

17.5.4 Environment

The environment is highly exposed to severe weather events. Natural habitats such as streams and trees risk major damage and destruction. Flooding events caused by snowmelt can produce river channel migration or damage riparian habitat.

17.6 VULNERABILITY

Although a winter storm is a slow onset hazard with generally six to twelve hours of warning time, utility disruptions from winter storms can severely impact the delivery of services. Water pipes can freeze and crack in sub-freezing temperatures. Ice can build up on power lines and cause them to break under the weight or ice on trees can cause tree limbs to fall on the lines. These events can disrupt electric service for long periods.

The economic impact may be felt by increased consumption of heating fuel which can lead to energy shortages and higher prices. House fires and resulting deaths tend to occur more frequently from increased and improper use of alternative heating sources. Fires during winter storms also present a greater danger because water supplies may freeze and impede firefighting efforts.

All populations, buildings, critical facilities, and infrastructure in the planning area are vulnerable to severe winter events. People and animals are subject to health risks from extended exposure to cold air.

Elderly people and economically disadvantaged populations in the planning area are at greater risk of death from hypothermia during these events. According to the U.S. Center for Disease Control, every year hypothermia kills about 600 Americans, half of whom are 65 years of age or older.

17.6.1 Population

Vulnerable populations are the elderly, low-income, linguistically isolated populations, people with life-threatening illnesses, and residents living in areas that are isolated from major roads. Power outages can be life-threatening to those dependent on electricity for life support. Isolation of these populations is a significant concern. These populations face isolation and exposure during severe winter weather events and could suffer more secondary effects of the hazard. Commuters who are caught in storms may be particularly vulnerable. Stranded commuters may be vulnerable to carbon monoxide poisoning or hypothermia. Additionally, individuals engaged in outdoor recreation during a severe winter event may be difficult to locate and rescue. Table 17-4 contains more specific jurisdictional information.

| TABLE 17-4 MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Youth Population (< 16) | % of Total Population | Elderly Population (> 65) | % of Total Population | Economically Disadvantage (Income< \$20,000) | % of Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 638 | 28.07 | 342 | 15.05 | 129 | 5.68 |
| City of El Campo | 3402 | 29.33 | 1648 | 14.21 | 992 | 8.55 |
| City of Wharton | 2317 | 26.23 | 1288 | 14.58 | 1251 | 14.17 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4,715 | 25.39 | 2,741 | 14.76 | 1,537 | 8.28 |
| Wharton County Total | 11,072 | 26.82 | 6,019 | 14.58 | 3,910 | 9.47 |

17.6.2 Property

All property is vulnerable during severe winter weather events, but properties in poor condition or in particularly vulnerable locations may risk the most damage. Those that are located under or near overhead lines or large trees may be vulnerable to falling ice or may be damaged in the event of a collapse.

Loss estimations for severe winter weather are not based on damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, loss estimates were developed representing projected damages (annualized loss) on historical events, statistical analysis, and probability factors. These were applied to the participating communities' reported event damages and exposed values for structures and content to create an annualized loss. Annualized losses of 'negligible' are less than \$50 annually. The annualized loss estimated for winter storm events is shown in Table 17-5.

| TABLE 17-5. LOSS ESTIMATES FOR WINTER STORM EVENTS | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value | Annualized Loss | Annualized Loss Percentage |
| City of East Bernard | \$391,249,566 | Negligible | Negligible |
| City of El Campo | \$2,159,712,947 | Negligible | Negligible |
| City of Wharton | \$1,416,664,643 | Negligible | Negligible |
| Unincorporated Area | \$2,255,940,086 | \$316 | <0.01 |
| Wharton County Total | \$6,233,567,243 | \$316 | <0.01 |

Vulnerability Narrative

Each community's vulnerability to winter weather events are described below.

- **City of East Bernard** - Winter storms in the City of East Bernard would expose the residents to high utility bills. Roads become dangerous to travel on because of icy conditions. This can lead to schools and businesses being shut down for a day or two. Communities that implement comprehensive outreach programs to educate residents on the risks and hazards associated with severe winter weather reduce their vulnerability.
- **City of El Campo** - The City of El Campo is at a greater risk of rolling blackouts during a winter weather event due to high usage. This can expose the elderly and economically disadvantaged residents to prolonged periods of cold without heating and high utility bills. Roads become dangerous to travel on because of icy conditions. This can lead to schools and businesses being shut down for a day or two. Homes built without proper building codes could suffer from a lack of insulation and may experience deteriorating infrastructure, physical harm, and property damage.
- **City of Wharton** - Winter storms in the City of Wharton would expose the residents to high utility bills. Roads become dangerous to travel on because of icy conditions. Communities that implement alternate power sources for critical facilities impacted during a winter storm help to mitigate the risk associated with increased wait times for residents in need.
- **Wharton County (Unincorporated Area)** – Wharton County Unincorporated Areas are at a greater risk of rolling blackouts during a winter weather event due to high usage from other areas of the electrical grid. The more rural areas of Wharton County could experience longer wait times for emergency response actions. This could expose them to hazards such as prolonged periods of cold without heating. Also, this would have a greater effect on the young, elderly, and economically disadvantaged that may not have the means to respond to such an event.

Community Perception of Vulnerability

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this HMP update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

17.6.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Incapacity and loss of roads are the primary transportation failures resulting from winter weather, mostly associated with secondary hazards. Snowstorms can significantly impact the transportation system and the availability of public safety services. Of particular concern are roads providing access to isolated areas and to the elderly. Prolonged obstruction of major routes can disrupt the shipment of goods and other commerce. Large, prolonged storms can have negative economic impacts on an entire region.

Severe windstorms, downed trees, and ice can create serious impacts on power and above-ground communication lines. Freezing of power and communication lines can cause them to break, disrupting electricity and communication. Loss of electricity and phone connection would leave certain populations isolated because residents would be unable to call for assistance.

17.6.4 Environment

The vulnerability of the environment to winter weather is the same as the exposure, discussed in Section 17.5.4.

17.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

All future development will be affected by winter storms. The vulnerability of community assets to severe winter storms is increasing over time as more people enter the planning area. The ability to withstand impacts lies in sound land-use practices and consistent enforcement of codes and regulations for new construction. The planning partners have adopted the International Building Code. This code is equipped to deal with the impacts of severe weather events. Land-use policies identified in general plans within the planning area also address many of the secondary impacts (flood and landslide) of the severe weather hazard. With these tools, the planning partnership is well equipped to deal with future growth and the associated impacts of severe weather.

17.8 SCENARIO

Although severe local storms are infrequent, impacts can be significant, particularly when secondary hazards, such as floods or erosion occur. A worst-case event would involve prolonged high winds during a winter storm accompanied by thunderstorms. Such an event would have both short-term and longer-term effects. Initially, schools and roads would be closed due to power outages caused by high winds and downed tree obstructions. In more rural areas, some subdivisions could experience limited ingress and egress. Prolonged rain could produce flooding, overtopped culverts with ponded water on roads, and erosion on steep slopes. Flooding and landslides could further obstruct roads and bridges, further isolating residents.

17.9 ISSUES

Important issues associated with a winter storm in the planning area include the following:

- The older building stock in the planning area is built to low code standards or none at all. These structures could be highly vulnerable to winter weather, particularly freezing temperatures, high winds, and ice.
- The redundancy of the power supply must be evaluated.

- The capacity for backup power generation is limited.
- Future efforts should be made to identify populations at risk and determine special needs during a winter storm event.

Chapter 18.

PANDEMIC

| PANDEMIC RANKING | |
|----------------------|------|
| Wharton County | High |
| City of East Bernard | High |
| City of El Campo | High |
| City of Wharton | High |

| DEFINITIONS | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Pandemic | An outbreak of a disease that occurs over a wide geographic area, such as multiple countries or continents, and typically affects a significant proportion of the population. |
| Outbreak | The sudden rise in the incidence of a disease. |
| Vector | Living organisms that can transmit infectious pathogens between humans, or from animals to humans |
| Common Vehicle | Disease transmitted by a common inanimate vehicle resulting in multiple infections; most commonly food or water. |

18.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

Infectious disease outbreaks occur from the presence of a pathogenic microbial agent. The level of infection determines the classification of the event as either an endemic, epidemic, or pandemic. An endemic classifies infections disease which is present at all times, but a low frequency. An epidemic is the sudden outbreak of the disease in a specified area, such as a city, country, or region. A pandemic is a result of an epidemic becoming more widespread. More specifically, a pandemic is an outbreak of a disease that occurs over a wide geographic area, such as multiple countries or continents, and typically affects a significant proportion of the population.

Diseases can spread through a population in a multitude of ways such as contact (direct and/or indirect), droplet, airborne, vector, and common vehicle. According to FEMA, endemic and epidemic infectious diseases are the leading cause of death worldwide (FEMA, n.d.). As the world continues to become more interconnected via travel, the threat of a rapidly spreading disease increases. Growing populations contribute to more densely populated areas causing an increase in the risk of exposure and allowing for the rapid spread of a potentially infectious disease. This, coupled with the increase in travel, creates a system capable of facilitating a pandemic.

Although the direct effects of the infectious disease during a pandemic are of great significance to human health, the effects on the economy and society can be far-reaching as well, as seen by the recent COVID-19 pandemic (see 18.2.1). A pandemic can cause major disruptions to daily lives through issued quarantines, and lockdowns among other non-pharmaceutical measures to prevent the spread of the infectious disease. The healthcare industry can become overwhelmed causing supply issues, strained medical workers, and neglected patients with other diseases or health problems. Economically,

manufacturing delays may cause supply chain disruptions, both national and international businesses can experience a downturn, and companies can experience a decrease in revenue growth creating a downward turn in the national and global economy. A society can also see far-reaching social implications such as the service sector being unable to operate, the disruption of cultural celebrations and religious festivities, as well as a rise in stress among the population (Haleem et. al., 2020).

18.2 HAZARD PROFILE

18.2.1 Past Events

Since the founding of Wharton County in 1846, there have been multiple pandemics that have occurred according to the Center for Disease Control (CDC). Although variants of the influenza virus have accounted for the majority of pandemics that have occurred in the United States, there have been other pandemics that have been caused by other infectious diseases. Some of these include the coronaviruses and human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS). Some of the more substantial pandemics which have affected the United States and therefore Wharton County since the founding are discussed below.

1918 Flu Pandemic

Considered one of the most severe pandemics in recent history, the flu pandemic of 1918 spread throughout the world from 1918 to 1919. Although the origin of the H1N1 influenza virus of the 1918 pandemic was never identified, the infection spread to the United States in the spring of 1918. At the time, no vaccine existed to guard the population from the rapidly spreading flu. This was accompanied by a lack of treatment options for secondary bacterial infections associated with flu infections. This resulted in limited control efforts such as isolation, quarantine, good personal hygiene, use of disinfectants, and limitation of public gatherings. By the end of the pandemic, it was estimated that approximately 500 million people, one-third of the world's population at the time, had been infected with the virus resulting in 50 million deaths worldwide, 675,000 of which occurred in the United States (CDC, 2018). Texas accounted for approximately 2,100 of the deaths in the United States, of which most occurred during September and October of 1918. Major urban areas of the state, such as Houston, issued bans on gatherings to help mitigate the spread of the virus during this time (Sault, 2020).

2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS)

Often noted as the first pandemic of the 21st century, SARS was first reported in Asia in February of 2003. The coronavirus illness (SARS-CoV) spread throughout more than two dozen countries, including the United States, and four continents before being contained. According to World Health Organization (WHO) data, in total 8,098 cases were reported, eight of which occurred in the United States. In each of the eight lab-confirmed cases in the United States, patients had traveled to locations where an outbreak was occurring. The pandemic resulted in 774 deaths, at a 9.6% mortality rate, none of which were in the United States. Since 2004 there have been no reported cases of SARS, but the six-month outbreak is estimated to have cost \$40 billion globally (CDC, 2016).

2019-Present Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19)

The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) was first identified in Wuhan, China in December of 2019. This disease is also known as the novel (or new) coronavirus as it has not previously been seen in humans. Like the coronavirus which spread during the 2003 SARS pandemic, the COVID-19 virus is a

respiratory disease caused by SARS-CoV-2. Since the virus was new when it first emerged, there were no available treatments or natural immunity to the pathogen resulting in a rapid spread from host to host.


In the United States, the first confirmed case of COVID-19 occurred on January 21, 2020, in a person having recently traveled back to the U.S. from the epicenter, Wuhan, China. By January 31st the global number of cases hit 9,800 with more than 200 deaths causing WHO to issue a Global Health Emergency. This was soon followed by the U.S. declaring a public health emergency on February 3rd. The first major outbreak in the U.S. occurred on March 6th with 21 passengers on a California cruise ship testing positive for COVID-19. By March 11th, WHO had officially declared COVID-19 a pandemic closely followed by a National Emergency declaration being issued in the U.S. two days later (AMJC, 2021).

COVID-19 quickly spread to every state in the U.S. after the first outbreak reporting in March. Figure 18-1 and Figure 18-2 illustrate the reported number of cases in Texas and Wharton County, respectively, since the beginning of the pandemic in March 2020 to May 2021.

In an effort to reduce the spread of the virus, multiple non-pharmaceutical measures were put in place throughout the country while medical professionals worked to produce a vaccine. By March 11th, most universities in Texas had switched to online learning, and on March 13th Texas declared a statewide emergency. On March 19th the governor of Texas issued an executive order closing all bars, restaurants, and schools. Soon after many counties issued stay-at-home orders and elective medical procedures were halted in most major counties to help relieve stress on the healthcare system. In a little over two weeks from the first major outbreak and the first executive order, the number of Texans filing for unemployment jumped 860%. Over the coming months, the reopening of industries began in a phased approach accompanied by the issuing of a mask mandate on July 2nd. Finally, on December 14th, the first doses of the COVID-19 vaccine arrived in Texas.


Over a year after the pandemic began, Texas officially reopened all businesses and lifted mask mandates on March 2, 2021. From March 2020 to May 2021, the Department of Health Services has reported 2,498,217 confirmed COVID-19 cases in Texas resulting in 49,900 deaths. Out of this Wharton County accounts for 3,693 cases and 116 deaths (Texas HHS, 2021). Confirmed cases of COVID-19 continue to occur throughout the country as the pandemic continues. As of May 18, 2021, there have been 163,312,429 confirmed cases of COVID-19 including 3,386,825 deaths (WHO, 2021). These numbers continue to rise as the COVID-19 pandemic continues into 2021.

Figure 18-1. New Cases Per Day in Texas During COVID-19 Pandemic Thus Far



Note: From Texas HHS

Figure 18-2. New Cases Per Day in Wharton County During COVID-19 Pandemic Thus Far



Note: From Texas HHS

18.2.2 Location

The origin of pandemics is random. Although Wharton County might not be the origin of a pandemic, by definition, this hazard usually encompasses the entire globe or extensive portions of it. If a pandemic were to reach any part of the United States, it is highly likely that it would reach Wharton County due to the interconnectivity of the country, but is variable based on disease transmission type. The more densely populated areas, such as the cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton, would be at the greatest risk for initial transmission. Although the unincorporated areas of Wharton are not as densely populated, the interconnectivity of the county's population both in industry and social gatherings would allow for further transmission. There are no distinct geographical boundaries for infectious diseases, therefore, they can occur throughout the planning area.

18.2.3 Frequency

The frequency of pandemics is unpredictable, but as noted by the Cleveland Clinic, intervals between pandemics are becoming shorter. A multitude of pandemics have been documented throughout human history at different severity levels. Since the turn of the 21st century, there have been multiple notable pandemics including but not limited to the 2003 SARS, 2009 Swine Flu, and COVID-19. It is expected that a pandemic will be experienced in the planning area within the next 10 years at some level of severity (see 18.2.4).

18.2.4 Severity

Pandemics have the potential to impact the planning area population as well as the economy at a variety of severity levels. From the population perspective, a pandemic can be evaluated based on the impact the disease has on those who have been infected, or the death toll to which is attributed to the pandemic. A common measure is the Pandemic Severity Index (PSI), which uses the case fatality ratio as the critical driver for categorizing the severity of a pandemic as shown in Table 18-1. This ranks a pandemic on Level 1 to Level 5, with Level 1 being least severe and Level 5 most severe. Based on the pandemic level of an area, varying non-pharmaceutical measures are suggested to mitigate transmission. These suggested measures could in turn have negative impacts on the economy such as those experienced during the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (Javaria, 2020).

| TABLE 18-1. PANDEMIC SEVERITY INDEX (PSI) | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Category | Case Fatality Ratio | Example |
| 1 | Less than 0.1% | Seasonal Flu |
| 2 | 0.1 - <0.5% | Asian Flu and Hong Kong Flu |
| 3 | 0.5 - <1% | Pandemic H1N1 (2009) |
| 4 | 1.0 - <2.0% | Lassa Fever |
| 5 | 2.0% or higher | 1918 Flu Pandemic |
| Note: Data from Javaria 2020 | | |

18.2.5 Warning Time

Very little to no warning can occur during the outbreak of a pandemic. With a vastly connected globe, an infectious disease can travel throughout the world in a matter of hours.

18.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Beyond the actual risk of an infectious disease are many other impacts. Pandemics can cause an increase in morbidity and mortality within a population, especially for lower-income citizens. Mitigation measures can cause significant social and economic disruption leading to individual behavioral changes and negative economic growth. These hazards can have lasting implications on the society for which it affects (Madhav et al, 2017).

18.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Although climate change does not have a direct impact on a pandemic, climate and natural disasters can play a role in the spread of infectious diseases. As climate change continues to increase the frequency of weather events such as hurricanes and droughts, the possibility of disease-spreading events increases. As described by Michaela Gack, Ph.D., Director, Cleveland Clinic's Florida Research and Innovation Center:

In some cases, it can displace certain animal species and thereby bring them in closer contact with humans, either directly with humans or via domestic animals, and this then facilitates cross-species transmission so that viruses can be transmitted from these wild animal species onto humans and thereby cause outbreaks.

Specifically, Dr. Gack notes “in the past 20 years, several viral outbreaks have been linked to a combination of human and environmental factors, including SARS, MERS, and Ebola.” (Cleveland Clinic, 2021).

18.5 EXPOSURE AND VULNERABILITY

While the entirety of the planning area is exposed to a pandemic hazard, potential loss estimates to the built environment are difficult to calculate. Generally, the most significant losses are experienced by the population and the healthcare network. The vulnerability of the population and critical facilities/infrastructure is unpredictable due to the varying nature of infectious diseases.

18.5.1 Population

It can be assumed that the entire planning area is exposed equally to the risk of a pandemic. Certain areas of higher population density have an increased risk of transmission throughout the community at a higher rate, but lower population density areas remain at equal risk of infection. The most vulnerable demographics during a pandemic will typically be the economically disadvantaged population areas, children under 16 years of age, and the elderly. Economically disadvantaged families and those living on a fixed income may not have the financial means to adequately deal with the effects of an event and not take the necessary steps to mitigate the spread of infectious diseases. The youth and elderly population may require further assistance as dependents if an event were to occur and tend to have weaker immune systems more susceptible to disease. Table 18-2 shows vulnerable populations per participating community.

| TABLE 18-2 MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Youth Population (< 16) | % of Total Population | Elderly Population (> 65) | % of Total Population | Economically Disadvantage (Income< \$20,000) | % of Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 638 | 28.07 | 342 | 15.05 | 129 | 5.68 |
| City of El Campo | 3402 | 29.33 | 1648 | 14.21 | 992 | 8.55 |
| City of Wharton | 2317 | 26.23 | 1288 | 14.58 | 1251 | 14.17 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4,715 | 25.39 | 2,741 | 14.76 | 1,537 | 8.28 |
| Total | 11,072 | 26.82 | 6,019 | 14.58 | 3,910 | 9.47 |

18.5.2 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Although all critical facilities and infrastructure in the planning area will be exposed equally to the risk of a pandemic, healthcare facilities will likely experience the greatest burden. If healthcare facilities and staff do not have the means to provide for the infected, further loss can be experienced by the community. Other critical infrastructures may also be limited by an infectious disease event such as emergency services, utility services, water services, and telecommunications. This can be caused by a lack of staffing or supplies necessary to provide the services (Madhav et al, 2021).

18.6 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

As the population of Wharton County and its participating communities continues to increase so does the risk of transmission associate with an infectious disease. Although pandemics are unpredictable, keeping the community informed with the most up-to-date information during an event is key. One of the most cost-effective strategies for increasing pandemic preparedness is consistently investing in critical facilities and infrastructure. Creating a scalable contingency plan for future outbreaks of varying sizes and severity is ideal for planning for future pandemics.

18.7 SCENARIO

Although pandemics with lasting and extensive impacts are not common, they are possible in the planning area. A worst-case scenario would involve an extremely contagious infectious disease that infects a large portion of the planning area and world. If the disease has a high mortality rate, PSI level 5, the high death rate could cripple the local and global economy. This would in turn disrupt supply chains to the county potentially resulting in food and basic necessity shortages. Critical facilities and infrastructure could become overburden or fail. This level of event could result in lasting damage to the planning areas' population, economy, and social structure.

18.8 ISSUES

The major issues for a pandemic are the following:

- Pandemics are unpredictable and can spread fast leaving little time to react and mitigate an outbreak.
- An increase in population density and connection of population centers both economically and socially to other areas increase the possibility of transmission of an infectious disease if an outbreak occurs.
- The creation of a scalable pandemic prevention and action plan for the county and participating communities is advised.

Chapter 19.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| HAZARDOUS MATERIALS RANKING | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Wharton County | High |
| City of East Bernard | High |
| City of El Campo | High |
| City of Wharton | High |

DEFINITIONS

Hazardous Materials Matter (solid, liquid, or gas) or energy that when released is capable of creating harm to people, the environment, and property, including weapons of mass destruction

19.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

According to the NFPA, a hazardous material (HAZMAT) is defined as “matter (solid, liquid, or gas) or energy that when released is capable of creating harm to people, the environment, and property, including weapons of mass destruction” (FEMA, 2019). HAZMAT incidents can cause significant impacts such as death, long-lasting health effects, or damage to buildings, infrastructure, and the environment.

HAZMATs vary greatly in the types of health risks they pose to humans, according to FEMA (2019). The risk to human health can vary from thermal, radiological, asphyxiation, chemical, etiological (biological), and mechanical harm:

- Thermal harm results from exposure to temperature extremes.
- Radiological harm results from exposure to radioactive materials.
- Asphyxiation results from exposure to materials that reduce oxygen levels that may cause suffocation.
- Chemical harm results from exposure to chemicals, including poison and corrosives.
- Etiological (Biological) harm results from exposure to biological materials, which include bacteria, viruses, and biological toxins.
- Mechanical harm results from exposure to, or contact with, fragmentation or debris scattered because of pressure release, explosion, or boiling liquid expanding vapor explosion.

HAZMAT incidents can happen during production, storage, transportation, use, or disposal (*Hazardous Materials Incidents*, 2021). During transportation, the method of transport could become involved in a traffic accident that would cause the material to be released. HAZMATs can also be released while being stored and handled due to poor packaging and nonsecure transportation.

19.2 HAZARD PROFILE

HAZMAT incidents can be a secondary hazard to natural hazard events such as floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and earthquakes. Not only can these hazards cause an incident, but they can also hinder response efforts. In the case of Hurricane Floyd in September 1999, communities along the Eastern United States were faced with flooded junkyards, disturbed cemeteries, deceased livestock, floating propane tanks, uncontrolled fertilizer spills, and a variety of other environmental pollutants causing widespread concern.

Weather conditions will directly affect how a HAZMAT incident develops. The micro-meteorological effects of buildings and terrain can alter the travel and duration of agents. Non-compliance with fire and building codes, as well as failure to maintain existing fire and containment features can substantially increase the damage from a HAZMAT release. In addition to the primary release, explosions and/or fires can result from a release, and contaminants can be extended beyond the initial area by persons, vehicles, water, wind, and wildlife. These factors contribute to the importance of maintaining an effective response team at all times.

Commercial Facilities Hazard

The EPA regulates hazardous chemicals used in commercial facilities and sets the limits of exposure to hazardous materials within the workplace. Chemical manufacturing, metal production, metal fabrication, and petroleum processing are four industries “responsible for approximately 90% of all industrial materials and waste generated”, including hazardous materials (EKU, 2020). Exposure to hazardous materials at these facilities comes in four forms (gases or vapors, liquids, dust, and solids) and can result in a variety of health issues or even death. In the event of a spill, leak, or exposure, appropriate safety equipment should be utilized to mitigate the effects.

Some HAZMATs are not as heavily regulated but can be just as dangerous under the right conditions. Ammonium nitrate, a chemical commonly used as fertilizer, is non-reactive under most conditions; however, when stored improperly can become destructive. When exposed to extreme heat, ammonium nitrate can be destabilized and make a fire burn even hotter or cause an explosion. If the destabilized chemical were confined or contaminated, there is a greater risk of explosion (Wertz, 2020).

Two incidents of note are the Beirut, Lebanon storage facility explosion and the West, Texas fertilizer plant explosion which were directly caused by the chemical ammonium nitrate:


In the port city of Beirut, on August 4, 2020, the improper storage of ammonium nitrate led to a major explosion. The explosion killed over 200 people and destroyed over 77,000 homes. The damage resulted in major, long-lasting critical infrastructure damage as well as the city and country's economy. (Fakih, 2021). The United Nations Development Program has estimated that the cost of cleaning up the environmental degradation from the explosion will be over \$100 million.

In West, Texas on April 17, 2013, an explosion occurred at the West Fertilizer Company. A fire started at the plant leading to an explosion of the ammonium nitrate storage. The explosion resulted in 15 deaths, approximating 200 injuries, and 350 damaged homes. Local community structures, as well as private residents, were heavily damaged or destroyed during the explosion leading to long-lasting impacts on the community (ABS Consulting, 2015).

Solar Farms Hazard

Solar farms expose the environment to multiple hazardous materials. The panels used to convert sunlight to electricity utilize toxic materials that can be leached into the environment. Issues may arise from the disposal of old solar modules. The Electric Power Research Institute conducted a study on solar panels which concluded that the disposal of solar panels in landfills is not recommended due to the potential for modules to break causing a release of toxic materials into the environment, specifically the soil). Solar panels often contain lead, cadmium, and other toxic chemicals which can leach into the environment unless disposed of properly (Shellenberger, 2019. Figure 19-1 identifies three solar farms that are operating or in the development stage within the planning area.

Figure 19-1. Solar Farms in Wharton County



Lithium Battery Hazard


Lithium batteries are considered hazardous material and must be transported following regulations established by the U.S. Department of Transportation's Hazardous Materials Regulations. Lithium-ion batteries contain highly flammable solvents separated by a thin plastic film (Phelan, 2020). If there is an issue with the plastic film and the solvents combine, a fire or explosion can occur, potentially releasing toxic gases.

Pipeline Hazard

The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) regulates and ensures the safe and secure movement of hazardous materials through pipelines (PHMSA, 2021). Many factors can contribute to pipeline safety issues such as “manufacturing issues, external weather and environmental issues, and age-related integrity issues” (PHMSA, 2019). Hazardous liquid lines transport crude oil, refined liquid product, liquid carbon dioxide, liquid anhydrous ammonia, and highly volatile liquids. Pipelines also serve as the major mode of transportation for natural gas as well as other hazardous gases in the United States.

These pipelines create a web throughout the United States spanning approximately 2.6 million miles with diameters ranging from 2 to 48 inches. According to the PHMSA, “43 percent of all hazardous liquid pipelines were installed prior to 1970”. In recent decades, many improvements have been made to pipeline manufacturing and construction. Pipelines constructed prior to 1970 are “vulnerable to seam-quality issues” (PHMSA, 2019). The transportation of HAZMATs through pipelines is considered low risk for an exposure incident but can result in high consequences should an incident occur. Figure 19-2 identifies the locations of all pipelines in Wharton County according to Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) records. These records identified approximately 548 miles of liquid transmission pipeline and 1,550 miles of gas transmission pipelines are within Wharton County.

Figure 19-2. Pipelines in Wharton County




Note: From TxDOT

Railway Hazard

Railways are often used for the transport of HAZMATs due to their high level of safety as a mode of transportation. According to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), from 1994 to 2005, 116 fatalities occurred due to hazardous materials released in highway accidents whereas only 14 fatalities occurred due to hazardous material released in railroad accidents (2020). The FRA administers and oversees the movement of hazardous materials. When HAZMATs are transported over railways, a range of safety measures are taken, ranging from “special train formations, improved maintenance of vehicles and track, routing away from heavily populated areas and special handling and security” (IRSC, n.d.). Accidents involving trains carrying HAZMATs can result in toxic spills, most of which are caused by derailed trains. Trains don’t carry passengers when they carry HAZMATs, so spills mostly affect those who live in the community where the spill occurs (Pottroff & Karlin, 2021). Figure 19-3 displays the locations of the railways that run through Wharton County.

Figure 19-3. Railways in Wharton County



19.2.1 Past Events

Wharton County has experienced 24 highway transportation incidents, none of which are classified as serious HAZMAT incidents. According to PHMSA (2000), a serious incident includes:

- a fatality or major injury caused by the release of hazardous material
- the evacuation of 25 or more employees or responders or any number of the general public as a result of the release of a hazardous material or exposure to fire
- a release or exposure to fire which results in the closure of a major transportation artery
- the alteration of an aircraft flight plan or operation
- the release of radioactive materials from Type B packaging
- the suspected release of Risk Group 3 or 4 infectious substance
- the release of over 11.9 gallons or 88.2 pounds of a severe marine pollutant
- the release of a bulk quantity (over 119 gallons or 882 pounds) of hazardous material.


Notable hazardous materials spills in the planning area are as follows:

- In 2014, a natural gas line along F.M. 1164, in Wharton County, ruptured causing an explosion. One person driving near the line experienced non-life-threatening injuries, but the explosion caused damage to the roadway and a nearby house. After the explosion occurred, the line was isolated so gas could no longer feed into the line. The road was closed and the fire was allowed to burn off (Halvety, 2014). Although there were no casualties during this incident, HAZMAT incidents can result in mass casualties and the destruction of numerous properties.
- On May 11, 2001, a fire occurred at a facility in the City of East Bernard resulting in the release of 250 pounds of pesticides. Although the release did not occur directly at the East Bernard River, the chemicals progressed through the storm water sewer and the City of East Bernard sewage treatment facility until finally reaching the river system. The spill released high levels of Guthion 2L and Bidrin-8, both highly toxic chemicals to fish, into the river system resulting in a fish kill approximately 20 miles downstream as well as the death of other area livestock (NOAA, 2015).

19.2.2 Location

Figure 19-4 shows the hazardous materials facilities in Wharton County. This list was compiled with the use of the HAZUS-HM inventory system as well as local knowledge. Undocumented hazardous materials storage may be located in the planning area at locations not identified in Figure 19-4. Hazardous materials may also travel throughout the planning area via railroads, pipelines, or roads.

Figure 19-4. HAZMAT Facilities in Wharton County



19.2.3 Frequency

Based on historical occurrence data provided by PHMSA, Wharton County and participating communities can expect to experience a hazardous material spill every 1 to 2 years, most likely linked to a transportation incident.

19.2.4 Severity

HAZMAT spills or toxic releases can have a substantial impact. Such events can cause multiple deaths, completely shut down facilities for 30 days or more, and cause more than 50 percent of affected properties to be destroyed or suffer major damage. Shielding in the form of sheltering-in-place can protect people and property from harmful events. Long-term effects can also result from releases in the form of contamination to land, soil, and groundwater.

The impacts associated with a pipeline failure are highly dependent upon the product being transported. If any of the pipelines in the planning area were to rupture, such an event could endanger lives and cause damage to property in the immediate area (within less than a half-mile radius).

19.2.5 Warning Time

Warning time for hazardous materials incidents is minimal to none. There are, however, more long-term and gradual releases, such as with solar farms that can and should be expected once these farms are operational.

19.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Hazardous materials spills and leaks can pollute waterways exposing fish to toxic chemicals causing immediate death or long-term disease. Spills can also negatively impact the growth of other aquatic life, destroying plant habitats and food sources. Common secondary hazards associated with toxic releases and hazardous materials include:

- Water quality
- Fire
- Air quality
- Public Health
- Agricultural Operations

19.4 EXPOSURE

All of Wharton County is exposed to HAZMATs, however, those closest to the storage facilities and solar farms, as well as those along the railways, highways, and pipelines, face a greater risk of exposure. An analysis was conducted to identify population and property within a half-mile radius of all documents hazardous materials locations (See Tables 19-2 through 19-5).

19.4.1 Population

It can be assumed that the entire planning area population may be potentially exposed to hazardous materials. Certain areas are at a higher risk of exposure due to their location near HAZMAT facilities (See Tables 19-2 through 19-5).

19.4.2 Property

According to the HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), there are 16,979 buildings within the census blocks that define the planning area with an asset replaceable value of almost \$3.9 billion (excluding contents). About 91% of these buildings (and 75% of the building value) are associated with residential housing. Other types of buildings in this report include agricultural, education, religious, and governmental structures. See hazard loss tables for community-specific total assessed numbers (e.g., Table 19-7). Table 19-1 list the exposed structures and population for the participating communities.

Although all structures within the planning area are considered at risk to HAZMAT incidents, those located near the HAZMAT facilities and along railways, major roads, and pipelines have a greater risk of exposure. Tables 19-2 through 19-5 list the exposed structures and population within a half-mile radius of storage/commercial facilities, solar farms, pipelines, and railways for each participating community.

| TABLE 19-1 EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 909 | 62 | 43 | 1,014 | 2,272 |
| City of El Campo | 4,465 | 352 | 200 | 5,017 | 11,602 |
| City of Wharton | 3,299 | 321 | 138 | 3,758 | 8,832 |
| Unincorporated Area | 6,799 | 210 | 181 | 7,190 | 18,574 |
| Wharton County Total | 15,472 | 945 | 562 | 16,979 | 41,280 |
| Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications. | | | | | |

TABLE 19-2
EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION WITHIN A HALF-MILE RADIUS OF
STORAGE/COMMERCIAL FACILITIES

| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
|-----------------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|------------------|------------------|
| City of East Bernard | 406 | 36 | 24 | 466 | 1,060 |
| City of El Campo | 713 | 63 | 36 | 812 | 2,175 |
| City of Wharton | 675 | 93 | 32 | 800 | 1,647 |
| Unincorporated Area | 74 | 6 | 3 | 83 | 256 |
| Wharton County Total | 1,868 | 198 | 95 | 2,161 | 5,138 |

Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications.

TABLE 19-3
EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION WITHIN A HALF-MILE RADIUS OF
SOLAR FARMS

| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|----------|------------------|------------------|
| City of East Bernard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of El Campo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of Wharton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unincorporated Area | 165 | 1 | 3 | 169 | 391 |
| Wharton County Total | 165 | 1 | 3 | 169 | 391 |

Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications.

TABLE 19-4
EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION WITHIN A HALF-MILE RADIUS OF
PIPELINES

| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
|-----------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------------|------------------|
| City of East Bernard | 374 | 25 | 16 | 415 | 1,063 |
| City of El Campo | 977 | 52 | 49 | 1078 | 2,715 |
| City of Wharton | 1,014 | 70 | 26 | 1,110 | 2,788 |
| Unincorporated Area | 5,129 | 161 | 123 | 5,413 | 12,324 |
| Wharton County Total | 7,494 | 308 | 214 | 8,016 | 18,890 |

Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications.

TABLE 19-5
EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION WITHIN A HALF-MILE RADIUS OF RAILWAYS

| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
|-----------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------------|------------------|
| City of East Bernard | 435 | 37 | 25 | 497 | 1,126 |
| City of El Campo | 1,568 | 190 | 91 | 1,849 | 4,638 |
| City of Wharton | 1,947 | 245 | 100 | 2,292 | 5,473 |
| Unincorporated Area | 1,397 | 76 | 46 | 1,519 | 3,443 |
| Wharton County Total | 5,347 | 548 | 262 | 6,157 | 14,680 |

Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications.

19.4.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

All critical facilities are likely vulnerable to HAZMATs. Downed power lines can cause blackouts, leaving large areas isolated. Phone, water, and sewer systems may not function. Roads may become impassable due to HAZMAT spills or pipeline explosions.

19.4.4 Environment

The environment is highly exposed to HAZMAT incidents. Natural habitats can experience major damage and destruction during a HAZMAT incident. The effects of a HAZMAT event can have long-lasting impacts on an area. Incidents can lead to the contamination of the water, soil, sediment, and air in an area. High levels of contamination can create an uninhabitable area.

19.5 VULNERABILITY

All populations, buildings, critical facilities, and infrastructure in the planning area are vulnerable to HAZMAT incidents. People and animals are subject to health risks from exposure to HAZMATs. Elderly people and economically disadvantaged populations in the planning area are at greater risk during these events due to a lack of physical and financial ability to prepare for and mitigate a HAZMAT incident.

19.5.1 Population

Vulnerable populations are the elderly, low-income, linguistically isolated populations, people with life-threatening illnesses, and residents living in areas that are living near major roads, railways, and the HAZMAT facilities. These populations face higher chances of illness or death when a HAZMAT incident occurs. Commuters who are caught near a HAZMAT incident may be particularly vulnerable. Additionally, individuals engaged in outdoor recreation during a HAZMAT event may be exposed to harsh chemicals. Table 19-6 contains the vulnerable populations by jurisdiction in the planning area.

| TABLE 19-6 MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Youth Population (< 16) | % of Total Population | Elderly Population (> 65) | % of Total Population | Economically Disadvantage (Income < \$20,000) | % of Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 638 | 28.07 | 342 | 15.05 | 129 | 5.68 |
| City of El Campo | 3402 | 29.33 | 1648 | 14.21 | 992 | 8.55 |
| City of Wharton | 2317 | 26.23 | 1288 | 14.58 | 1251 | 14.17 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4,715 | 25.39 | 2,741 | 14.76 | 1,537 | 8.28 |
| Wharton County Total | 11,072 | 26.82 | 6,019 | 14.58 | 3,910 | 9.47 |

19.5.2 Property

All property is vulnerable during HAZMAT events, but properties in poor condition or particularly vulnerable locations may risk the most damage. Those that are located over or near HAZMAT facilities, railways, major roads, or pipelines may be vulnerable to damage in the event of a spill, fire, or explosion.

Loss estimations for HAZMAT incidents are not based on damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, loss estimates were developed representing historical data from transportation incidents listed in the PHMSA database. Annualized losses of ‘negligible’ are less than \$50 annually but are included due to the possibility of a high-value event. The annualized loss estimated for hazardous materials incidents is shown in Table 19-7. This table does not include estimates for other assessed hazardous materials exposure types and is not an accurate loss estimation for all hazardous material incidents. There is potential for a high-value hazardous materials incident to occur throughout the planning area.

| TABLE 19-7 LOSS ESTIMATES FOR HAZARDOUS MATERIAL | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value | Annualized Loss | Annualized Loss Percentage |
| City of East Bernard | \$391,249,566 | Negligible | Negligible |
| City of El Campo | \$2,159,712,947 | \$1,483 | <0.1 |
| City of Wharton | \$1,416,664,643 | \$1,132 | <0.1 |
| Unincorporated Area | \$2,255,940,086 | \$5,167 | <0.1 |
| Wharton County Total | \$6,233,567,243 | \$7,782 | <0.1 |

Community Perception of Vulnerability

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this HMP update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

19.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Damage to roadways and structures poses the greatest issue for emergency functions during an event. Of particular concern are roads providing access to vulnerable populations and critical facilities. Severe damage to major routes can disrupt the shipment of goods and other commerce as well as emergency functions. Damage to certain facilities could cause prolonged impacts on the planning area.

19.5.4 Environment

The vulnerability of the environment to HAZMATs is the same as the exposure, discussed in Section 19.4.4.

19.6 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

Jurisdictions in the planning area should ensure that known HAZMAT facilities are regulated under their planning and zoning programs. In areas where hazardous materials may be present, permitting processes should require investigations to assess risk and vulnerability to hazard areas. HAZMAT issues generally do impact land use and structure development. Issues pertaining to land use in these areas are likely addressed through jurisdictional building codes, ordinances, and regulations.

19.7 SCENARIO

Although HAZMAT incidents are infrequent, impacts can be significant. A worst-case event would involve a large HAZMAT incident in a populated area. Such an event could lead to the instantaneous loss of life and property. If a major roadway were to be involved in such an event, emergency operations and supply chains could be hindered, causing further risks to public health and safety. Damage to subsurface infrastructure could hinder water, electric, sewer, and gas supply to portions of the planning area. Damage to this infrastructure could also lead to the contamination of the water supply resulting in long-lasting impacts.

19.8 ISSUES

The major issues for a HAZMAT incident are the following:

- Hazardous materials incidents are unpredictable and can spread fast leaving little time to react and mitigate the effects of the incident
- Spills and releases can cause facilities to be shut down for prolonged periods
- The capacity for backup power generation is limited
- The older building stock in the planning area is built to low code standards or none at all. These structures could be highly vulnerable to HAZMAT incidents

- Knowledge of the long-term impacts of solar Farms to land, agriculture, soil, and groundwater is limited, and means to mitigate these potential impacts are not well defined

Chapter 20. LAND SUBSIDENCE

| LAND SUBSIDENCE RANKING | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Wharton County | Low |
| City of East Bernard | Low |
| City of El Campo | Low |
| City of Wharton | Low |

| <u>DEFINITIONS</u> | |
|------------------------|---|
| Land Subsidence | Gradual or sudden sinking of the Earth's surface due to the removal or displacement of subsurface earth materials |
| Sinkhole | Depression in the ground that has no natural external surface drainage – type of land subsidence |

20.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

According to the USGS, land subsidence is the gradual or sudden sinking of the Earth's surface due to the removal or displacement of subsurface earth materials (USGS, n.d.). Land subsidence can be characterized by the gradual sinking of the Earth's surface over an extended period of time or by the sudden sinking of the Earth's surface. The two causes of subsidence are natural compression and human activity. USGS (2000) notes the following:

The principal causes (of land subsidence) are aquifer-system compaction, drainage of organic soils, underground mining, hydrocompaction, natural compaction, sinkholes, and thawing permafrost (National Research Council, 1991). Three distinct processes account for most of the water-related subsidence--compaction of aquifer systems, drainage and subsequent oxidation of organic soils, and dissolution and collapse of susceptible rocks.

The pumping of groundwater remains the largest cause of subsidence in the United States. More than 80 percent of identified land subsidence occurrences in the United States have been caused by human interaction with subsurface water. Although aquifer systems have the ability to recharge, the excessive pumping of groundwater can lead to compaction which is largely unrecoverable (USGS, 2000). The level of depressurization that an aquifer might experience varies greatly depending on the distribution of clays and sands within an aquifer due to their grain structure (Young, et.al., 2020). Clay's compressibility is far greater than that of sand allowing for greater subsurface compression (Freeze & Cherry 1979; Domenico & Schwartz, 1990). Another attribute leading to greater subsidence levels when comparing clay and sand is the difference in porosity. Due to the higher porosity associated with clay at the time of deposition, clays can experience a greater overall reduction in porosity over time compared to sand deposits. This results in greater land subsidence in areas with large clay deposits (Young, et.al., 2020).


Another major contributor to land subsidence occurrences, specifically sinkholes, is the rock type of an area. As ground-water levels decrease from pumping and percolation increase, rock types susceptible to dissolution in water begin to form cavities. These rock cavities tend to be associated with two specific

rock types: evaporites (salt, gypsum, and anhydrite) and carbonates (limestone and dolomite). Evaporites tend to form cavities in a relatively short time, a few days or years, when compared to carbonates that can take centuries to millennia to form. Approximately 40 percent of the contiguous United States (including Wharton County and participating communities) is underlain with evaporites and approximately 40 percent of the United States east of Tulsa, Oklahoma consists of carbonate karst landscapes (USGS, 2000).

20.1.1 Texas Gulf Coast Aquifer

The Houston-Galveston region is one of the largest areas of land subsidence in the United States. Running parallel to the Gulf of Mexico coastline, the Texas coastal region contains the largest aquifer system in Texas stretching from the border of Louisiana to the border of Mexico. Figure 20-1 shows the Gulf Coast Aquifer expanding 41,970 square miles, encompassing 56 counties, including Wharton County (Texas Water Development Board, n.d.). Although Wharton is not affected to the extent of the Houston-Galveston metropolitan area, the county still experiences land subsidence due to the Texas Gulf Coast Aquifer.

Figure 20-1. Major Aquifers in Texas



Note: From Texas Water Development Board (n.d)


20.2 HAZARD PROFILE

20.2.1 Past Events

The most notable historical event of land subsidence in Wharton County is the sinkhole that opened on August 12, 1983, near the town of Boling. On the western bank of the San Bernard River in Wharton County lies the Boling Dome (see Figure 20-2). Stretching five miles east-west and 3 miles north-south, this oval-like salt dome contains petroleum, sulfur, and salt. Due to its rich mineral deposits, mining from the Boling Dome began in March of 1929. Sulfur mining started in 1929 and lasted until 1993. During the sulfur mining period, over 8,000 wells were drilled, removing 80.8 million tons of sulfur. Oil production from the Boling Dome produced 6,246 million cubic feet of natural gas and 25,635,836 barrels of oil with the use of 12,000 wells between 1925 and 1989. Today, Valero, Incorporated uses the Boling Dome for 7.5 million barrels of gas storage within the salt stock (Hudgins, n.d.)

Likely due to subsurface instability caused by the removal of subsurface mineral deposits, a sinkhole opened three miles northeast of the City of Boling on August 12, 1983. Spanning approximately 250 feet in diameter and twenty-five feet deep, the sinkhole opened up along Farm Road 442 collapsing the roadway. Gulf Production Company records showed a well location drilled in 1927 existed near the center of the sinkhole. Although this is the largest sinkholes to open over the Boling Dome, several other sinkholes have occurred over the area (Hudgins, n.d.).

Figure 20-2. Boling Dome




Note: From Growth Faulting and Subsidence in the Houston, Texas Area: Guide to the Origins, Relationships, hazards, Potential Impacts and Methods of Investigation: An Update (Campbell & Wise, 2018)

Land Subsidence Studies

Although land subsidence occurrences are recorded throughout the Texas Gulf Aquifer, very few studies have been conducted beyond the Houston-Galveston area. This is largely, in part, due to the level, difficulty, and expense associated with these studies. One study conducted by Ratzlaff (1982) noted land subsidence throughout Wharton County and neighboring counties as less than 0.5 ft (0.15 m) from 1918 to 1973. Another study conducted by Young (2016) indicated at least 2 ft of land subsidence had occurred over a more than 50-year time period in Wharton County. This was determined when comparing photoionization detector (PID) data collected prior to 1950 and Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) surveys collated after 2006. Figure 20-3 displays the “estimated average land subsidence from before 1950 to after 2003 for specific polygons as determined by the difference between ground surface elevation from PIDs surveyed prior to 1950 and from LiDAR surveys after 2006 at the locations of the PIDs. Land subsidence values are expressed as averages and medians (in parenthesis) of the differences calculated at PIDs located inside the polygons. Positive values indicate lower ground surface elevation at a later time. Negative values indicate higher ground surface elevations at a later time” (Young, 2016).

Figure 20-3. Estimates of Land Subsidence Rates in Wharton County Based on the Analysis of Remote Sensing Data



Note: From Young (2016)

The following information comes from a recent study of Wharton County, prepared for the Coastal Bend Groundwater Conservation District, which analyzed land subsidence in the Wharton County conducted by Young, et. al. (2020).


The study assessed land subsidence during two time periods: 2015 to 2019 and 2007 to 2010. Wharton County was divided into 15 zones for analysis. The study concluded for the period of 2015 to 2019, “the average deformation for the 15 zones ranged from -1.28 mm/yr (land subsidence) to 0.75 mm/yr (land uplift). Specifically, “the ground surface in the southern and eastern portion of Wharton County is generally uplifting, whereas in the portion of Wharton County north of Highway 59 and northwest of the City of Wharton is generally subsiding”. For the period between 2007 to 2010 “the average deformation rates for the 15 zones ranged from -2.76 mm/yr (land subsidence) to 1.7 mm/yr (land uplift).” Figure 20-4 compares the average rate of deformation for the 15 zones. Negative values indicate a rate of subsidence. Positive values indicate rates of rebound.

Although Wharton County is experiencing land subsidence, one of the most significant findings of this data set was that the land subsidence rates in Wharton County are not greater than that of the naturally occurring land subsidence along the Texas Gulf Coast; the land subsidence throughout Wharton County was less than 8 mm/year. The low rate of land subsidence documented in this study was partially attributed to the relatively stable annual mean water levels in the Texas Gulf Coast Aquifer System over the last twenty years. The study also notes the importance of the historical pumping rates in Wharton County:

With regard to land subsidence, a very significant aspect of the historical pumping rates is the pumping rate from 2007 to 2018 relative to the previous pumping period. Based on the changes in the historical pumping rates, land subsidence rates in Wharton were likely the greatest from about 1960 to about 1995. From about 1995 to 2007, the slow hydraulic response of the clays to the increased aquifer water levels caused by a reduction of pumping would likely have allowed land subsidence to continue a few years after 1995 but at a much-reduced rate than before 1995. From 2007 to 2018, changes in land surface elevation would remain relatively small because the average annual pumping level of 125,700 AFY is about 15% less than the average annual pumping rate of 160,700 AFY from 1968 to 2007.

When comparing the historical pumping rates to the findings of all three studies, a strong correlation can be seen between the land subsidence rates and the historical pumping rates.

Figure 20-4. Land Subsidence Study Averages 2007 to 2010 and 2015 to 2019



Note: From Mapping of Ground Surface Deformation Rates in Wharton County Based on the Analysis of Remote Sensing Data (Young, et. al., 2020)

20.2.2 Location

Wharton County and the participating communities are susceptible to land subsidence. Although most of the land subsidence occurrence in Wharton County is characterized as a slow process and goes largely unnoticed, occurrences of sudden land subsidence in the area have been recorded. The sinkhole which opened in 1983 in the unincorporated area of Wharton County north-east of the town of Boling where mineral removal has occurred is the most significant recorded sudden land subsidence event. Although this is a significant event, smaller sudden land subsidence events have occurred throughout the Boling Dome area. Sudden land subsidence can cause major damage to both subsurface infrastructure and

surface infrastructure. As in the case of the Boling Sinkhole in 1983, roadways can become damaged and made impassable.

Though largely unnoticed, gradual land subsidence in Wharton County remains an issue. Land subsidence has been recorded throughout the county in multiple studies. One study noted the most recent significant shifts in Wharton County have been in the area north of Highway 59 and northwest of the City of Wharton. Local observations have also noted land subsidence along the new Lane City Dam located at Arbuckle Reservoir 8 miles south-east of the City of Wharton and 6.5 miles south-west of the City of Boling as well as along the Colorado River near the Arbuckle Reservoir at the Lane City River Gauge by LCRA.

20.2.3 Frequency

As discussed in Past Events and Land Subsidence Studies (section 20.2.1 and 20.2.2), only one major occurrence of sudden land subsidence has been recorded in Wharton County, specifically to the northeast of the City of Boling. However, gradual land subsidence remains an issue throughout Wharton County as it is a natural process that can be exacerbated by human activity. With documented land subsidence in Wharton County and participating communities since before 1950, the probability of a future land subsidence event for the planning area is high (probable in the next 10 years).

20.2.4 Severity

The magnitude and severity of land subsidence in Wharton County and the participating communities are largely related to the extent and location of the areas that are impacted. Sudden land subsidence events can cause property damage as well as loss of life; however, events may also occur in remote areas of the planning area where there is little to no impact on people or property. If subsurface conditions remain stable, future events can be assumed to be similar in extent and severity as previous events in the area, averaging 0.70mm/yr.

20.2.5 Warning Time

Generally, land subsidence occurs over an extended period of time, going largely unnoticed; however, sudden land subsidence can occur with little to no warning. Although naturally occurring, these processes may be intensified as a result of human activities, mainly groundwater pumping.

20.3 SECONDARY HAZARDS

Events that cause damage to improved areas can result in secondary hazards, such as explosions from natural gas lines, loss of utilities (such as water and sewer due to shifting infrastructure), and potential failures of reservoir dams. Water and sewer damage can lead to groundwater contamination risking environmental health and safety. Over time land subsidence may also cause changes in elevation and slope of waterways reducing or hindering drainage capacity of an area causing excessive flooding; damage public infrastructures such as roadways, bridges, and railways hindering emergency operations; and damage public and private buildings causing foundation issues or lowering finished floor elevations, resulting in higher flood hazards (Leake, 2016).

20.4 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

In areas where climate change results in less precipitation and reduced surface-water supplies, communities will pump more groundwater. Changes in precipitation events and the hydrological cycle may result in changes in the rate of subsidence. The reduction of surface water will likely coincide with a population increase and a rise in potable water supply-demand. As groundwater pumping levels rise, land subsidence rates will likely increase due to the high correlation noted between groundwater pumping levels and land subsidence.

20.5 EXPOSURE

While all structures and foundations are exposed to land subsidence in Wharton County, some areas such as that over the Boling Dome are at a higher risk for sudden land subsidence occurrence due to increased human interaction with subsurface minerals. Each participating community's structures and population are potentially exposed and at risk by expansive soils. Table 20-1 lists the exposed population and structure count for each participating jurisdiction.

20.5.1 Population

It can be assumed that the entire planning area is exposed to some extent to land subsidence. Certain areas are more exposed due to geographic location and human activity. Current growth trends could cause more planning area residents to be exposed to land subsidence. Increased population will increase demands on structure development, as well as sub-surface water use which may lead to higher land subsidence rates.

20.5.2 Property

According to the HAZUS-MH inventory data (updated with 2010 U.S. Census data and 2018 RS Means Square Foot Costs), there are 16,979 buildings within the census blocks that define the planning area with an asset replaceable value of almost \$3.9 billion (excluding contents). About 91% of these buildings (and 75% of the building value) are associated with residential housing. Other types of buildings in this report include agricultural, education, religious, and governmental structures. See hazard loss tables for community-specific total assessed numbers (e.g., Table 20-3). Table 20-2 lists the exposed structures and population for the participating communities.

Although all structures within the planning area are considered to be exposed to land subsidence, those located near the Boling Dome are particularly vulnerable to sudden land subsidence.

| TABLE 20-1 EXPOSED STRUCTURES AND POPULATION | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|------------|------------------|------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Residential | Commercial | Other * | Total Structures | Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 909 | 62 | 43 | 1,014 | 2,272 |
| City of El Campo | 4,465 | 352 | 200 | 5,017 | 11,602 |
| City of Wharton | 3,299 | 321 | 138 | 3,758 | 8,832 |
| Unincorporated Area | 6,799 | 210 | 181 | 7,190 | 18,574 |
| Wharton County Total | 15,472 | 945 | 562 | 16,979 | 41,280 |
| Note: *Other includes industrial, agricultural, religious, governmental, and educational classifications. | | | | | |

20.5.3 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

All critical facilities are considered exposed to land subsidence. There are several major roads that are available to move people and supplies throughout the region. Damage to these roads and other infrastructure could hinder emergency services and affect public health and safety.

20.5.4 Environment

The environment is highly exposed to land subsidence. Natural habitats can experience major damage and destruction during land subsidence events.

20.6 VULNERABILITY

Wharton County and participating communities have a high risk from land subsidence as studies have recorded continual subsidence in the area since the 1950s. For the specific rankings given for each entity see ranking tables in chapter 21. Because land subsidence cannot be directly modeled in HAZUS-MH, annualized losses were estimated using GIS-based analysis, historical data analysis, and statistical risk assessment methodology. Event frequency, severity indicators, expert opinions, and historical local knowledge of the region were used for this assessment.

20.6.1 Population

The risk of injury or fatalities as a result of this hazard is limited but possible. The most vulnerable demographics will be the economically disadvantaged population areas, children under 16 years, and the elderly. Economically disadvantaged families and those living on a fixed income may not have the financial means to adequately deal with the effects of an event and make the necessary structural improvements. The youth and elderly population may require further assistance as dependents if an event were to occur. Table 20-2 shows all vulnerable populations per participating community.

| TABLE 20-2 MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Youth Population (< 16) | % of Total Population | Elderly Population (> 65) | % of Total Population | Economically Disadvantage (Income< \$20,000) | % of Total Population |
| City of East Bernard | 638 | 28.07 | 342 | 15.05 | 129 | 5.68 |
| City of El Campo | 3402 | 29.33 | 1648 | 14.21 | 992 | 8.55 |
| City of Wharton | 2317 | 26.23 | 1288 | 14.58 | 1251 | 14.17 |
| Unincorporated Area | 4,715 | 25.39 | 2,741 | 14.76 | 1,537 | 8.28 |
| Wharton County Total | 11,072 | 26.82 | 6,019 | 14.58 | 3,910 | 9.47 |

All properties are at some level of risk from land subsidence, but properties in poor condition or in particularly vulnerable locations may risk the most damage. Generally, damage is minimal and goes unreported.

Loss estimations for land subsidence hazards are not based on damage functions, because no such damage functions have been generated. Instead, loss estimates were developed representing projected damages (annualized loss) on exposed values. Historical events, statistical analysis, and probability factors were applied to the counties and communities exposed values to create an annualized loss. Table 20-3 lists the property loss estimates for each participating community compared to the exposed value including structure and content. Annualized losses of ‘negligible’ are less than \$50 annually. The Negligible loss hazards are still included despite minimal annualized losses because of the potential for a high-value damaging event.

| TABLE 20-3 LOSS ESTIMATES FOR LAND SUBSIDENCE | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Exposed Value | Annualized Loss | Annualized Loss Percentage |
| City of East Bernard | \$391,249,566 | Negligible | Negligible |
| City of El Campo | \$2,159,712,947 | Negligible | Negligible |
| City of Wharton | \$1,416,664,643 | Negligible | Negligible |
| Unincorporated Area | \$2,255,940,086 | Negligible | Negligible |
| Wharton County Total | \$6,233,567,243 | Negligible | Negligible |

Vulnerability Narrative

All participating communities are at risk to land subsidence. Table 20-1 list the exposed structures and population for each participating community. Table 20-2 lists the vulnerable population per community. Notably, the portions of Wharton County, north of Highway 59 and northwest of the City of Wharton as well as the area located over the Boling Dome, have recorded incidence of significant land subsidence. As the population of the unincorporated areas of Wharton County continues to increase, vulnerability to land subsidence events will increase.

Community Perception of Vulnerability

See the front page of the current chapter for a summary of hazard rankings for Wharton County and participating communities in this HMP update. Chapter 21 gives a detailed description of these rankings and Chapter 22 addresses mitigations actions for this hazard vulnerability.

20.6.2 Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Damage to roadways and structures poses the greatest issue for the community. Of particular concern are roads providing access to vulnerable populations and critical facilities. Severe damage to major routes can disrupt the shipment of goods and other commerce as well as emergency functions. Damage to certain facilities could cause prolonged impacts on the planning area.

20.6.3 Environment

The vulnerability of the environment to winter weather is the same as the exposure, discussed in Section 20.5.4.

20.7 FUTURE TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT

All future development will be affected by land subsidence. The vulnerability of community assets to land subsidence is increasing over time as more people enter the planning area. The ability to withstand impacts lies in sound land-use practices. Future coordination with groundwater districts will help to monitor and mitigate the effects of land subsidence on new structures. This will allow the communities to deal with future growth and the associated impacts of land subsidence.

20.8 SCENARIO

Although sudden land subsidence events are infrequent, impacts can be significant. A worst-case event would involve a large, sudden land subsidence event in a populated area. Such an event could lead to the instantaneous loss of life and property. If a major roadway were to be involved in such an event, emergency operations and supply chains could be hindered resulting in further risks to public health and safety. Damage to subsurface infrastructure could hinder water, electric, sewer, and gas supply to portions of the planning area. Damage to this infrastructure could also lead to the contamination of the water supply resulting in long-lasting impacts.

20.9 ISSUES

Important issues associated with land subsidence in the planning area include the following:

- Rising rates of land subsidence are in many cases closely related to changes in groundwater pumping rates. Groundwater interaction (draw-down and recharge) should be closely monitored.
- A more detailed analysis should be conducted for critical facilities and infrastructure within the planning area in regard to land subsidence. The analysis should address how potential structural issues were addressed in facility design and construction.
- Continue monitoring the Lane City gauge subsidence and determine if new more stringent flood standards are needed and to be set to mitigate for added flood risk.

Chapter 21.

PLANNING AREA RISK RANKING

A risk ranking was performed for the hazards of concern described in this plan. This risk ranking assesses the probability of each hazard's occurrence as well as its likely impact on the people, property, and economy of the planning area. The risk ranking was conducted by the Planning Committee based on the hazard risk assessment and community survey results presented to the Steering Committee as well as personal and professional experience with hazards in the planning area. Estimates of risk were generated with data from HAZUS-MH using methodologies promoted by FEMA. The results are used in establishing mitigation priorities. The hazard rankings were used in establishing mitigation action priorities.

21.1 PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE

The probability of occurrence of a hazard is indicated by a probability factor based on the likelihood of annual occurrence:

- **High** – Hazard event is likely to occur within 10 years (Probability Factor = 3)
- **Medium** – Hazard event is likely to occur within 25 years (Probability Factor = 2)
- **Low** – Hazard event is not likely to occur within 100 years (Probability Factor = 1)
- **No exposure** – There is no probability of occurrence (Probability Factor = 0)

The assessment of hazard frequency is generally based on past hazard events in the planning area. The probability of occurrence is shown in Table 21-1.

**TABLE 21-1.
HAZARD PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE**

| | Wharton County | | City of East Bernard | | City of El Campo | | City of Wharton | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Hazard | High/Med/ Low/No | Probability Factor | High/Med/ Low/No | Probability Factor | High/Med/ Low/No | Probability Factor | High/Med/ Low/No | Probability Factor |
| Dam/Levee Failure | N | 0 | N | 0 | N | 0 | N | 0 |
| Drought | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Earthquake | L | 1 | N | 0 | N | 0 | N | 0 |
| Expansive Soils | H | 3 | H | 3 | M | 2 | H | 3 |
| Extreme Heat | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Flood | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Hail | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Hazardous Materials | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Hurricane/ Tropical Storm | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Land Subsidence | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Lightning | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Pandemic | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Tornado | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Wildfire | H | 3 | M | 2 | M | 2 | M | 2 |
| Wind | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Winter Weather | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |

21.2 IMPACT

Hazard impacts were assessed in three categories, impacts on: people, property, and the local economy. It should be noted that planners can use an element of subjectivity when assigning values for impacts.

Numerical impact factors were assigned as follows:

- **People** – Values were assigned based on the percentage of the total population exposed to the hazard event, but a level of subjectivity was applied to these rankings based on the local knowledge. The degree of impact on individuals will vary and is not measurable, so the calculation assumes for simplicity and consistency that all people who live in a hazard zone will be equally impacted when a hazard event occurs. Impact factors were assigned as follows:

- High – 50% or more of the population is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 3)
- Medium – 25% to 49% of the population is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 2)
- Low – 24% or less of the population is exposed to the hazard (Impact Factor = 1)
- No impact – None of the population is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 0)
- **Property** – Values were assigned based on the percentage of the total assessed property value exposed to the hazard event, but a level of subjectivity was applied to these rankings based on the local knowledge:
 - High – 30% or more of the total assessed property value is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 3)
 - Medium – 15% to 29% of the total assessed property value is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 2)
 - Low – 14% or less of the total assessed property value is exposed to the hazard (Impact Factor = 1)
 - No impact – None of the total assessed property value is exposed to a hazard (Impact Factor = 0)
- **Economy** – Values were assigned based on total impact to the economy from the hazard event and activities conducted after the event to restore the community to previous functions. Values were assigned based on the number of days the hazard impacts the community, including impacts on tourism, businesses, road closures, or government response agencies, but a level of subjectivity is applied to these rankings based on the local knowledge.
 - High – Community impacted for more than 7 days (Impact Factor = 3)
 - Medium – Community impacted for 1 to 7 days (Impact Factor = 2)
 - Low – Community impacted for less than 1 day (Impact Factor = 1)
 - No impact – No community impacts estimated from the hazard event (Impact Factor = 0)

The impacts of each hazard category were assigned a weighting factor to reflect the significance of the impact. These weighting factors are consistent with those typically used for measuring the benefits of hazard mitigation actions: impact on people was given a weighting factor of 3; impact on property was given a weighting factor of 2; and impact on the economy was given a weighting factor of 1. The impacts for each hazard are summarized in Table 21-2 through Table 21-4. The total impact factor shown on the tables equals the impact factor multiplied by the weighting factor.

**TABLE 21-2.
IMPACT ON PEOPLE FROM HAZARDS**

| | Wharton County | | City of East Bernard | | City of El Campo | | City of Wharton | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Hazard | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor |
| Dam/Levee Failure | L | 1 | N | 0 | N | 0 | H | 3 |
| Drought | H | 3 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Earthquake | N | 0 | N | 0 | N | 0 | N | 0 |
| Expansive Soils | M | 2 | L | 1 | H | 3 | M | 2 |
| Extreme Heat | H | 3 | M | 2 | H | 3 | M | 2 |
| Flood | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Hail | M | 2 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Hazardous Materials | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Hurricane/ Tropical Storm | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Land Subsidence | L | 1 | L | 1 | L | 1 | L | 1 |
| Lightning | L | 1 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Pandemic | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Tornado | M | 2 | M | 2 | L | 1 | M | 2 |
| Wildfire | M | 2 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Wind | L | 1 | L | 1 | H | 3 | L | 1 |
| Winter Weather | L | 1 | L | 1 | M | 2 | M | 2 |

**TABLE 21-3.
IMPACT ON PROPERTY FROM HAZARDS**

| | Wharton County | | City of East Bernard | | City of El Campo | | City of Wharton | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Hazard | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor |
| Dam/Levee Failure | L | 1 | N | 0 | N | 0 | H | 3 |
| Drought | H | 3 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Earthquake | N | 0 | N | 0 | N | 0 | N | 0 |
| Expansive Soils | M | 2 | L | 1 | H | 3 | M | 2 |
| Extreme Heat | H | 3 | M | 2 | H | 3 | M | 2 |
| Flood | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Hail | M | 2 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Hazardous Materials | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Hurricane/ Tropical Storm | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Land Subsidence | L | 1 | L | 1 | L | 1 | L | 1 |
| Lightning | L | 1 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Pandemic | L | 1 | H | 3 | L | 1 | L | 1 |
| Tornado | M | 2 | M | 2 | L | 1 | M | 2 |
| Wildfire | M | 2 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Wind | L | 1 | L | 1 | H | 3 | L | 1 |
| Winter Weather | L | 1 | L | 1 | M | 2 | M | 2 |

| TABLE 21-4. IMPACT ON ECONOMY FROM HAZARDS | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| | Wharton County | | City of East Bernard | | City of El Campo | | City of Wharton | |
| Hazard | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor | High/Med /Low/No | Total Impact Factor |
| Dam/Levee Failure | L | 1 | N | 0 | N | 0 | H | 3 |
| Drought | H | 3 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Earthquake | N | 0 | N | 0 | N | 0 | N | 0 |
| Expansive Soils | M | 2 | L | 1 | H | 3 | M | 2 |
| Extreme Heat | H | 3 | M | 2 | H | 3 | M | 2 |
| Flood | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Hail | M | 2 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Hazardous Materials | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Hurricane/ Tropical Storm | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Land Subsidence | L | 1 | L | 1 | L | 1 | L | 1 |
| Lightning | L | 1 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Pandemic | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 | H | 3 |
| Tornado | M | 2 | M | 2 | L | 1 | M | 2 |
| Wildfire | M | 2 | L | 1 | M | 2 | L | 1 |
| Wind | L | 1 | L | 1 | H | 3 | L | 1 |
| Winter Weather | L | 1 | L | 1 | M | 2 | M | 2 |

21.3 RISK RATING AND RANKING

The risk rating for each hazard was calculated by multiplying the probability factor by the sum of the weighted impact factors for people, property, and operations, as summarized in Table 21-5. Based on these ratings, a priority of high, medium, or low was assigned to each hazard. The hazards ranked as being of highest concern vary by jurisdiction but generally include drought, extreme heat, flood, hurricane/tropical storm, and pandemic. Table 21-6 summarizes the hazard risk ranking.

**TABLE 21-5.
HAZARD RISK RANKING CALCULATIONS**

| | Wharton County | | | City of East Bernard | | | City of El Campo | | | City of Wharton | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------|
| Hazard | Probability Factor | Impact Weighted Sum | Total | Probability Factor | Impact Weighted Sum | Total | Probability Factor | Impact Weighted Sum | Total | Probability Factor | Impact Weighted Sum | Total |
| Dam/Levee Failure | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Drought | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 12 | 36 | 3 | 6 | 18 |
| Earthquake | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Expansive Soils | 3 | 12 | 36 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 2 | 18 | 36 | 3 | 12 | 36 |
| Extreme Heat | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 12 | 36 | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 12 | 36 |
| Flood | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 18 | 54 |
| Hail | 3 | 12 | 36 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 12 | 36 | 3 | 6 | 18 |
| Hazardous Materials | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 18 | 54 |
| Hurricane/ Tropical Storm | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 18 | 54 |
| Land Subsidence | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 18 |
| Lightning | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 12 | 36 | 3 | 6 | 18 |
| Pandemic | 3 | 14 | 42 | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 14 | 42 | 3 | 14 | 42 |
| Tornado | 3 | 12 | 36 | 3 | 12 | 36 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 12 | 36 |
| Wildfire | 3 | 12 | 36 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 12 | 24 | 2 | 6 | 12 |
| Wind | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 18 | 54 | 3 | 6 | 18 |
| Winter Weather | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 12 | 36 | 3 | 12 | 36 |

Notes:

Impact Weighted Sum=Total Impact Factor People+ Total Impact Factor Property + Total Impact Factor Economy

Total = Probability x Impact Weighted Sum

**TABLE 21-6.
HAZARD RISK SUMMARY**

| Hazard | Wharton County | City of East Bernard | City of El Campo | City of Wharton |
|------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Dam/Levee Failure | No Exposure | No Exposure | No Exposure | No Exposure |
| Drought | High | Medium | Medium | Low |
| Earthquake | No Exposure | No Exposure | No Exposure | No Exposure |
| Expansive Soils | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Extreme Heat | High | High | High | Medium |
| Flood | High | High | High | High |
| Hail | Medium | Medium | Medium | Low |
| Hazardous Materials | High | High | High | High |
| Hurricane/ Tropical Storm | High | High | High | High |
| Land Subsidence | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Lightning | Low | Medium | Medium | Low |
| Pandemic | High | High | High | High |
| Tornado | Medium | High | Low | Medium |
| Wildfire | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| Wind | Low | Medium | High | Low |
| Winter Weather | Low | Medium | Medium | Medium |

PART 3
MITIGATION AND PLAN
MAINTENANCE STRATEGY

Chapter 22.

AREA-WIDE MITIGATION ACTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

The Steering Committee reviewed a variety of hazard mitigation alternatives that present a broad range of alternatives to be considered for use in the planning area, in compliance with Title 44 Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR) (Section 201.6(c)(3)(ii)). The menu provided a baseline of mitigation alternatives that are backed by a planning process, are consistent with the planning partners' goals and objectives, and are within the capabilities of the partners to implement. The Steering Committee reviewed the full range of actions as well as the county and participating cities' ability to implement the variety of mitigation actions. Hazard mitigation actions recommended in this plan were selected from among the alternatives presented in the menu as well as other projects known to be necessary.

22.1 RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

The planning partners and the Steering Committee identified actions that could be implemented to provide hazard mitigation benefits. Table 22-1 lists the recommended mitigation actions and the hazards addressed by the action. All of the hazards profiled in this plan are addressed by more than one mitigation action.

Table 22-2 provides more details on the mitigation actions, including the mitigation action description, action type, estimated cost, potential funding sources, timeline, and benefit to the community (high, medium, or low). Mitigation types used for this categorization are as follows:

- Local Plans and Regulations (LPR) – These actions include government authorities, policies, or codes that influence the way land and buildings are being developed and built.
- Structure and Infrastructure Projects (SIP) – These actions involve modifying existing structures and infrastructure to protect them from a hazard or remove them from a hazard area. This could apply to public or private structures as well as critical facilities and infrastructure. This type of action also involves projects to construct manmade structures to reduce the impact of hazards.
- Natural Systems Protection (NSP) – These are actions that minimize damage and losses, and also preserve or restore the functions of natural systems.
- Education and Awareness Programs (EAP) – These are actions to inform and educate citizens, elected officials, and property owners about hazards and potential ways to mitigate them. These initiatives may also include participation in national programs, such as StormReady and Firewise Communities.

22.2 BENEFIT/COST REVIEW AND PRIORITIZATION

The action plan must be prioritized according to a benefit/cost analysis of the proposed projects and their associated costs (44 CFR, Section 201.6(c)(3)(iii)). The benefits of proposed projects were weighed against estimated costs as part of the project prioritization process. The benefit/cost analysis was not of the detailed variety required by FEMA for project grant eligibility under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) and Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Grant Program. A less formal approach was used because some projects may not be implemented for up to 10 years, and associated costs and benefits could change dramatically in that time. Therefore, a review of the apparent benefits versus the apparent cost of each project was performed. Each of the mitigation actions was assigned a subjective ranking (high,

medium, and low) based on these discussions related to the costs and benefits of these projects. Table 22-2 shows the benefit of each mitigation action.

During the prioritization evaluation process, each planning partner reviewed a variety of characteristics for each proposed mitigation action. A few of the components which were discussed are as follows: cost-benefit ranking, benefits to life safety, property protection, cost-effectiveness, multi-hazard reduction, timeline, and feasibility.

The Steering Committee used the results of the benefit/cost review and prioritization exercise to rank the mitigation actions in order of priority, with 1 being the highest priority. The highest priority mitigation actions are shown in red on Table 22-2, medium priority actions are shown in yellow, and low priority actions are shown in green.

**TABLE 22-1.
MITIGATION ACTIONS DEVELOPED TO ADDRESS HAZARDS**

| Action No. | Title | Dam/Levee Failure | Drought | Earthquake | Expansive Soil | Extreme heat | Flood | Hail | Hazardous Material | Land Subsidence | Hurricane/ Tropical Storm | Lightning | Pandemic | Tornado | Wildfire | Wind | Winter Weather |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------|---------|------------|----------------|--------------|-------|------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|------|----------------|
| WHARTON COUNTY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the County (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | N/A | | | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 2 | Update and adopt the Wharton County Flood Insurance Study and FIRM | N/A | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Adopt “Higher Standard” Riverine Flood Damage Prevention Ordinances and Standards | N/A | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Join FEMA’s CRS Program | N/A | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Create/Maintain a Wharton Disaster Response Team | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 6 | Implement a Wharton County Flood Warning/Monitoring System | N/A | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Install emergency backup generators at critical facilities | N/A | | X | | X | X | X | | | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| 8 | Educate community on hazards | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 9 | Drainage Master Plan Update | N/A | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Update Subdivision Ordinance | N/A | | | X | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 11 | Collaborate with Regional Flood Planning Group | N/A | | | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 12 | Collaborate with local canal owners to identify funding to improve and expand existing infrastructure | N/A | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**TABLE 22-1.
MITIGATION ACTIONS DEVELOPED TO ADDRESS HAZARDS**

| Action No. | Title | Dam/Levee Failure | Drought | Earthquake | Expansive Soil | Extreme heat | Flood | Hail | Hazardous Material | Land Subsidence | Hurricane/ Tropical Storm | Lightning | Pandemic | Tornado | Wildfire | Wind | Winter Weather |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|---------|------------|----------------|--------------|-------|------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|------|----------------|
| 13 | Collaborate with local MUD Districts to establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | N/A | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | N/A | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| 15 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | N/A | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| 16 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | N/A | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Establish a county-wide hazardous material response team | N/A | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| CITY OF EAST BERNARD | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Purchase Public Hazard Alert System | N/A | X | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 2 | Organize outreach program for vulnerable populations | N/A | | N/A | | X | X | | | | X | | | | | | X |
| 3 | Prepared and adopt a stormwater drainage plan and ordinance | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 4 | Update emergency response plan | N/A | X | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 5 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 6 | Install emergency generators at critical facilities | N/A | | N/A | | X | X | X | | | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| 7 | Implementation of Zoning Ordinance | N/A | | N/A | X | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 8 | Update Comprehensive Plan | N/A | X | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**TABLE 22-1.
MITIGATION ACTIONS DEVELOPED TO ADDRESS HAZARDS**

| Action No. | Title | Dam/Levee Failure | Drought | Earthquake | Expansive Soil | Extreme heat | Flood | Hail | Hazardous Material | Land Subsidence | Hurricane/Tropical Storm | Lightning | Pandemic | Tornado | Wildfire | Wind | Winter Weather |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------|---------|------------|----------------|--------------|-------|------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|------|----------------|
| 9 | Develop plan to improve Pandemic response | N/A | | N/A | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| 10 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | N/A | | N/A | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| 11 | Collaborate with local MUD Districts to establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | N/A | X | N/A | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | N/A | | N/A | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| 13 | GIS Mapping | N/A | | N/A | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Establish a hazardous material response team | N/A | | N/A | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| CITY OF EL CAMPO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Provide education on water conservation techniques | N/A | X | N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 3 | Adopt freeboard ordinance | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 4 | Adopt IBC and IRC | N/A | X | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| 5 | GIS mapping | N/A | | N/A | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Outreach to vulnerable populations regarding extreme and adverse weather/conditions | N/A | | N/A | | X | | | | | | | | | | | X |

**TABLE 22-1.
MITIGATION ACTIONS DEVELOPED TO ADDRESS HAZARDS**

| Action No. | Title | Dam/Levee Failure | Drought | Earthquake | Expansive Soil | Extreme heat | Flood | Hail | Hazardous Material | Land Subsidence | Hurricane/Tropical Storm | Lightning | Pandemic | Tornado | Wildfire | Wind | Winter Weather |
|------------------------|---|-------------------|---------|------------|----------------|--------------|-------|------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|------|----------------|
| 7 | Implement Master Drainage Plan (7 projects) | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 8 | Educate the community on all hazards | N/A | X | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 9 | Alternative notification/alert system | N/A | X | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 10 | Establish Post Disaster Temporary Transfer Center | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 11 | Establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | N/A | X | N/A | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Update Drainage master plan | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 13 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | N/A | | N/A | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| 14 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | N/A | | N/A | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| 15 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | N/A | | N/A | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Establish an all hazards response team | N/A | | N/A | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Install emergency generators at critical facilities | N/A | X | N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CITY OF WHARTON | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Clean and repair storm drains routinely | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 2 | Increase freeboard requirements for permitting structures in the floodplain | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |

**TABLE 22-1.
MITIGATION ACTIONS DEVELOPED TO ADDRESS HAZARDS**

| Action No. | Title | Dam/Levee Failure | Drought | Earthquake | Expansive Soil | Extreme heat | Flood | Hail | Hazardous Material | Land Subsidence | Hurricane/ Tropical Storm | Lightning | Pandemic | Tornado | Wildfire | Wind | Winter Weather |
|------------|--|-------------------|---------|------------|----------------|--------------|-------|------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|------|----------------|
| 3 | Implement a comprehensive watershed ordinance for new development | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Acquire, reuse, and preserve open spaces adjacent to flood-prone areas | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Educate the community on the hazards | N/A | X | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 6 | Minimize the impact of flooding by installing berms and levees where appropriate | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 7 | Develop flood-reduction / stream restoration/channelization projects to ensure adequate drainage/diversion of stormwater | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 8 | Establish a reserve fund for emergency and public mitigation measures | N/A | X | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 9 | Strengthen and harden at-risk critical facilities | N/A | X | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 10 | Acquisition and relocation, elevation and “demo-rebuild” of flood-prone structures | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Install emergency backup generators at critical facilities | N/A | | N/A | | X | X | X | | | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| 12 | Use impact fees to help fund public hazard mitigation projects related to land development | N/A | | N/A | X | | X | | | | X | | | X | | X | |
| 13 | Implement warning systems | N/A | X | N/A | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 14 | Establish/implement drought/expansive soil contingency plan | N/A | X | N/A | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**TABLE 22-1.
MITIGATION ACTIONS DEVELOPED TO ADDRESS HAZARDS**

| Action No. | Title | Dam/Levee Failure | Drought | Earthquake | Expansive Soil | Extreme heat | Flood | Hail | Hazardous Material | Land Subsidence | Hurricane/ Tropical Storm | Lightning | Pandemic | Tornado | Wildfire | Wind | Winter Weather |
|--|---|-------------------|---------|------------|----------------|--------------|-------|------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|------|----------------|
| 15 | Update/implement Drainage Master Plan | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 16 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | N/A | | N/A | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |
| 17 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | N/A | | N/A | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| 18 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | N/A | | N/A | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| 19 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | N/A | | N/A | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Establish a hazardous material response team | N/A | | N/A | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Notes: COVID-19 Coronavirus Disease 2019 CRS Community Rating System FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map GIS Geographic Information System IBC International Building Code IRC International Residential Code MUD Municipal Utility District | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|-----------------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------|---------|
| WHARTON COUNTY | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the County (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | Install larger drainage improvements throughout the county. During flood and hurricane events the streams overflow. There are areas that do not pass the required flow needed for emergency access during flood events. | 1 | SIP | G1, G2, G6 | Drainage Department | >\$100,000 | Road and Bridge Fund, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 2 | Update and adopt the Wharton County Flood Insurance Study and FIRM | Updated and adopt a new Flood Insurance Study and FIRM. This would prevent new properties from developing on the floodway. | 8 | LPR, EAP | G2 | Commissioner's Court | >\$100,000 | Road and Bridge Fund, State/Federal Grants, TWDB | 60 | High |
| 3 | Adopt "Higher Standard" Riverine Flood Damage Prevention Ordinances and Standards | This would result in a discount on insurance for new and existing properties and mitigate damages for both new and existing structures. | 9 | LPR | G2, G3, G6 | Drainage Department | <\$10,000 | Road and Bridge Fund | 24 | High |
| 4 | Join FEMA's CRS Program | Complete the initial steps to join FEMA's CRS program and reduce the cost of insurance for new and existing buildings. It is better to protect existing properties through the development of CRS activities. | 17 | LPR, EAP | G4, G6 | Development Department | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | County funds | 60 | Low |
| 5 | Create/Maintain a Wharton Disaster Response Team | Having a disaster response team in place that can respond quickly to a natural or man-caused event would prevent damage to existing buildings. | 10 | EAP | G1, G2, G6 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds | 60 | High |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|--|--|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 6 | Implement a Wharton County Flood Warning/Monitoring System | Wharton County experiences flooding at low-water crossing which can lead to injuries and even fatalities. | 2 | SIP | G1, G2 | Commissioner's Court | >\$100,000 | HGAC, State/Federal Grants | 36 | High |
| 7 | Install emergency backup generators at critical facilities | Install emergency back-up generators at critical facilities to provide backup power from hazard events. | 3 | SIP | G1, G3, G6 | Commissioner's Court | >\$100,000 | County funds, State/Federal grants | 36 | High |
| 8 | Educate the community on hazards | Educate the community on the hazards they are exposed to and how to mitigate their homes from hazards on the county website and public forums. | 15 | EAP | G1, G2, G3, G4, G5 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds | 60 | Medium |
| 9 | Drainage Master Plan Update | Develop an update the 2010 DMP needed to identify and prioritize drainage improvements County-Wide | 7 | LPR | G2, G4, G5 | Commissioner's Court | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | County funds, State/Federal grants | 60 | Medium |
| 10 | Update Subdivision Ordinance | Update development regulations to resolve loop holes in standards and improve clarity | 4 | LPR | G2, G4, G5 | Drainage Department | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | County funds | 24 | High |
| 11 | Collaborate with Regional Flood Planning Group | Coordinate with RFPG to ensure projects are identified in their plan for future grant funding | 5 | LPR, EAP | G4, G5, G6 | Drainage Department | <\$10,000 | County funds | 60 | High |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---|--|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 12 | Collaborate with local canal owners to identify funding to improve and expand existing infrastructure | Coordinate with LCRA primarily as it relates to existing canal systems that may have leaks or seepages issues. Develop a plan to resolve these problems to help reduce water loss during droughts. | 14 | SIP | G1, G2, G4, G6 | Commissioner's Court | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | County funds, State/Federal grants | 60 | Low |
| 13 | Collaborate with local MUD Districts to establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | Coordinate with MUD districts on water, wastewater, and soil expansion plan. Identify projects for funding. | 6 | LPR | G3, G4, G5 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds, State/federal grants | 60 | Low |
| 14 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | Coordinate with regional partners to develop a regional plan to improve future Pandemic response. | 12 | LRP | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | County funds, State/federal grants | 60 | Medium |
| 15 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | Conduct "lessons learned" meetings related to the pandemic and compile a report. | 11 | LPR, EAP | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds | 12 | Medium |
| 16 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | This effort will include coordination and monitoring related to known subsidence issues. This may also include coordination with LCRA on known subsidence issues near the Lane City Gage. | 16 | LPR | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds | 60 | Low |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 17 | Establish a county-wide hazardous material response team | Develop a county-wide hazard response team and coordinate a regional response plan. | 13 | LPR, EAP | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | County funds | 60 | Medium |
| CITY OF EAST BERNARD | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Purchase Public Hazard Alert System | The city will purchase a public hazard alert system so that the city may provide warning to the citizens during a hazard event. | 8 | SIP | G1 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | Medium |
| 2 | Organize outreach program for vulnerable populations | We will use several media outlets to promote accessible heating and cooling centers and education of flood and hurricane hazards to vulnerable populations. | 10 | EAP | G1, G3, G4, G6 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | Information Technology | 60 | Medium |
| 3 | Prepare and adopt a stormwater drainage plan and ordinance | Prepared and adopt a stormwater drainage plan and ordinance needed to prioritize and identify funding needed to implement the plan. | 1 | LPR | G1, G2, G3, G4, G5 | City Secretary | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | City Funds | 36 | High |
| 4 | Update emergency response plan | Form a committee to update the emergency response plan for emergency officials and personnel to use. | 7 | LPR | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City and County funds | 24 | Medium |
| 5 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | Conduct a regional drainage assessment, develop a plan, and begin implementation of identified and prioritized projects. | 2 | SIP | G1, G2, G6 | Public Works | <\$100,000 | City and County funds | 60 | High |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|--|--|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 6 | Install emergency generators at critical facilities | Install emergency generators at key critical facilities to provide back-up power during/post hazardous events. | 3 | SIP | G1, G2 | Public Works | <\$100,000 | WCID Funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | Medium |
| 7 | Implementation of Zoning Ordinance | Develop a zoning ordinance to better regulate development throughout the city. Zoning will be used to manage congestion and develop in a sustainable way. | 6 | LPR | G2, G4, G5 | City Secretary | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 8 | Update Comprehensive Plan | Update comprehensive plan to help guide city staff on the direction forward. | 4 | LPR | G1, G2, G4, G5 | City Secretary | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | City Funds | 36 | High |
| 9 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | Develop a plan based on "lessons learned" from the pandemic. Coordinate with regional partners. | 13 | LPR | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City and County funds | 60 | Medium |
| 10 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | Develop an after-action report based on COVID-19 lessons learned. | 12 | LRP, EAP | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City and County funds | 60 | Medium |
| 11 | Collaborate with local MUD Districts to establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | Collaborate with local MUD districts on water, wastewater, and expansive soils plan. This plan is needed to identify and prioritize water, wastewater, and similar improvements. | 11 | LPR | G3, G4, G5 | City Secretary | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | WCID Funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | Medium |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|-------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 12 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | This effort will include coordination and monitoring related to known subsidence issues. | 14 | LPR | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City and County funds | 60 | Medium |
| 13 | GIS Mapping | Develop a City-Wide GIS web map for use in maintaining City-Wide data. | 5 | LPR | G1, G2 | City Secretary | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | City Funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | Medium |
| 14 | Establish a hazardous material response team | Develop a county-wide hazard response team and coordinate a regional response plan. | 9 | LRP, EAP | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City and County funds | 60 | Medium |
| CITY OF EL CAMPO | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Provide education on water conservation techniques | Provide water conservation measures low-flow plumbing, etc., as mail inserts with utility bills and discuss with local media outlets. | 8 | EAP | G3, G4, G6 | Utility Department | <\$10,000 | Utility Revenue | 36 | High |
| 2 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | Implement drainage improvements to culverts, bridges, channels, detention facilities, and levees as needed. | 4 | SIP | G1, G2, G6 | Public Works | >\$100,000 | City funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 3 | Adopt freeboard ordinance | Adopt freeboard ordinance to reduce flood risk of structures. | 17 | LPR | G2, G3, G4, G5 | Building Department | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | High |
| 4 | Adopt IBC and IRC | Adopt the latest IBC and IRC that go to mitigated identified hazards, such as a tornado, high wind, and impact-resistant materials (windows, doors, roof bracing); dry-proofing public buildings for flooding; upgrading to higher standard insulation for extreme heat and winter storms; installing lightning rods and grounding systems on public buildings; retrofitting to low-flow plumbing and replacing landscaping with drought and fire resistant plant; stricter codes for hail and fire-resistant roofing and siding; implementing higher standards for foundations, and upgrading requirements for construction beams, breakers and foundation to mitigate impacts of earthquake and expansive soils. | 6 | LPR | G1, G2, G4, G5 | Building Department | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | High |
| 5 | GIS mapping | Use GIS mapping to overlay properties with known hazards of expansive soils, flood, and wildland interface areas. Then notify residents of at-risk structures to help residents mitigate the hazards around their property. | 7 | LPR | G1, G2 | Public Works | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | Information Technology | 36 | Medium |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---|--|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------|---------|
| 6 | Outreach to vulnerable populations regarding extreme and adverse weather/conditions | We will use several media outlets to promote accessible heating and cooling centers and education of flood and hurricane hazards to vulnerable populations. | 9 | EAP | G1, G3, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 7 | Implement Master Drainage Plan (7 projects) | Seven areas of the city are known to be subject to flood damage because of inadequate storm drainage. Install larger storm drainage and reduce flood damage. | 11 | SIP | G1, G2, G4, G6 | Public Works | >\$100,000 | City funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 8 | Educate community on all hazards | Educate the community on the hazards they are exposed to and how to mitigation their homes from hazards on the county website and public forums. | 12 | EAP | G1, G3, G4, G6 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 9 | Alternative notification / alert system | Develop and implement an alternative system to assist with emergency response despite the loss of power and internet for the community and staff. | 5 | LPR, EAP | G1 | Emergency Management | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | Information Technology | 36 | high |
| 10 | Establish Post Disaster Temporary Transfer Center | This activity may include identification of a Transfer Center, construction of a Transfer Center, and/or setup of a Transfer Center | 16 | LPR | G4 | Emergency Management | >\$100,000 | City Funds, State/Federal Grants, Cost Sharing | 60 | Medium |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 11 | Establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | Develop and implement a drought and expansive soils contingency plan that addresses mitigation measures for drought, extreme heat, and expansive soils. | 14 | LPR, EAP | G1, G3, G4, G5, G6 | Utility Department | <\$10,000 | City funds, State/Federal Grants | 36 | High |
| 12 | Update Drainage master plan | Update 2004 Drainage Master Plan to help direct the City forward with regard to planning and drainage improvements | 13 | LPR | G1, G2, G3, G4, G5 | Public Works | >\$100,000 | City funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 13 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | Develop a plan based on "lessons learned" from the pandemic. Coordinate with regional partners. | 3 | LPR | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | Medium |
| 14 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | Develop an after-action report based on COVID-19 lessons learned. | 1 | LPR, EAP | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | Medium |
| 15 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | This effort will include coordination and monitoring related to known subsidence issues. | 15 | LPR | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------|---------|
| 16 | Establish an all hazards response team | Develop a county-wide hazard response team and coordinate on a regional response plan. | 10 | LPR, EAP | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 17 | Install emergency generators at critical facilities | Install emergency generators at key critical facilities to provide back-up power during/post hazardous events. | 2 | SIP | G1, G2 | Public Works | >\$100,000 | City Funds, State/Federal Grants, Cost Share | 60 | High |
| CITY OF WHARTON | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Clean and repair storm drains routinely | Citywide cleaning and repairing of storm drains. | 3 | SIP | G1, G2 | Public Works | >\$100,000 | Public Works Fund | 60 | High |
| 2 | Increase freeboard requirements for permitting structures in the floodplain | Adopt ordinance to increase freeboard requirement in the 100-year floodplain. This action will result in safer structures, and thus, fewer flood damages. | 13 | SIP | G2, G3, G4, G5, G6 | Floodplain Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 12 | High |
| 3 | Implement a comprehensive watershed ordinance for new development | This ordinance will help to reduce flood risk to new development. | 4 | LPR | G2, G5, G6 | Floodplain Management | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | Watershed Funds | 24 | High |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|--|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 4 | Acquire, reuse, and preserve open spaces adjacent to flood-prone areas | Acquire, reuse, and preserve open spaces adjacent to flood-prone areas | 11 | LPR | G2, G4, G5, G6 | City Public Works | >\$100,000 | FMA, PDM, HMGP | 36 | High |
| 5 | Educate the community on the hazards | We will use several media outlets to promote accessible heating and cooling centers and education of flood and hurricane hazards to vulnerable populations. | 15 | EAP | G1, G3, G5, G6 | Planning Dept. | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 36 | Medium |
| 6 | Minimize the impact of flooding by installing berms and levees where appropriate | Coordinate with the USACE and other entities to implement levee improvements, etc. | 1 | SIP | G1, G2, G4, G6 | Floodplain Administrator | >\$100,000 | City Funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 7 | Develop flood-reduction / stream restoration/channelization projects to ensure adequate drainage/diversion of stormwater | Projects may include channel improvements to Caney Creek, Peach Creek, Baughman Slough, the Colorado River, and/or other minor channels throughout the City limits and ETJ. | 5 | SIP | G1, G2, G4, G6 | Planning Dept. | >\$100,000 | City Funds, State/Federal Grants | 60 | High |
| 8 | Establish a reserve fund for emergency and public mitigation measures | Coordinate with City Council to establish this fund. | 7 | LPR, EAP | G2, G3, G4, G5, G6 | Planning Dept. | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | high |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|--|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---|--------------------|---------|
| 9 | Strengthen and harden at-risk critical facilities | This effort will focus on Water Treatment, Wastewater Treatment, electric, water supply, and other similar facilities | 2 | LPR | G1, G6 | Emergency Management | >\$100,000 | City Funds | 48 | High |
| 10 | Acquisition and relocation, elevation, and “demo-rebuild” of flood-prone structures | This will focus on flood-prone structures specifically identified during Hurricane Harvey Flood | 12 | SIP, NSP | G2, G5, G6 | Emergency Management | >\$100,000 | FMA, PDM, HMGP | 60 | High |
| 11 | Install emergency backup generators at critical facilities | Install emergency backup generators at critical facilities | 8 | SIP, NSP | G1, G2, G6 | Emergency Management | >\$100,000 | HMGP, City Funds | 60 | High |
| 12 | Use impact fees to help fund public hazard mitigation projects related to land development | Use impact fees to help fund public hazard mitigation projects related to land development | 17 | LPR | G1, G2, G3, G4, G5 | Floodplain Administrator | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | Medium |
| 13 | Implement warning systems | Coordinate with County and LCRA to implement a County-Wide Flood Warning System of gauges. | 9 | LPR, EAP | G1 | Planning Dept. | >\$100,000 | Grant Funds, HGAC, and Coordination with County | 60 | High |
| 14 | Establish/implement drought/expansive soil contingency plan | Develop and implement a drought and expansive soils contingency plan that addresses mitigation measures for drought, extreme heat, and expansive soils. | 20 | LPR | G3, G4, G5 | Planning Dept. | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Low |

**TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS**

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 15 | Update/implement Drainage Master Plan | Update DMP to identify flood reduction projects, funding sources, and prioritization | 14 | LPR | G1, G2, G3, G4, G5 | Planning Dept. | \$10,000 to \$100,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 16 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | Implement drainage improvements throughout the City, including culvert improvements, levees, dams, channel widening, storm sewer, and detention facilities. | 6 | SIP | G1, G2, G6 | Planning Dept. | >\$100,000 | City Funds | 60 | High |
| 17 | Develop plan to improve Pandemic response | Develop a plan based on "lessons learned" from the pandemic. Coordinate with regional partners. | 16 | LPR | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 18 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | Develop an after-action report based on COVID-19 lessons learned. | 18 | LPR, EAP | G1, G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 19 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | This effort will include coordination and monitoring related to known subsidence issues. | 19 | LPR | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 60 | Medium |
| 20 | Establish a hazardous material response team | Develop a county-wide hazard response team and coordinate a regional response plan. | 10 | LPR, EAP | G4 | Emergency Management | <\$10,000 | City Funds | 24 | High |

Notes:

TABLE 22-2.
RECOMMENDED MITIGATION ACTIONS

| Action No. | Title | Description | Mitigation Action Ranking | Action Type | Applicable Goals | Responsible Department | Estimated Cost | Potential Funding Sources | Timeline in Months | Benefit |
|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| COVID-19 | Coronavirus Disease 2019 | | IBC | International Building Code | | | | | | |
| CRS | Community Rating System | | IRC | International Residential Code | | | | | | |
| DMP | Drainage Master Plan | | LCRA | Lower Colorado River Authority | | | | | | |
| EAP | Education and Awareness Program | | LRP | Local Plans and Regulations | | | | | | |
| ETJ | Extraterritorial Jurisdiction | | MUD | Municipal Utility District | | | | | | |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency | | NSP | Natural Systems Protection | | | | | | |
| FIRM | Flood Insurance Rate Map | | SIP | Structure and Infrastructure Project | | | | | | |
| GIS | Geographic Information System | | | | | | | | | |

Chapter 23.

PLAN ADOPTION AND MAINTENANCE

23.1 PLAN ADOPTION

A hazard mitigation plan must document that it has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting federal approval of the plan (44 CFR Section 201.6(c)(5)). For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval must document that it has been formally adopted. All planning partners fully met the participation requirements specified by the Steering Committee and will seek Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA) compliance under this plan. The plan will be submitted for review to the Texas Division of Emergency Management (TDEM) and then to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Region VI for review and pre-adoption approval. Once pre-adoption approval has been provided, all planning partners will formally adopt the plan. All partners understand that DMA compliance and its benefits cannot be achieved until the plan is adopted. Copies of the resolutions adopting this plan for all planning partners can be found in Appendix D.

23.2 PLAN MAINTENANCE STRATEGY

A hazard mitigation plan must present a plan maintenance process that includes the following (44 CFR Section 201.6(c)(4)):

- A section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan over a 5-year cycle
- A process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate
- A discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

This chapter details the formal process that will ensure that the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan remains an active and relevant document and that the planning partners maintain their eligibility for applicable funding sources. The plan maintenance process includes a schedule for monitoring and evaluating the plan annually and producing an updated plan every 5 years. This chapter also describes how public participation will be integrated throughout the plan maintenance and implementation process. It also explains how the mitigation strategies outlined in this plan will be incorporated into existing planning mechanisms and programs, such as comprehensive land-use planning processes, capital improvement planning, and building code enforcement and implementation. The plan's format allows sections to be reviewed and updated when new data become available, resulting in a plan that will remain current and relevant.

23.2.1 Plan Implementation

The effectiveness of the hazard mitigation plan depends on its implementation and incorporation of its action items into partner jurisdictions' existing plans, policies, and programs. Together, the action items in the plan provide a framework for activities that the partnership can implement over the next 5 years. The planning team and the Steering Committee have established goals and objectives and have prioritized mitigation actions that will be implemented through existing plans, policies, and programs.

The Wharton County Office of Emergency Management will have the lead responsibility for overseeing the plan implementation and maintenance strategy. Plan implementation and evaluation will be a shared responsibility among Wharton County and the cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Warton. The public will be invited to attend meetings regarding the implementation of the plan and feedback will be solicited at the end of the meeting.

23.2.2 Steering Committee

The Steering Committee is a total volunteer body that oversaw the development of the plan and made recommendations on key elements of the plan, including the maintenance strategy. It was the Steering Committee's position that an implementation committee with representation similar to the initial Steering Committee should have an active role in the plan maintenance strategy. The Steering Committee and the Implementation Committee are the same. Therefore, it is recommended that a Steering Committee remain a viable body involved in key elements of the plan maintenance strategy. The new Steering Committee should strive to include representation from the planning partners, as well as other stakeholders in the planning area. The public will be invited to attend Steering Committee meetings regarding maintenance of the plan and will be asked for feedback or comments on the maintenance strategy.

The principal role of the new implementation committee in this plan maintenance strategy will be to review the annual progress report and provide input to the Wharton County Emergency Management Coordinator on possible enhancements to be considered at the next update. Future plan updates will be overseen by a Steering Committee similar to the one that participated in this plan development process, so keeping an interim Steering Committee intact will provide a head start on future updates. Completion of the progress report is the responsibility of each planning partner, not the responsibility of the Steering Committee. It will simply be the Steering Committee's role to review the progress report in an effort to identify issues needing to be addressed by future plan updates.

With the adoption of this plan, the implementation committee will be tasked with plan monitoring, evaluation, and maintenance. The participating jurisdictions and agencies, led by the Wharton County Emergency Management Coordinator, agree to:

- Meet annually, and after a disaster event, to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the plan;
- Act as a forum for hazard mitigation issues;
- Disseminate hazard mitigation ideas and activities to all participants;
- Pursue the implementation of high priority, low- or no-cost recommended actions;
- Maintain vigilant monitoring of multi-objective, cost-share, and other funding opportunities to help the community implement the plan's recommended actions for which no current funding exists;
- Monitor and assist in implementation and update of this plan;
- Keep the concept of mitigation in the forefront of community decision making by identifying plan recommendations when other community goals, plans, and activities overlap, influence, or directly affect increased community vulnerability to disasters;
- Report on plan progress and recommended changes to the Wharton County Commissioners Court and governing bodies of participating jurisdictions; and
- Inform and solicit input from the public.

The implementation committee is an advisory body and can only make recommendations to county, city, or district elected officials. Its primary duty is to see the plan successfully carried out and to report to the community governing boards and the public on the status of plan implementation and mitigation opportunities. Other duties include reviewing and promoting mitigation proposals, hearing stakeholder concerns about hazard mitigation, passing concerns on to appropriate entities, and posting relevant information in areas accessible to the public.

23.2.3 Plan Maintenance Schedule

The implementation committee will meet annually and after a state or federally declared hazard event as appropriate to monitor progress and update the mitigation strategy. The Wharton County Emergency Management Coordinator will be responsible for initiating the plan reviews with the implementation committee.

23.2.4 Annual Progress Report

The minimum task of each planning partner will be the evaluation of the progress of its individual action plan during a 12-month performance period. This review will include the following:

- Summary of any hazard events that occurred during the performance period and the impact these events had on the planning area
- Review of mitigation success stories
- Review of continuing public involvement and feedback received from the community
- Brief discussion about why targeted strategies were not completed
- Re-evaluation of the action plan to evaluate whether the timeline for identified projects needs to be amended (such as changing a long-term project to a short-term one because of new funding)
- Recommendations for new projects
- Changes in or potential for new funding options (grant opportunities)
- Impact of any other planning programs or initiatives that involve hazard mitigation
- Monitor the incorporation of the Mitigation Plan into planning mechanisms

The planning team has created a template to guide the planning partners in preparing a progress report (see Appendix E). The plan maintenance Steering Committee and the public will provide feedback to the planning team on items included in the template. The planning team will then prepare a formal annual report on the progress of the plan. This report should be used to:

- Post on the Wharton County Office of Emergency Management website dedicated to the hazard mitigation plan
- Provide information for a press release that will be issued to the local media
- Inform planning partner governing bodies of the progress of actions implemented during the reporting period.

Uses of the progress report will be at the discretion of each planning partner. Annual progress reporting is not a requirement specified under 44 CFR. However, it may enhance the planning partnership's opportunities for funding. While failure to implement this component of the plan maintenance strategy

will not jeopardize a planning partner's compliance under the DMA, it may jeopardize its opportunity to partner and leverage funding opportunities with the other partners.

Evaluation of progress can be achieved by monitoring changes in vulnerabilities identified in the plan. Changes in vulnerability can be identified by noting:

- Decreased vulnerability as a result of implementing recommended actions,
- Increased vulnerability as a result of failed or ineffective mitigation actions, and/or
- Increased vulnerability as a result of new development (and/or annexation).

23.2.5 Plan Update

Local hazard mitigation plans must be reviewed, revised if appropriate, and resubmitted for approval in order to remain eligible for benefits under the DMA (44 CFR, Section 201.6(d)(3)). The Wharton County partnership intends to update the hazard mitigation plan on a 5-year cycle from the date of initial plan adoption. This cycle may be accelerated to less than 5 years based on the following triggers:

- A Presidential Disaster Declaration that impacts the planning area
- A hazard event that causes loss of life
- A comprehensive update of the county or participating city's comprehensive plan

It will not be the intent of future updates to develop a completely new hazard mitigation plan for the planning area. The update will, at a minimum, include the following elements:

- The update process will be convened through a Steering Committee.
- The hazard risk assessment will be reviewed and, if necessary, updated using best available information and technologies.
- The action plans will be reviewed and revised to account for any actions completed, dropped, or changed and to account for changes in the risk assessment or new partnership policies identified under other planning mechanisms (such as the comprehensive plan).
- The draft update will be sent to appropriate agencies and organizations for comment.
- The public will be given an opportunity to participate in the update process and comment on the update prior to adoption.
- The partnership governing bodies will adopt their respective portions of the updated plan.

23.2.6 Continuing Public Involvement

The public will continue to be apprised of the plan's progress through the Wharton County Office of Emergency Management's websites and other methods as appropriate. This site will not only house the final plan, it will become the one-stop shop for information regarding the plan, the partnership, and plan implementation. Copies of the plan will be distributed to the public library system in Wharton County Library. Upon initiation of future update processes, a new public involvement strategy will be initiated based on guidance from a new Steering Committee. This strategy will be based on the needs and capabilities of the planning partnership at the time of the update. This strategy will include the use of local media outlets within the planning area to notify the public of the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the plan. The public will be invited to participate in each stage by attending meetings and

provide feedback to the planning team and new Steering Committee. The Steering Committee may include community stakeholders, such as prominent businesses, local action groups, etc.

23.2.7 Incorporation into Other Planning Mechanisms

The information on hazard, risk, vulnerability, and mitigation contained in this plan is based on the best science and technology available at the time this plan was prepared. The existing Wharton County regulations, ordinances, and plans (including the Wharton County Emergency Operations Plan), and the comprehensive plans of the partner cities are considered to be integral parts of this plan. The county and partner cities, through the adoption of comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances, have planned for the impact of natural hazards.

It will be the responsibility of the county and the cities to determine additional implementation procedures when appropriate. This includes integrating the requirements of the hazard mitigation plan into other local planning documents, processes, or mechanisms.

All municipal planning partners are committed to creating a linkage between the hazard mitigation plan and their individual comprehensive plans. Other planning processes and programs to be coordinated with the recommendations of the hazard mitigation plan include the following:

- Comprehensive plans
- Strategic plans
- Partners' emergency response plans
- Capital improvement programs
- Municipal codes
- Community design guidelines
- Water-efficient landscape design guidelines
- Stormwater management programs
- Water system vulnerability assessments
- Community wildfire protection plans
- Growth management plans
- Ordinances, resolutions, and regulations
- Continuity of operations plans

The previous *Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2016* identified mitigation actions for each participating community. These mitigation actions and their current status are listed in Table 2-2.

Ongoing or delayed mitigation actions identified in the previous plan were carried forward into new mitigation actions for Wharton County or the City of East Bernard, the City of El Campo, or the City of Wharton. The annual progress report discussed in Chapter 22.2.4 and Appendix E will provide a framework for tracking future mitigation actions and the incorporation of this plan into other planning mechanisms.

Opportunities to integrate the requirements of this plan into other local planning mechanisms will continue to be identified through future meetings of the Steering Committee, by the individual communities and the county, and through the annual and five-year review processes as required by FEMA. The primary means for integrating mitigation strategies into other local planning mechanisms will be through the revision, update, and implementation of each jurisdiction's individual plans that require specific planning and administrative tasks (for example, plan amendments, ordinance revisions, capital improvement projects, etc.).

The previous Steering Committee representatives will remain charged with ensuring that the goals and strategies of new and updated local planning documents for their jurisdictions or agencies are consistent with the goals and actions of the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update and will not contribute to increased hazard vulnerability in Wharton County, the City of East Bernard, the City of El Campo, or the City of Wharton. During the planning process for new and updated local planning documents, such as a comprehensive plan, capital improvements plan, or emergency management plan, the applicable jurisdiction will provide a copy of the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update to the appropriate parties and recommend that all goals and strategies of new and updated local planning documents are consistent with and support the goals of the Wharton County plan and will not contribute to increased hazards in the affected jurisdiction(s).

Although it is recognized that there are many possible benefits to integrating components of this plan into other local planning mechanisms, the development and maintenance of this stand-alone hazard mitigation plan is deemed by the Steering Committee to be the most effective and appropriate method to ensure the implementation of local hazard mitigation actions at this time. All organizations will incorporate the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update into existing plans in an effort to mitigate the impact of future disasters. A list of the existing plans and procedures in which mitigation activities will be integrated is listed in Table 22-1.

**TABLE 23-1.
INCORPORATION OF MITIGATION ACTIVITIES**

| Type of Plan | Department | Review Timeline | New or Existing | Actions to be Integrated |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| WHARTON COUNTY | | | | |
| Wharton County Master Subdivision Policy, 2005 (as amended) | Permit and Inspection Department | 5 years | Existing | Maintain current data on high-risk areas via the mitigation plan and regularly incorporate information on high-risk hazard areas into the subdivision requirements, thereby eliminating or reducing potential impacts on current and future development. Update to the development regulations will help resolve loopholes in standards and improve clarity. |
| Flood Damage Prevention Order signed October 22, 2001 | Permit and Inspection Department | 5 years | Existing | Overlay high-risk/flood-prone areas with current and future floodplain regulations, thereby minimizing or reducing the impacts of flooding on current and future development. Adopt “Higher Standard” Riverine Flood Damage Prevention Ordinances and Standards to reduce insurance rates and mitigate flood damages for both new/existing buildings. The new county floodplain maps went into effect on December 21, 2017. |
| Wharton County Basic Emergency Operations Plan | Emergency Manager, Commissioners’ Court | 2 years | Existing | Integrate and implement hazard mitigation plan data on high hazards and applicable mitigation actions that are affected by or will affect the emergency operations plan on an annual basis. |
| Drainage Master Plan | Drainage Department, Commissioners’ Court | 5 Years | New | The county will incorporate current data on high hazard areas presented in the hazard mitigation plan as they prepare/commission and adopt a stormwater drainage master plan. This will help identify and prioritize drainage improvements countywide helping to reduce the impact of flooding on new and existing structures. |
| Drought/Expansive Soils Contingency Plan | Emergency Management | 5 Years | New | The county will collaborate with local MUD districts regarding water, wastewater, and soil expansion throughout the county. Areas of concern as well as projects to mitigate the effects of drought and expansive soils will be identified. The identified projects will be prioritized into a drought/expansive soils contingency plan to be adopted by the county. |
| Pandemic Response Plan | Emergency Management | 5 Years | New | The county will participate in “lessons learned” meetings related to the COVID-19 pandemic and compile a report. This report will be used to help collaborate with local and regional entities to develop a regional plan to improve future pandemic response. |
| CITY OF EAST BERNARD | | | | |
| 2005 East Bernard Comprehensive Plan (To be Updated) | City Secretary | 3 Years | Existing/New | The city will conduct a review/update of the current 2005 East Bernard Comprehensive Plan to identify projects, plans, and policies which will help guide the development of East Bernard in the future. The update process will review mitigation actions from the hazard mitigation plan for incorporation into the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives elements. |
| Standard for Floodplain Management (2004) | City Secretary | Annual | Existing | During the regular review process, the City Council will review the identified actions and will either approve or deny the actions. |
| Wharton County Basic Emergency Operations Plan | City Secretary | 2 years | Existing | Under the leadership of the County OEM, all appropriate planning documents will be updated to include and implement the appropriate mitigation actions as prioritized in the current hazard mitigation plan. |

**TABLE 23-1.
INCORPORATION OF MITIGATION ACTIVITIES**

| Type of Plan | Department | Review Timeline | New or Existing | Actions to be Integrated |
|--|---|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Stormwater Drainage Plan and Ordinance | City Council | Annual | New | City Council will incorporate current data on high hazard areas presented in the hazard mitigation plan as they prepare/commission and adopt a stormwater drainage plan and ordinance. |
| Zoning Ordinance | City Secretary | Annual | New | City Council will incorporate current data on high hazard areas presented in the hazard mitigation plan as they prepare/commission and adopt a zoning ordinance. This will aid in the reduction or elimination of potential negative impacts of high hazards on existing and future development. |
| Drought/Expansive Soils Contingency Plan | City Secretary | 5 Years | New | The city will collaborate with local MUD districts regarding water, wastewater, and soil expansion throughout the county. Areas of concern as well as projects to mitigate the effects of drought and expansive soils will be identified. The identified projects will be prioritized into a drought/expansive soils contingency plan to be adopted by the city. |
| Pandemic Response Plan | Emergency Management | 5 Years | New | The city will participate in “lessons learned” meetings related to the COVID-19 pandemic and compile a report. This report will be used to help collaborate with local and regional entities to develop a regional plan to improve future pandemic response. |
| CITY OF EL CAMPO | | | | |
| El Campo 2020 Plan | City Council | 20 years | Existing | During the regular review process, the Planning and Zoning Commission will consider mitigation actions from the hazard mitigation plan for incorporation into the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives elements, and present those actions to the City Council for approval. |
| Drought/Expansive Soils Contingency Plan | Utility Department | 3 Years | New | The city will collaborate with local MUD districts regarding water, wastewater, and soil expansion throughout the county. Areas of concern as well as projects to mitigate the effects of drought and expansive soils will be identified. The identified projects will be prioritized into a drought/expansive soils contingency plan to be adopted by the city. |
| Chapter 10, Subdivision (2014, as amended) | Inspection Department, Planning and Zoning Commission | 5 years | Existing | During the City’s regular review and update of the subdivision regulations, they will incorporate current data on high hazard areas thereby reducing or eliminating the potential negative impacts of high hazards on existing and future development. |
| Floodplain Ordinance, Part of Chapter 10, Buildings (2006, as amended) | Inspection Department, Planning and Zoning Commission | 5 years | Existing | During the regular review process of the Floodplain Ordinance (within the Subdivision Ordinance), bring the identified actions to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council for approval. The Council will approve or deny the actions. |
| Chapter 14, Zoning (2000, as amended) | Board of Adjustment, Planning and Zoning Commission | 10 years | Existing | During the City’s regular review and update of the zoning ordinance, they will incorporate current data on high hazard areas, thereby reducing or eliminating the potential negative impacts of high hazards on existing and future development. |

**TABLE 23-1.
INCORPORATION OF MITIGATION ACTIVITIES**

| Type of Plan | Department | Review Timeline | New or Existing | Actions to be Integrated |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| Site Plan Review Process | Building Official and Public Works Department | Regularly | Existing | The Building Official and Public Works Department will consider the high hazard areas within the community and make development decisions in the best interest of the community integrating the mitigation plan data and proposed actions as applicable into their decision-making processes. |
| Capital Improvements Plan | City Development Corporation | Annual | Existing | During the annual budget review cycle, the City Development Corporation will bring the identified mitigation actions to the City Council for approval as part of the capital improvements funding stream. The Council will approve or deny the actions. |
| Wharton County Basic Emergency Operations Plan | Assistant Police Chief | 2 years | Existing | Under the leadership of the City Police Department and the County Office of Emergency Management, all appropriate planning documents will be updated to include and implement the appropriate mitigation actions as prioritized in the current hazard mitigation plan. |
| Drainage Master Plan (Update) | Public Works | 5 Years | Existing/New | The City of El Campo will incorporate engineering studies as well as current data on high hazard areas presented in the hazard mitigation plan as they prepare/commission and adopt a stormwater drainage master plan. This will help identify and prioritize drainage improvements in El Campo helping reduce the impact of flooding on new and existing structures. |
| Pandemic Response Plan | Emergency Management | 5 Years | New | The city will participate in “lessons learned” meetings related to the COVID-19 pandemic and compile a report. This report will be used to help collaborate with local and regional entities to develop a regional plan to improve future pandemic response. |
| CITY OF WHARTON | | | | |
| 2018-2028 Wharton Comprehensive Plan | City Council | 10 Years | Existing | During the regular review process, City Council will consider mitigation actions from the hazard mitigation plan for incorporation into the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives elements. |
| Subdivision Ordinance (within the City of Wharton Code of Ordinances, as amended) | Code Enforcement Department | 10 years | Existing | During the City’s regular review and update of the subdivision regulations, they will incorporate current data on high hazard areas thereby reducing or eliminating the potential negative impacts of high hazards on existing and future development. |
| Watershed Ordinance | Floodplain Management | 2 years | New | The city will adopt/implement a watershed ordinance to aid in the reduction of flood risk to new development and its impact on other properties in the city. |
| Standard for Floodplain Management (1996) | Code Enforcement Department | 5 years | Existing | During the regular review process of the Floodplain Ordinance, update the ordinance to be more restrictive. Incorporate identified hazard mitigation plan actions to increase freeboard requirements for permitting structures in the floodplain. Bring proposed amendments to the City Council, which will approve or deny the actions. |
| Wharton Code of Ordinance – Zoning (1997, as amended) | Code Enforcement Department | 10 years | Existing | During the City’s regular review and update of the City’s zoning ordinance, they will incorporate current data on high hazard areas thereby reducing or eliminating the potential negative impacts of high hazards on existing and future development. |
| Adopted Annual Budget | City Manager | Annual | Existing | During the annual budget review cycle, bring the identified mitigation actions to the City Council for approval. The Council will approve or deny the actions. |

**TABLE 23-1.
INCORPORATION OF MITIGATION ACTIVITIES**

| Type of Plan | Department | Review Timeline | New or Existing | Actions to be Integrated |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| Drainage Master Plan (Update) | Planning Department | 5 Years | Existing/New | The City of El Campo will incorporate engineering studies as well as current data on high hazard areas presented in the hazard mitigation plan as they prepare/commission and adopt a stormwater drainage master plan. This will help identify and prioritize drainage improvements in El Campo helping reduce the impact of flooding on new and existing structures. |
| Drought/Expansive Soils Contingency Plan | Planning Department | 5 Years | New | The city will collaborate with local MUD districts regarding water, wastewater, and soil expansion throughout the county. Areas of concern as well as projects to mitigate the effects of drought and expansive soils will be identified. The identified projects will be prioritized into a drought/expansive soils contingency plan to be adopted by the city. |
| Pandemic Response Plan | Emergency Management | 5 Years | New | The city will participate in “lessons learned” meetings related to the COVID-19 pandemic and compile a report. This report will be used to help collaborate with local and regional entities to develop a regional plan to improve future pandemic response. |

REFERENCES

- 30 Tex. Admin. Environmental Quality (2005)
- 7 C.F.R. Appendix A-Subpart E-Part 1724. Hazard Potential Classification for Civil Works Projects
- ABS Consulting. 28 August 2015. West Fertilizer Incident Support Services Final Report. Accessed August 2021 at https://www.csb.gov/assets/1/6/west_fertilizer_incident_support_services_fpr_finalrev1_compressed_02111____.pdf?15619
- American Journal of Managed Care (AJMC). 2021. A Timeline of COVID-19 Developments in 2020. Accessed May 2021 at <https://www.ajmc.com/view/a-timeline-of-covid19-developments-in-2020>
- Campbell, M. & Wise, H. 2018. Growth Faulting and Subsidence in the Houston, Texas Area: Guide to the Origins, Relationships, Hazards, Potential Impacts and Methods of Investigation: An Update. 2. Accessed July 2021 at https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Salt-Domes-in-the-Houston-Area-and-Environs-Modified-After-24-p-120-O-Offshore_fig4_324706667
- CDC. 2016. SARS (10 Years After). Accessed May 2021 at <https://www.cdc.gov/dotw/sars/>
- Center for Climate and Energy Solutions. No Date. Hurricanes and Climate Change. Accessed at <https://www.c2es.org/content/hurricanes-and-climate-change/>
- Center for Climate and Energy Solutions. No Date. Tornadoes and Climate Change. Accessed at <https://www.c2es.org/content/tornadoes-and-climate-change/>
- Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). 2018. Past Pandemics Accessed May 2021 at <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/pandemic-resources/basics/past-pandemics.html>
- Clean Water Act, Pub. L. No. 95-217. (1977).
- Cleveland Clinic. April 2021. How Climate Change May Affect Future Pandemics. Accessed on May 2021 at <https://newsroom.clevelandclinic.org/2021/04/21/how-climate-change-may-affect-future-pandemics/>
- Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA). 1993. Preparing for an Uncertain Climate, Vol. I. OTA-O-567. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Dillon, Gregory K; Gilbertson-Day, Julie W. 2020. Wildfire Hazard Potential for the United States (270-m), version 2020. 3rd Edition. Fort Collins, CO: Forest Service Research Data Archive. <https://doi.org/10.2737/RDS-2015-0047-3>
- Domenico, P.A., and F.W. Schwartz. 1990. Physical and chemical hydrogeology: New York, NY, John EKU. (2020, July 22). Top toxic chemicals in American industries. EKU Online. <https://safetymanagement.eku.edu/blog/top-hazardous-materials-in-american-industries/>.
- Emergency Management and Assistance, 44 C.F.R. (2002).
- Endangered Species Act, Pub. L. No. 96-159. (1979).
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); 430-R-16-061. October 2016. Climate Change and Extreme Heat. Accessed at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-10/documents/extreme-heat-guidebook.pdf>

EPA. Updated August 2016. "Heat-Related Deaths." Accessed April 2021 at https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-08/documents/print_heat-deaths-2016.pdf.

Fakih, L., & Majzoub, A. (2021, August 3). "They killed us from the inside". Human Rights Watch. <https://www.hrw.org/report/2021/08/03/they-killed-us-inside/investigation-august-4-beirut-blast#>.

Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, Pub. L. No. 106-390 (2000)

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). April 2021. National Flood Insurance Program Community Rating System. Accessed at <https://www.fema.gov/floodplain-management/community-rating-system>

Federal Reserve Economic Data (FRED). Unemployment Data. Accessed at <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/TXWHAR1URN>

FEMA. (2019). (rep.). Hazardous Materials Incidents: Guidance for State, Local, Tribal, Territorial, and Private Sectors.

FEMA. 2004. Using HAZUS-MH for Risk Assessment, How to Guide, FEMA (433). August.

FEMA. 2018. Hazards, United States – Multi-Hazard (HAZUS-MH). Software Database.

FEMA. April 2021. OpenFEMA Dataset: Disaster Declarations Summaries – V2. FEMA. Accessed at <https://www.fema.gov/openfema-data-page/disaster-declarations-summaries-v2>

FEMA. February 2013. Living With Dams – Know Your Risks. Accessed at https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/2020-08/fema_living-with-dams_p-956.pdf

FEMA. No Date. Flood Insurance Analytics Reports and Data. Accessed at <https://nfipservices.floodsmart.gov/reports-flood-insurance-data>

FEMA. No Date. Unit 13: Pandemic Scenario. Accessed May 2021 at <https://training.fema.gov>

FRA. (2020, February 25). Hazardous Materials Transportation. Hazardous Materials Transportation | FRA. <https://railroads.dot.gov/program-areas/hazmat-transportation/hazardous-materials-transportation>.

Freeze, R.A. and J.A. Cherry, J.A. 1979. Groundwater: Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, 604 pp.

Haleem, A., Javaid, M., & Vaishya, R. (2020). Effects of COVID-19 pandemic in daily life. Current medicine research and practice, 10(2), 78–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmrp.2020.03.011>

Harris County Homeland Security and Emergency Management, & Tetra Tech, 1Harris County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Action Plan253–258 (n.d.).

Hazardous material incidents. The Atlantic Beach Official Website (n.d.). <https://coab.us/591/Hazardous-Material-Incidents>

Hazardous material incidents. The Atlantic Beach Official Website (n.d.). <https://coab.us/591/Hazardous-Material-Incidents#:~:text=Hazardous%20materials%20come%20in%20the,of%20chemical%20accidents%20in%20plants>.

Hazardous materials incidents. Ready.gov. (2021, February 18). <https://www.ready.gov/hazardous-materials-incidents>.

- Hlavaty, C., & Glenn, M. (2014, June 27). Gas line ruptures in Wharton county, injuring one. Chron. <https://www.chron.com/neighborhood/bayarea/article/Gas-line-ruptures-in-Wharton-County-injuring-one-5582181.php>.
- Hudgin, M. No Date. Boling Dome. Handbook of Texas Online. Accessed July 2021 at <https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/boling-dome>
- Hudgins, Merle R. 2010. "Wharton County," Handbook of Texas Online. (<https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hcw06>), accessed June 8, 2015. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.
- IRSC. (n.d.). Common Risks Managed by the Railway Industry. International Railway
- Javaria U. COVID-19 Severity Index comparison between Asia and Europe: A guide to Prevention from Pandemic. J Prev Med Vol. 5 Iss No.6: 69
- Leake, S.A., 2016. Land Subsidence From Ground-Water Pumping. Accessed July 2021 at <https://geochange.er.usgs.gov/sw/changes/anthropogenic/subside/>
- Madhav N, Oppenheim B, Gallivan M, et al. November 2017. Disease Control Priorities: Improving Health and Reducing Poverty. 3rd edition. Chapter 17. Accessed on May 2021 at <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK525302/> DOI: 10.1596/978-1-4648-0527-1_ch17
- McEwen, Harry F. and Crout, Jack. 2006. "Soil Survey of Wharton County, Texas". Accessed at https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_MANUSCRIPTS/texas/whartonTX1974/whartonTX1974.pdf
- Mehta, Ankita. International Business Times. October 9, 2011. "Texas Sets Record for Hottest Summer in U.S. History". Accessed April 2021 at <https://www.ibtimes.com/texas-sets-record-hottest-summer-us-history-311216>
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2011. A Guide for Assessing Community Emergency Response Needs and Capabilities for Hazardous Materials Releases. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/14502>.
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). August 2, 2004. NASA News. Accessed at https://www.nasa.gov/home/hqnews/2004/jul/HQ_04252_glaciers.html
- National Drought Mitigation Center (University of Nebraska-Lincoln), United States Department of Agriculture, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. April 6, 2021. United States Drought Monitor. Accessed at <https://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/CurrentMap.aspx>. Accessed April 2021.
- National Drought Mitigation Center (University of Nebraska-Lincoln). April 2021. Drought Impact Reporter. Accessed April 2021 at Map of Drought Impacts ([unl.edu](https://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/CurrentMap.aspx)).
- National Integrated Drought Information System (NIDIS). September 2018. PDF. Accessed at https://www.drought.gov/sites/default/files/2020-07/NIDIS_NDAWN_StrategicPlan_2018.pdf
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). April 2021. Crop Moisture Index by Division. Accessed April 2021 at https://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/analysis_monitoring/regional_monitoring/cmi.gif

National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). 1999. Wind Resource Estimation and Mapping at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Accessed at <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy99osti/26245.pdf>

National Research Council. 1991. Mitigating losses from land subsidence in the United State: Washington, D.C. National Academy Press, 58 p.

Natural Resources Defense Council. May 2012. “Killer Summer Heat: Projected Death Toll Rising Temperatures in America Due to Climate Change.” Accessed at NRDC: Killer Summer Heat - Projected Death Toll from Rising Temperatures in America Due to Climate Change (PDF)

NOAA. 2020. Climate.gov – IBTrACS Historical Hurricane Tracks. Accessed at <https://www.climate.gov/maps-data/dataset/historical-hurricane-tracks-gis-map-viewer>

NOAA. 2021. Storm Events Database. Accessed March 2021 at <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/stormevents/>

NOAA. May 15, 2015. Incident News. East Bernard Pesticide Spill. Accessed August 2021 at <https://incidentnews.noaa.gov/incident/7563#!>

NOAA. No date. National Centers for Environmental Information - Climate Data Online Search. Accessed at <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cdo-web/results>

NOAA. No Date. National Hurricane Center and Central Pacific Hurricane Center – Saffir-Simpson Hurricane Wind Scale. Accessed at <https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/aboutsshws.php>

NOAA. No Date. National Hurricane Center and Central Pacific Hurricane Center – Tropical Cyclone Climatology. Accessed at <https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/climo/>

NOAA-National Centers for Environmental Information. April 2021. Drought Severity Index and Palmer Drought Hydrological Index. Accessed April 2021 at Historical Palmer Drought Indices | Temperature, Precipitation, and Drought | National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) ([noaa.gov](https://www.noaa.gov)).

NOAA-National Centers for Environmental Information. April 2021. Standard Precipitation Index and Palmer Z Index. Accessed April 2021 at Drought - March 2021 | State of the Climate | National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) ([noaa.gov](https://www.noaa.gov)).

NOAA-National Weather Service (NWS). 2019. Storm Prediction Center WCM. Accessed March 2021 at <https://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/>

NOAA-NWS. No date. Heat Index. Accessed at <https://www.weather.gov/ama/heatindex>

NOAA-NWS. No Date. The Enhanced Fujita Scale (EF Scale). Accessed at <https://www.weather.gov/oun/efscale>

NOAA-NWS. No date. Wind Chill Chart. Accessed at <https://www.weather.gov/safety/cold-wind-chill-chart>

NREL. No Date. National Wind Technology Center. Accessed at <https://www.nrel.gov/wind/nwtc.html>

Phelan, M. (2020, July 10). Why do lithium-ion batteries explode? Phelan Petty. <https://phelanpetty.com/blog/why-do-lithium-ion-batteries-explode/>.

PHMSA. (2000, October 1). Serious Incident Definition.

- PHMSA. (2019, October 1). Pipeline Safety: Safety of Hazardous Liquid Pipelines. Federal Register. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/10/01/2019-20458/pipeline-safety-safety-of-hazardous-liquid-pipelines>.
- PHMSA. (2021, May 5). PHMSA Regulations. PHMSA. <https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/regulations>.
- Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. (2000, October 1). Serious Incident Definition. Pipelines: Where are they? Texas Pipeline Awareness Alliance. (2018). <https://pipeline-safety.org/pipelines-where-they-are/>.
- Pottroff & Karlin. (2021, February 2). Toxic spills. Train Accidents. <https://www.pottroff.com/areas-of-practice/train-accidents/toxic-spills/>.
- Ratzlaff, K.W. 1982. Land-Surface Subsidence in the Texas Coastal Region: Texas Department of Water Resources Report 272, 26 p
- Runkle, J., K. Kunkel, J. Nielsen-Gammon, R. Frankson, S. Champion, B. Stewart, L. Romolo, and W. Sweet, 2017: Texas State Climate Summary. NOAA Technical Report NESDIS 149-TX, 4 pp.
- Safety Council. <https://international-railway-safety-council.com/common-risks-managed-railway-industry/>.
- Shellenberger, M. (2019, May 28). If solar panels are so clean, why do they produce so much toxic waste? Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelshellenberger/2018/05/23/if-solar-panels-are-so-clean-why-do-they-produce-so-much-toxic-waste/?sh=6e19dfa0121c>.
- Soil and Water Conservation Society. 2003. Conservation Implications of Climate Change: Soil Erosion and Runoff from Cropland. Ankeny, IA: Soil and Water Conservation Society. Accessed at <https://www.swcs.org/resources/publications/conservation-implications-of-climate-change>
- Sperling's Best Places. "Climate in Wharton County, Texas." Accessed April 2021 at <https://www.bestplaces.net/climate/county/texas/wharton>.
- TDEM. 2013. State of Texas Mitigation Plan Update. October 15.
- Texas A&M Forest Service (TFS). 2021. Texas Wildfire Risk Assessment Portal (TxWRAP). Texas Wildfire Risk. Accessed at <https://www.texaswildfirerisk.com/>
- Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ). August 2009. Design and Construction Guidelines for Dams in Texas. Accessed at https://www.tceq.texas.gov/assets/public/comm_exec/pubs/rg/rg-473.pdf
- Texas Division of Emergency Management (TDEM). 2018. State of Texas Mitigation Plan. Accessed at <http://tdem.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/txHazMitPlan.pdf>
- Texas Health and Human Services (Texas HHS). May 17, 2021. Texas COVID-19 Data. Accessed May 2021 at <https://dshs.texas.gov/coronavirus/AdditionalData.aspx>
- Texas Parks & Wildlife. No date. GIS. Accessed at <https://tpwd.texas.gov/gis/#data>
- Texas Real Estate Research Center at Texas A&M University. No Date. Building Permits. Accessed at <https://www.recenter.tamu.edu/data/building-permits>
- Texas Water Development Board (TWD). April 2014. Updated December 2016. "State of Texas Emergency Management Plan (Drought Annex)." Accessed at

- https://waterdatafortexas.org/drought/twdb-reports/state_of_texas_drought_annex_2016.pdf. Accessed April 2021.
- Texas Water Development Board. No Date. Gulf Coast Aquifer. Accessed July 2021 at <https://www.twdb.texas.gov/groundwater/aquifer/majors/gulf-coast.asp>
- TFS. 2012. Community Wildfire Protection Plan Guide (CWPP). PDF. Accessed at https://tfsweb.tamu.edu/uploadedFiles/TFSMain/Preparing_for_Wildfires/Wildland_Urban_Interface/Contact_Us/CWPP2.pdf
- TFS. 2020. Wildfire and Disasters: Texas Wildfire Protection Plan (TWPP). Texas A&M Forest Service. Accessed at <https://tfsweb.tamu.edu/TWPP/>
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2018. National Inventory of Dams (NID). Accessed at <https://nid.sec.usace.army.mil>
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. No date. USACE Program Levees. Accessed at <https://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Levee-Safety-Program/USACE-Program-Levees/>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. April 9, 2021. Unemployment Rate in Wharton County, TX. Accessed at <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/TXWHAR1URN>
- U.S. Census Bureau. No Date. Explore Census Data. Accessed at <https://data.census.gov>
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) – National Agricultural Statistics Service. 2017. 2017 Census of Agriculture County Profile – Wharton County Texas. Accessed at https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/AgCensus/2017/Online_Resources/County_Profiles/Texas/cp48481.pdf
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2021. Earthquake Hazards Accessed April 2021 at <https://www.usgs.gov/natural-hazards/earthquake-hazards/earthquakes>
- USDA/PRISM Climate Group. 2015. 30-Year Normals. Accessed at <https://prism.oregonstate.edu/normals/>
- USGS. 1989. National Geologic Map Database. Swelling clays map of the conterminous United States. Accessed at <https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/Prodesc/proddesc10014.htm>
- USGS. 1989. The Severity of an Earthquake. Accessed April 2021 at <https://pubs.usgs.gov/gip/earthq4/severitygip.html>
- USGS. 2000. Land Subsidence in the United States: USGS Fact Sheet-165-00. Accessed July 2021 at <https://water.usgs.gov/ogw/pubs/fs00165/>
- USGS. 2008. An Atlas of ShakeMaps for Selected Global Earthquakes. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2008-1236. Prepared by Allen, T.I., Wald, D.J., Hotovec, A.J., Lin, K., Earle, P.S. and Marano, K.D.
- USGS. 2010. PAGER—Rapid Assessment of an Earthquake’s Impact. U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2010-3036.
- USGS. 2016. National Land Cover Database. MRLC. Accessed at <https://www.mrlc.gov/national-land-cover-database-nlcd-2016>
- USGS. No Date. Land Subsidence. Accessed July 2021 at <https://www.usgs.gov/mission-areas/water-resources/science/land-subsidence>

- Vaisala - National Lightning Detecting Network. 2020. Annual Lightning Report 2020. Accessed at
- Wertz, J. (2020, January 29). A Common Fertilizer Can Cause Explosions. Uneven Regulation Puts People at Risk. Center for Public Integrity. <https://publicintegrity.org/environment/growing-food-sowing-trouble/fertilizers-explosive-potential-west-texas/>.
- Wilhite, D.A, and M.H. Glantz. 1985. Understanding the Drought Phenomenon: The Role of Definitions. *Water International*. 10 (3): 111-120.
<https://www.vaisala.com/sites/default/files/documents/WEA-MET-Annual-Lightning-Report-2020-B212260EN-A.pdf>
- Winnipeg Regional Health Authority. 2008. The Chain of Infection. Accessed May 2021 at https://professionals.wrha.mb.ca/old/extranet/ipc/files/manuals/ltc/ManualPCH_Sec03.pdf
- Young, S., Pham, H., Lu, Z., & Qu, F. 2020. Mapping of Ground Surface Deformation Rates in Wharton County Based on the Analysis of Remote Sensing Data.
- Young, S.C. 2016. Estimates of Land Subsidence in GMA 15 Based on Ground Surface Elevation Data and Model Results, prepared for Calhoun County GCD, Coastal Bend GCD, Coastal Plains GCD, Pecan

Wharton County
Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

APPENDIX A.
ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS

APPENDIX A. ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS

ACRONYMS

Note: Acronyms are defined the first time they are used in each part of this plan

| | |
|----------|--|
| %g | Percent Gravity Acceleration |
| °C | Degrees Celsius |
| °F | Degrees Fahrenheit |
| 44 CFR | Title 44 Code of Federal Regulations |
| AIDS | Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome |
| ASTM | American Society for Testing and Materials |
| BFE | Base Flood Elevation |
| CDC | Center for disease Control |
| CEM | Certified Emergency Manager |
| COVID-19 | Coronavirus Disease 2019 |
| CPZ | Community Protection Zone |
| CRS | Community Rating System |
| CWA | Clean Water Act |
| CWPP | Community Wildfire Protection Plan |
| CWSRF | Clean Water State Revolving Fund |
| DCM | Drainage Criteria Manual |
| DMA | Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 |
| DMP | Drainage Master Plan |
| DPS | Department of Public Safety |
| EAP | Education and Awareness Program |
| EDA | Endangered Species Act |
| EF | Enhanced Fujita |
| EMS | Emergency Medical Services |
| EOP | Emergency Operations Plan |
| EPA | Environmental Protection Agency |
| ESA | Endangered Species Act |
| ESD | Emergency Service District |
| ETJ | Extraterritorial Jurisdiction |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency |

| | |
|----------|---|
| FERC | Federal Energy Regulatory Commission |
| FHBM | Flood Hazard Boundary Map |
| FIRM | Flood Insurance Rate Map |
| FRA | Federal Railroad Administration |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| GLF | Geophysical Log Facility |
| HAZMAT | Hazardous Materials |
| HAZUS-MH | Hazards United States Multi-Hazard |
| H-GAC | Houston-Galveston Area Council |
| HIV | Human Immunodeficiency Virus |
| HMGP | Hazard Mitigation Grant Program |
| HMP | Hazard Mitigation Plan |
| IBC | international building code |
| IRC | international residential code |
| ISD | Independent School District |
| kts | knots |
| LCRA | Lower Colorado River Authority |
| LPR | Local Plans and Regulations |
| ML | Local Magnitude Scale |
| MLI | Midterm Levee Inventory |
| mph | Miles per Hour |
| MUD | municipal utility district |
| MW | Moment Magnitude |
| NASA | National Aeronautic Space Administration |
| NCDC | National Climatic Data Center |
| NEHRP | National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program |
| NFIP | National Flood Insurance Program |
| NFPA | National Fire Protection Association |
| NIDIS | national Integrated Drought Information System |
| NLD | National Levee Database |
| NOAA | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration |
| NREL | National Renewable Energy Laboratory |
| NSP | Natural Systems Protection |
| NSSL | National Sever Storm Laboratory |

| | |
|--------|--|
| NWS | National Weather Service |
| OTA | Congressional Office of Technology Assessment |
| PDI | Palmer Drought Index |
| PDM | Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program |
| PGA | Peak Ground Acceleration |
| PHDI | Palmer Hydrological Drought Index |
| PHMSA | Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration |
| PID | Photoionization Detector |
| PMF | Probable Maximum Flood |
| PSI | Pandemic Severity Index |
| SARS | Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome |
| SFHA | Special Flood Hazard Area |
| SIP | Structure and Infrastructure Project |
| SPI | Standardized Precipitation Index |
| SWCD | Soil and Water Conservation District |
| TCEQ | Texas Commission on Environmental Quality |
| TCRFC | Texas Colorado River Floodplain Coalition |
| TDEM | Texas Division of Emergency Management |
| TFS | Texas Forest Service |
| TNRIS | Texas Natural Resources Information System |
| TSSWCB | Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board |
| TSSWCD | Texas State Soil and Water Conservation District |
| TWDB | Texas Water Development Board |
| TxDOT | Texas Department of Transportation |
| TxWRAP | Texas A&M Forest Service Wildfire Risk Assessment Portal |
| UBC | Unified Building Code |
| UDC | Unified Development Code |
| USACE | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers |
| USDA | United States Department of Agriculture |
| USFS | U.S. Forest Service |
| USGS | United States Geological Survey |
| VFD | Volunteer Fire Department |
| VRI | Value Response Index |
| WCEDC | Wharton County Economic Development Corporation |

| | |
|------|--|
| WCID | Water Control and Improvement District |
| WDEC | Wharton Economic Development Corporation |
| WHO | World Health Organization |
| WHP | Wildfire Hazard Potential |
| WUI | Wildland Urban Interface |

DEFINITIONS

100-Year Flood: The term “100-year flood” can be misleading. The 100-year flood does not necessarily occur once every 100 years. Rather, it is the flood that has a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. Thus, the 100-year flood could occur more than once in a relatively short period of time. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) defines it as the 1% annual chance flood, which is now the standard definition used by most federal and state agencies and by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

Accredited Levee: A levee that is shown on a FIRM as providing protection from the 1% annual chance or greater flood. A **non-accredited** or **de-accredited levee** is a levee that is not shown on a FIRM as providing protection from the 1% annual chance or greater flood. A **provisionally accredited levee** is a previously accredited levee that has been de-accredited for which data and/or documentation is pending that will show the levee is compliant with NFIP regulations.

Acre-Foot: An acre-foot is the amount of water it takes to cover 1 acre to a depth of 1 foot. This measure is used to describe the quantity of storage in a water reservoir. An acre-foot is a unit of volume. One acre-foot equals 7,758 barrels; 325,829 gallons; or 43,560 cubic feet. An average household of four will use approximately 1 acre-foot of water per year.

Asset: An asset is any man-made or natural feature that has value, including, but not limited to, people; buildings; infrastructure, such as bridges, roads, sewers, and water systems; lifelines, such as electricity and communication resources; and environmental, cultural, or recreational features such as parks, wetlands, and landmarks.

Base Flood: The flood having a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year, also known as the “100-year” or “1% chance” flood. The base flood is a statistical concept used to ensure that all properties subject to the NFIP are protected to the same degree against flooding.

Basin: A basin is an area within which all surface water, whether from rainfall, snowmelt, springs, or other sources, flows to a single water body or watercourse. The boundary of a river basin is defined by natural topography, such as hills, mountains, and ridges. Basins are also referred to as “watersheds” and “drainage basins.”

Benefit: A benefit is a net project outcome and is usually defined in monetary terms. Benefits may include direct and indirect effects. For benefit-cost analysis of proposed mitigation measures, benefits are limited to specific, measurable risk reduction factors, including a reduction in expected property losses (buildings, contents, and functions) and protection of human life.

Benefit/Cost Analysis: A benefit/cost analysis is a systematic, quantitative method of comparing projected benefits to projected costs of a project or policy. It is used as a measure of cost-effectiveness.

Breach: An opening through which floodwaters may pass after part of a levee has given way.

Building: A building is defined as a structure that is walled and roofed, principally aboveground, and permanently fixed to a site. The term includes manufactured homes on permanent foundations on which the wheels and axles carry no weight.

Capability Assessment: A capability assessment provides a description and analysis of a community's current capacity to address threats associated with hazards. The assessment includes two components: an inventory of an agency's mission, programs, and policies, and an analysis of its capacity to carry them out. A capability assessment is an integral part of the planning process in which a community's actions to reduce losses are identified, reviewed, and analyzed, and the framework for implementation is identified. The following capabilities were reviewed under this assessment:

- Legal and regulatory capability
- Administrative and technical capability
- Fiscal capability

Collapsible soils: Collapsible soils consist of loose, dry, low-density materials that collapse and compact under the addition of water or excessive loading. Soil collapse occurs when the land surface is saturated at depths greater than those reached by typical rain events. This saturation eliminates the clay bonds holding the soil grains together. Similar to expansive soils, collapsible soils result in structural damage such as cracking of the foundation, floors, and walls in response to settlement.

Common Vehicle: Disease transmitted by a common inanimate vehicle resulting in multiple infections; most commonly food or water

Community Protection Zones (CPZ): CPZs are based on an analysis of the "Where People Live" housing density data and surrounding fire behavior potential and represent those areas considered the highest priority for wildfire mitigation planning activities. "Rate of Spread" data is used to determine the areas of concern around populated areas that are within a 2-hour fire spread distance.

Conflagration: A fire that grows beyond its original source area to engulf adjoining regions. Wind, extremely dry or hazardous weather conditions, excessive fuel buildup, and explosions are usually the elements behind a wildfire conflagration.

Critical Area: An area defined by state or local regulations as deserving special protection because of unique natural features or its value as a habitat for a wide range of species of flora and fauna. A sensitive/critical area is usually subject to more restrictive development regulations.

Critical Facility: Facilities and infrastructure that are critical to the health and welfare of the population. These become especially important after any hazard event occurs. For the purposes of this plan, critical facilities include:

- Structures or facilities that produce, use, or store highly volatile, flammable, explosive, toxic, or water-reactive materials.
- Hospitals, nursing homes, and housing are likely to contain occupants who may not be sufficiently mobile to avoid death or injury during a hazard event.
- Police stations, fire stations, vehicle and equipment storage facilities, and emergency operations centers are needed for disaster response before, during, and after hazard events.
- Public and private utilities, facilities, and infrastructure are vital to maintaining or restoring normal services to areas damaged by hazard events.

- Government facilities.

Dam: A barrier, including one for flood detention, designed to impound liquid volumes and which has a height of dam greater than six feet (Texas Administrative Code, Ch. 299, 1986).

Dam Failure: Dam failure refers to a partial or complete breach in a dam (or levee) that impacts its integrity. Dam failures occur for a number of reasons, such as flash flooding, inadequate spillway size, mechanical failure of valves or other equipment, freezing and thawing cycles, earthquakes, and intentional destruction.

Debris Flow: Dense mixtures of water-saturated debris that move down-valley; looking and behaving much like flowing concrete. They form when loose masses of unconsolidated material are saturated, become unstable, and move down slope. The source of water varies but includes rainfall, melting snow or ice, and glacial outburst floods.

Deposition: Deposition is the placing of eroded material in a new location.

Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA): The DMA is Public Law 106-390 and is the latest federal legislation enacted to encourage and promote proactive, pre-disaster planning as a condition of receiving financial assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Act. The DMA emphasizes planning for disasters before they occur. Under the DMA, a pre-disaster hazard mitigation program and new requirements for the national post-disaster hazard mitigation grant program (HMGP) were established.

Drainage Basin: A basin is an area within which all surface water, whether from rainfall, snowmelt, springs, or other sources, flows to a single water body or watercourse. The boundary of a river basin is defined by natural topography, such as hills, mountains, and ridges. Drainage basins are also referred to as **watersheds** or **basins**.

Drought: Drought is a period of time without substantial rainfall or snowfall from one year to the next. Drought can also be defined as the cumulative impacts of several dry years or a deficiency of precipitation over an extended period of time, which in turn results in water shortages for some activity, group, or environmental function. Hydrological drought is caused by deficiencies in surface and subsurface water supplies. A socioeconomic drought impacts the health, well-being, and quality of life or starts to have an adverse impact on a region. Drought is a normal, recurrent feature of climate and occurs almost everywhere.

Earthquake: An earthquake is defined as a sudden slip on a fault, volcanic or magmatic activity, and sudden stress changes in the earth that result in ground shaking and radiated seismic energy. Earthquakes can last from a few seconds to over 5 minutes and have been known to occur as a series of tremors over a period of several days. The actual movement of the ground in an earthquake is seldom the direct cause of injury or death. Casualties may result from falling objects and debris as shocks shake, damage, or demolish buildings and other structures.

Emergency Action Plan: A document that identifies potential emergency conditions at a dam and specifies actions to be followed to minimize property damage and loss of life. The plan specifies actions the dam owner should take to alleviate problems at a dam. It contains procedures and information to assist the dam owner in issuing early warning and notification messages to responsible downstream emergency management authorities of the emergency situation. It also contains inundation maps to show emergency management authorities the critical areas for action in case of an emergency. (FEMA 64)

Enhanced Fujita Scale (EF-scale): The EF-scale is a set of wind estimates (not measurements) based on damage. It uses 3-second gusts estimated at the point of damage based on a judgment of 8 levels of

damage to the 28 indicators. These estimates vary with height and exposure. Standard measurements are taken by weather stations in openly exposed area.

Epicenter: The point on the earth's surface directly above the hypocenter of an earthquake. The location of an earthquake is commonly described by the geographic position of its epicenter and by its focal depth.

Expansive Soil: Expansive soils are soils that expand when water is added and shrink when they dry out. They usually undergo significant volume change with the addition or depletion of pore water. Generally, the result of the chemical structure of certain types of clay soils.

Exposure: Exposure is defined as the number and dollar value of assets considered to be at risk during the occurrence of a specific hazard.

Extent: The extent is the size of an area affected by a hazard.

Extreme Heat: Summertime weather that is substantially hotter or more humid than average for a location at that time of year.

Fault: A fracture in the earth's crust along which two blocks of the crust have slipped with respect to each other.

Fire Behavior: Fire behavior refers to the physical characteristics of a fire and is a function of the interaction between the fuel characteristics (such as type of vegetation and structures that could burn), topography, and weather. Variables that affect fire behavior include the rate of spread, intensity, fuel consumption, and fire type (such as underbrush versus crown fire).

Fire Frequency: Fire frequency is the broad measure of the rate of fire occurrence in a particular area. An estimate of the areas most likely to burn is based on past fire history or fire rotation in the area, fuel conditions, weather, ignition sources (such as human or lightning), fire suppression response, and other factors.

Flash Flood: A flash flood occurs with little or no warning when water levels rise at an extremely fast rate.

Flood: The inundation of normally dry land resulting from the rising and overflowing of a body of water.

Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM): FIRMs are the official maps on which the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has delineated the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA).

Flood Insurance Study: A report published by the Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration for a community in conjunction with the community's FIRM. The study contains such background data as the base flood discharges and water surface elevations that were used to prepare the FIRM. In most cases, a community FIRM with detailed mapping will have a corresponding flood insurance study.

Floodplain: Any land area susceptible to being inundated by floodwaters from any source. A FIRM identifies most, but not necessarily all, of a community's floodplain as the SFHA.

Floodway: Floodways are areas within a floodplain that are reserved for the purpose of conveying flood discharge without increasing the base flood elevation by more than one foot. Generally speaking, no development is allowed in floodways, as any structures located there would block the flow of floodwaters.

Focal Depth: The depth from the earth's surface to the hypocenter.

Freeboard: Freeboard is the margin of safety added to the base flood elevation.

Freezing Rain: The result of rain occurring when the temperature is below the freezing point. The rain freezes on impact, resulting in a layer of glaze ice up to an inch thick. In a severe ice storm, an evergreen tree 60 feet high and 30 feet wide can be burdened with up to 6 tons of ice, creating a threat to power and telephone lines and transportation routes.

Frequency: For the purposes of this plan, frequency refers to how often a hazard of a specific magnitude, duration, or extent is expected to occur on average. Statistically, a hazard with a 100-year frequency is expected to occur about once every 100 years on average and has a 1% chance of occurring any given year. Frequency reliability varies depending on the type of hazard considered.

Fujita Scale of Tornado Intensity: Tornado wind speeds are sometimes estimated on the basis of wind speed and damage sustained using the Fujita Scale. The scale rates the intensity or severity of tornado events using numeric values from F0 to F5 based on tornado wind speed and damage. An F0 tornado (wind speed less than 73 miles per hour [mph]) indicates minimal damage (such as broken tree limbs), and an F5 tornado (wind speeds of 261 to 318 mph) indicates severe damage.

Goal: A goal is a general guideline that explains what is to be achieved. Goals are usually broad-based, long-term, policy-type statements and represent global visions. Goals help define the benefits that a plan is trying to achieve. The success of a hazard mitigation plan is measured by the degree to which its goals have been met (that is, by the actual benefits in terms of actual hazard mitigation).

Geographic Information System (GIS): GIS is a computer software application that relates data regarding physical and other features on the earth to a database for mapping and analysis.

Ground Subsidence: Ground subsidence is the sinking of land over human-caused or natural underground voids and the settlement of native low-density soils.

Groundwater Depletion: Groundwater depletion occurs when groundwater is pumped from pore spaces between grains of sand and gravel. If an aquifer has beds of clay or silt within or next to it, the lowered water pressure in the sand and gravel causes slow drainage of water from the clay and silt beds. The reduced water pressure is a loss of support for the clay and silt beds. Because these beds are compressible, they compact (become thinner), and the effects are seen as a lowering of the land surface.

Hazard: A hazard is a source of potential danger or adverse condition that could harm people or cause property damage.

Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP): Authorized under Section 202 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, the HMGP is administered by FEMA and provides grants to states, tribes, and local governments to implement hazard mitigation actions after a major disaster declaration. The purpose of the program is to reduce the loss of life and property due to disasters and to enable mitigation activities to be implemented as a community recovers from a disaster.

Hazardous Materials (HAZMAT): Matter (solid, liquid, or gas) or energy that when released is capable of creating harm to people, the environment, and property, including weapons of mass destruction

Hazards U.S. Multi-Hazard (HAZUS-MH) Loss Estimation Program: HAZUS-MH is a GIS-based program used to support the development of risk assessments as required under the DMA. The HAZUS-MH software program assesses risk in a quantitative manner to estimate damages and losses associated with natural hazards. HAZUS-MH is FEMA's nationally applicable, standardized methodology and software program and contains modules for estimating potential losses from earthquakes, floods, and wind hazards. HAZUS-MH has also been used to assess vulnerability (exposure) for other hazards.

High Hazard Dam: Dams where failure or operational error will probably cause loss of human life. (FEMA 333)

Hurricane: A tropical cyclone with maximum sustained surface winds (using the U.S. 1-minute average) of 64 knot (kt) (74 miles per hour [mph]) or more.

Hydraulics: Hydraulics is the branch of science or engineering that addresses fluids (especially water) in motion in rivers or canals, works and machinery for conducting or raising water, the use of water as a prime mover, and other fluid-related areas.

Hydrology: Hydrology is the analysis of the waters of the earth. For example, a flood discharge estimate is developed by conducting a hydrologic study.

Hypocenter: The region underground where an earthquake's energy originates.

Intensity: For the purposes of this plan, intensity refers to the measure of the effects of a hazard.

Interface Area: An area susceptible to wildfires and where wildland vegetation and urban or suburban development occur together. An example would be smaller urban areas and dispersed rural housing in forested areas.

Inventory: The assets identified in a study region comprise an inventory. Inventories include assets that could be lost when a disaster occurs and community resources are at risk. Assets include people, buildings, transportation, and other valued community resources.

Land Subsidence: Land subsidence is the loss of surface elevation due to the removal of subsurface support. In Texas, there are three types of subsidence that warrant the most concern: groundwater depletion, sinkholes in karst areas, and erosion.

Landslide: Landslides can be described as the sliding movement of masses of loosened rock and soil down a hillside or slope. Fundamentally, slope failures occur when the strength of the soils forming the slope exceeds the pressure, such as weight or saturation, acting upon them.

Levee: A man-made structure, usually an earthen embankment or concrete floodwall, designed and constructed in accordance with sound engineering practices to contain, control, or divert the flow of water so as to provide reasonable assurance of excluding temporary flooding from the leveed area.

Lightning: Lightning is an electrical discharge resulting from the buildup of positive and negative charges within a thunderstorm. When the buildup becomes strong enough, lightning appears as a "bolt," usually within or between clouds and the ground. A bolt of lightning instantaneously reaches temperatures approaching 50,000°F. The rapid heating and cooling of air near lightning causes thunder. Lightning is a major threat during thunderstorms. In the United States, 75 to 100 people are struck and killed by lightning each year (see <http://www.fema.gov/hazard/thunderstorms/thunder.shtm>).

Liquefaction: Liquefaction is the complete failure of soils, occurring when soils lose shear strength and flow horizontally. It is most likely to occur in fine-grain sands and silts, which behave like viscous fluids when liquefaction occurs. This situation is extremely hazardous to development on the soils that liquefy and generally results in extreme property damage and threats to life and safety.

Local Government: Any county, municipality, city, town, township, public authority, school district, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (regardless of whether the council of governments is incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under state law), regional or interstate government entity, or agency or instrumentality of a local government; any Indian tribe or authorized tribal

organization, or Alaska Native village or organization; and any rural community, unincorporated town or village, or other public entity.

Magnitude: Magnitude is the measure of the strength of an earthquake, and is typically measured by the Richter scale. As an estimate of energy, each whole number step in the magnitude scale corresponds to the release of about 31 times more energy than the amount associated with the preceding whole number value.

Mitigation: A preventive action that can be taken in advance of an event that will reduce or eliminate the risk to life or property.

Mitigation Actions: Mitigation actions are specific actions to achieve goals and objectives that minimize the effects of a disaster and reduce the loss of life and property.

National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP): The NFIP provides federally backed flood insurance in exchange for communities enacting floodplain regulations.

Objective: For the purposes of this plan, an objective is defined as a short-term aim that, when combined with other objectives, forms a strategy or course of action to meet a goal.

Outbreak: The sudden rise in the incidence of a disease.

Pandemic: An outbreak of a disease that occurs over a wide geographic area, such as multiple countries or continents, and typically affects a significant proportion of the population; a pandemic outbreak of a disease.

Peak Ground Acceleration: Peak Ground Acceleration is a measure of the highest amplitude of ground shaking that accompanies an earthquake, based on a percentage of the force of gravity.

Preparedness: Preparedness refers to actions that strengthen the capability of government, citizens, and communities to respond to disasters.

Presidential Disaster Declaration: These declarations are typically made for events that cause more damage than state and local governments and resources can handle without federal government assistance. Generally, no specific dollar loss threshold has been established for such declarations. A Presidential Disaster Declaration puts into motion long-term federal recovery programs, some of which are matched by state programs, designed to help disaster victims, businesses, and public entities.

Probability of Occurrence: The probability of occurrence is a statistical measure or estimate of the likelihood that a hazard will occur. This probability is generally based on past hazard events in the area and a forecast of events that could occur in the future. A probability factor based on yearly values of occurrence is used to estimate the probability of occurrence.

Repetitive Loss Property: Any NFIP-insured property that, since 1978 and regardless of any changes of ownership during that period, has experienced:

- Four or more paid flood losses in excess of \$1,000; or
- Two paid flood losses in excess of \$1,000 within any 10-year period since 1978; or
- Three or more paid losses that equal or exceed the current value of the insured property.

Riparian Zone: The area along the banks of a natural watercourse.

Riverine: Of or produced by a river. Riverine floodplains have readily identifiable channels. Floodway maps can only be prepared for riverine floodplains.

Risk: Risk is the estimated impact that a hazard would have on people, services, facilities, and structures in a community. Risk measures the likelihood of a hazard occurring and resulting in an adverse condition that causes injury or damage. Risk is often expressed in relative terms such as a high, moderate, or low likelihood of sustaining damage above a particular threshold due to the occurrence of a specific type of hazard. Risk also can be expressed in terms of potential monetary losses associated with the intensity of the hazard.

Risk Assessment: Risk assessment is the process of measuring the potential loss of life, personal injury, economic injury, and property damage resulting from hazards. This process assesses the vulnerability of people, buildings, and infrastructure to hazards and focuses on (1) hazard identification; (2) impacts of hazards on physical, social, and economic assets; (3) vulnerability identification; and (4) estimates of the cost of damage or costs that could be avoided through mitigation.

Risk Ranking: This ranking serves two purposes, first to describe the probability that a hazard will occur, and second to describe the impact a hazard will have on people, property, and the economy. Risk estimates for the jurisdiction are based on the methodology that the jurisdiction used to prepare the risk assessment for this plan. The following equation shows the risk ranking calculation:

$$\text{Risk Ranking} = \text{Probability} + \text{Impact (people + property + economy)}$$

Robert T. Stafford Act: The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, Public Law 100-107, was signed into law on November 23, 1988. This law amended the Disaster Relief Act of 1974, Public Law 93-288. The Stafford Act is the statutory authority for most federal disaster response activities, especially as they pertain to FEMA and its programs.

Severe Local Storm: Small-scale atmospheric systems, including tornadoes, thunderstorms, windstorms, ice storms, and snowstorms. These storms may cause a great deal of destruction and even death, but their impact is generally confined to a small area. Typical impacts are on transportation infrastructure and utilities.

Significant Hazard Dam: Dams where failure or operational error will result in no probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, or disruption of lifeline facilities, or can impact other concerns. Significant hazard dams are often located in rural or agricultural areas but could be located in areas with population and significant infrastructure. (FEMA 333)

Sinkhole: A collapse depression in the ground with no visible outlet. Its drainage is subterranean. It is commonly vertical-sided or funnel-shaped.

Soil Erosion: Soil erosion is the removal and simultaneous transportation of earth materials from one location to another by water, wind, waves, or moving ice.

Special Flood Hazard Area: The base floodplain is delineated on a FIRM. The SFHA is mapped as a Zone A in riverine situations. The SFHA may or may not encompass all of a community's flood problems.

Stakeholder: Business leaders, civic groups, academia, non-profit organizations, major employers, managers of critical facilities, farmers, developers, special purpose districts, and others whose actions could impact hazard mitigation.

Stream Bank Erosion: Streambank erosion is common along rivers, streams, and drains where banks have been eroded, sloughed, or undercut. However, it is important to remember that a stream is a dynamic and constantly changing system. It is natural for a stream to want to meander, so not all eroding banks are "bad" and in need of repair. Generally, stream bank erosion becomes a problem where development has

limited the meandering nature of streams, where streams have been channelized, or where stream bank structures (like bridges, culverts, etc.) are located in places where they can actually cause damage to downstream areas. Stabilizing these areas can help protect watercourses from continued sedimentation, damage to adjacent land uses, control unwanted meander, and improvement of habitat for fish and wildlife.

Steep Slope: Different communities and agencies define it differently, depending on what it is being applied to, but generally a steep slope is a slope in which the percent slope equals or exceeds 25%. For this study, steep slope is defined as slopes greater than 33%.

Sustainable Hazard Mitigation: This concept includes the sound management of natural resources, local economic and social resiliency, and the recognition that hazards and mitigation must be understood in the largest possible social and economic context.

Thunderstorm: A thunderstorm is a storm with lightning and thunder produced by cumulonimbus clouds. Thunderstorms usually produce gusty winds, heavy rains, and sometimes hail. Thunderstorms are usually short in duration (seldom more than 2 hours). Heavy rains associated with thunderstorms can lead to flash flooding during the wet or dry seasons.

Tornado: A tornado is a violently rotating column of air extending between and in contact with a cloud and the surface of the earth. Tornadoes are often (but not always) visible as funnel clouds. On a local scale, tornadoes are the most intense of all atmospheric circulations, and winds can reach destructive speeds of more than 300 mph. A tornado's vortex is typically a few hundred meters in diameter, and damage paths can be up to 1 mile wide and 50 miles long.

Tropical Storm: A tropical cyclone with maximum sustained surface wind speed (using the U.S. 1-minute average) ranges from 34 kt (39 mph) to 63 kt (73 mph).

Tropical Depression: A tropical cyclone with maximum sustained surface wind speed (using the U.S. 1-minute average) ranges from 4 kt (39 mph) to 63 kt (73 mph).

Values Response Index (VRI): The wildfire VRI reflects a rating of the potential impact of a wildfire on values or assets. The VRI is an overall rating that combines the impact ratings for WUI (housing density) and Pine Plantations (pine age) into a single measure. VRI combines the likelihood of a fire occurring

Vector: Living organisms that can transmit infectious pathogens between humans, or from animals to humans (threat) with those areas of most concern that are adversely impacted by fire to derive a single overall measure of wildfire risk.

Vulnerability: Vulnerability describes how exposed or susceptible an asset is to damage. Vulnerability depends on an asset's construction, contents, and the economic value of its functions. Like indirect damages, the vulnerability of one element of the community is often related to the vulnerability of another. For example, many businesses depend on uninterrupted electrical power. Flooding of an electric substation would affect not only the substation itself but businesses as well. Often, indirect effects can be much more widespread and damaging than direct effects.

Watershed: A watershed is an area that drains downgradient from areas of higher land to areas of lower land to the lowest point, a common drainage basin.

Wildfire: Wildfire refers to any uncontrolled fire occurring on undeveloped land that requires fire suppression. The potential for wildfire is influenced by three factors: the presence of fuel, topography, and air mass. Fuel can include living and dead vegetation on the ground, along the surface as brush and small trees, and in the air such as tree canopies. The topography includes both slope and elevation. Air

mass includes temperature, relative humidity, wind speed and direction, cloud cover, precipitation amount, duration, and the stability of the atmosphere at the time of the fire. Wildfires can be ignited by lightning and, most frequently, by human activity including smoking, campfires, equipment use, and arson.

Wildfire Hazard Potential (WHP): The wildfire threat or WHP is the likelihood of a wildfire occurring or burning into an area. The threat is calculated by combining multiple landscape characteristics including surface and canopy fuels, fire behavior, historical fire occurrences, weather observations, terrain conditions, and other factors.

Windstorm: Windstorms are generally short-duration events involving straight-line winds or gusts exceeding 50 mph. These gusts can produce winds of sufficient strength to cause property damage. Windstorms are especially dangerous in areas with significant tree stands, exposed property, poorly constructed buildings, mobile homes (manufactured housing units), major infrastructure, and aboveground utility lines. A windstorm can topple trees and power lines; cause damage to residential, commercial, critical facilities; and leave tons of debris in its wake.

Winter Storm: A storm having significant snowfall, ice, or freezing rain; the quantity of precipitation varies by elevation.

Zoning Ordinance: The zoning ordinance designates allowable land use and intensities for a local jurisdiction. Zoning ordinances consist of two components: a zoning text and a zoning map.

Wharton County

Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

APPENDIX B.

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

APPENDIX B.

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

This appendix presents the local mitigation action review tool for the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan. The review tool demonstrates how the plan meets federal regulations and offers state and FEMA planners an opportunity to provide feedback on the plan to the community.

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

The Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool demonstrates how the local Mitigation Plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR §201.6 and offers States and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the community.

- The Regulation Checklist provides a summary of FEMA's evaluation of whether the Plan has addressed all requirements.
- The Plan Assessment identifies the plan's strengths as well as documents areas for future improvement.
- The Multi-jurisdiction Summary Sheet is an optional worksheet that can be used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of each Element of the Plan (Planning Process; Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation; and Plan Adoption).

The FEMA Mitigation Planner must reference this Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide when completing the Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Jurisdiction: Wharton County, Texas | Title of Plan: Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 2021 | Date of Plan: TO BE ADDED ONCE SUBMITTED |
| Local Point of Contact: Andy Kirkland | Address: 315 E. Elm Street Wharton, TX 77488 | |
| Title: Emergency Management Coordinator | | |
| Agency: Wharton County Office of Emergency Management | | |
| Phone Number: (979) 532 - 1123 | E-mail: Andy.kirkland@co.wharton.tx.us | |

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| State Reviewer: | Title: | Date: |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|

| | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| FEMA Reviewer: | Title: | Date: |
| Date Received in REMA region VI: | | |
| Plan Not Approved | | |
| Plan Approvable Pending Adoption | | |
| Plan Approved | | |

SECTION 1:
MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET

| MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| # | Jurisdiction Name | Jurisdiction Type | Jurisdiction Contact | E-mail | Requirements Met (Y/N) | | | | |
| | | | | | A. Planning Process | B. HIRA | C. Mitigation Strategy | D. Update Rqmts. | E. Adoption Resolution |
| 1 | Wharton County | County | Andy Kirkland | Andy.kirkland@co.wharton.tx.us | | | | | |
| 2 | City of East Bernard | Incorporated City | Audrey Searce | ebcityhall@gmail.com | | | | | |
| 3 | City of El Campo | Incorporated City | Lori Hollingsworth | lhollingsworth@cityofelcampo.org | | | | | |
| 4 | City of Wharton | Incorporated City | Gwyneth Teves | gteves@cityofwharton.com | | | | | |

SECTION 2: REGULATION CHECKLIST

| REGULATION CHECKLIST | | Location in Plan (section and/or page number) | | Met | Not Met |
|---|--|--|--|-----|------------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans) | | | | | |
| ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS | | | | | |
| A1. Does the Plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(1)) | Pages ES-1 to ES-4 (Executive Summary); Pages 3-1 to 3-2 (Section 3.2), 3-4 (Section 3.4); Pages 3-4 to 3-6 (Section 3.5) | | | | |
| A2. Does the Plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as other interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement §201.6(b)(2)) | Pages 3-4 to 3-6 (Sections 3.4 through 3.6); Page 3-8 (Section 3.8.1) | | | | |
| A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1)) | Pages 3-8 through 3-10 (Section 3.8) | | | | |
| A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3)) | Page 3-7 to 3-8 (Section 3.7); Pages 6-33 to 6-48 (Section 6.9); Pages 7-1 to 7-11 (Chapter 7) | | | | |
| A5. Is there discussion of how the community(ies) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii)) | Pages 23-1 through 23-5 (Sections 23.2.1 through 23.2.6); Page 23-5 to 23-10 (Section 23.2.7) | | | | |
| A6. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a 5-year cycle)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i)) | Pages 23-1 through 23-10 (Section 23.2); Pages E-1 through E-9 (Appendix E) | | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT A REQUIRED REVISIONS:</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RIASK ASSESSMENT | | | | | |
| B1. Does the Plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction(s)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)) | Chapters 8 through 20, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Section 1 of each chapter (General Background) describes the type of hazard• Section 2.2 of each chapter (Location) (Section 20.2.3 for Land Subsidence)• Section 2.3 (Frequency); and 2.4 (Severity) of each chapter, which describe the extent of the hazard | | | | |

| REGULATION CHECKLIST | | Location in Plan (section and/or page number) | Met | Not Met |
|--|--|--|-----|------------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans) | | | | |
| B2. Does the Plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i)) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Previous occurrences: Pages 6-3 and 6-4 (Section 6.2); Chapters 8 through 20, Section 2.1 (Past Events) of each chapter• Probability of future events: Chapters 8 through 20, Section 2.3 (Frequency) of each chapter | | | |
| B3. Is there a description of each identified hazard’s impact on the community as well as an overall summary of the community’s vulnerability for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)) | Chapters 8 through 20; specifically, Section 2.4 (Severity), Section 4, 5, and/or 6 (Exposure, Vulnerability, and/or Exposure and Vulnerability) of each chapter | | | |
| B4. Does the Plan address NFIP insured structures within the jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)) | Page 12-32 through 12-35 (Section 12.6.2, Property); including Figure 12-13 | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT B REQUIRED REVISIONS:</u> | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY | | | | |
| C1. Does the plan document each jurisdiction’s existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)) | Pages 6-33 to 6-48 (Section 6.9); Pages 7-1 through 7-11 (Chapter 7); Pages 23-5 through 23-10 (Section 23.2.7) | | | |
| C2. Does the Plan address each jurisdiction’s participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii)) | Page 6-33; Pages 6-38 through 6-48 (description of laws, ordinances, and programs for each jurisdiction); Pages 7-1 through 7-11 (floodplain ordinances and availability of DFIRMs); Pages 12-32 through 12-35 | | | |
| C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i)) | Pages 4-1 through 4-2 (Chapter 4) | | | |
| C4. Does the Plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii)) | Pages 22-1 through 22-20(Chapter 22); specifically, Tables 22-1 and 22-2 | | | |
| C5. Does the Plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including cost benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii)) | Pages 22-2 and 22-3 (Section 22.2) | | | |

| REGULATION CHECKLIST | | Location in Plan (section and/or page number) | Met | Not Met |
|---|--|---|------------|----------------|
| Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans) | | | | |
| C6. Does the Plan describe a process by which local governments will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii)) | Pages 23-5 through 23-10 (Section 23.2.7); Specifically, Table 23-1 | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT C REQUIRED REVISIONS:</u> | | | | |
| ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION (applicable to plan updates only) | | | | |
| D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Chapter 6.8 (pages 6-29 through 6-33) and Chapters 8 through 20, Section 6 or Section 7 of each chapter (Future Trends in Development) | | | |
| D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Pages 2-1 through 2-8 (Section 2.1); Table 2-2 | | | |
| D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3)) | Pages 1-1 through 1-3 (Chapter 1); Pages 2-1 through 2-8 (Section 2.1) | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT D REQUIRED REVISIONS:</u> | | | | |
| ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION | | | | |
| E1. Does the Plan include documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5)) | Pre-adoption review: Documentation to be provided upon issuance of pre-adoption approval by TDEM and FEMA Region VI | | | |
| E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5)) | Pre-adoption review: Documentation to be provided upon issuance of pre-adoption approval by TDEM and FEMA Region VI | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT E REQUIRED REVISIONS:</u> | | | | |
| ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA) | | | | |
| F1. | | | | |
| F2. | | | | |
| <u>ELEMENT F REQUIRED REVISIONS:</u> | | | | |

SECTION 3: PLAN ASSESSMENT

A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas that could be improved beyond minimum requirements.

Element A: Planning Process

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

Element D: Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation (Plan Updates Only)

B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

Wharton County
Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

APPENDIX C.
PUBLIC OUTREACH

APPENDIX C. PUBLIC OUTREACH

This appendix includes the agenda, sign-in sheets, and meeting notes from each of the Steering Committee Meetings. This appendix also includes the community brochure and results of the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan questionnaire, as described in Section 3.7.2.

Hazard Mitigation Plan Update - Wharton County

Steering Committee Meeting #1

Tuesday, June 22, 2021 @ 10:00 A.M.

Location: Wharton County Civic Center and Zoom

DISCUSSION TOPICS:




1. Introductions
2. Project Overview
3. Plan Components
4. Risk Assessment
 - a. Hazard Identification
 - b. Hazard Analysis
5. Community Survey Results
6. Introduction of Mitigation Strategies
7. Next Steps
8. Questions and Comments Session

ATTENDEES SUMMARY:

Eric Scheibe – Scheibe Consulting, LLC
Abigail Ayers – Scheibe Consulting, LLC
Steve Johnson – City of Wharton – Emergency Management Coordinator
Richard Zahn – Wharton County - Commissioner Precinct 1
Krystal Hasselmeier – City of Wharton – Assistant to the Community Development Director
Gwyn Teves – City of Wharton – Community Development Director
Audrey Searce – City of East Bernard – Emergency Management Coordinator
Fred Ivy – Hungerford MUD – President
Jessica Moreno – Wharton County - Administrative Assistant Precinct 1
W.D. Bud Graves – Wharton County – Commissioner Precinct 2
Casey Lewis – Wharton County - Administrative Assistant Precinct 4
Rodney Grimmer – Fort Bend County Homeland Security and Emergency Management– Hazard Mitigation Planner
Brandi Jimenez – City of Wharton – Assistant to the City Manager
Mario Chapa – LCRA – Business Continuity Program Manager
Shelly Schulz – Wharton County Electric Cooperative – Communications Specialist
Philip Gaudette – East Bernard ISD - Elementary Principal
David Janecek – East Bernard ISD - Junior High Principal
Frank Garza - Fort Bend County Homeland Security and Emergency Management – Regional Planner
Ryan Simper – TxDOT – Area Engineer
Stephan Gage – HGAC – Principal Planner, Transportation
Joseph Pace – City of Wharton – City Manager
Kenna Lucas – El Campo Lost Lagoon – Owner


ATTENDANCE SIGN-IN SHEET:

Steering Committee Meeting #1 – June 22, 2021

| Entity | Name | Title | Sign-In |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| Wharton County | Andy Kirkland | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Wharton County | Debbie Cenko | Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| City of Wharton | Krystal Hasselmeier | Assistant to the Community Development Director |  |
| City of Wharton | Gwyneth Teves | Community Development Director |  |
| City of East Bernard | Audrey Searce | City Secretary |  |
| City of El Campo | Lori Hollingsworth | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| City of El Campo | Kevin Thompson | Director of Public Works | |
| Colorado County | Charles Rogers | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Jackson County | Kelly Janica | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Matagorda County | Amanda Campos | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Fort Bend County | Mark Flathouse | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Fort Bend County | Alan Spears | | |
| Brazoria County | Steve Rosa | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| City of Kendleton | Christina Flores | City Secretary | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| City of Beasley | Misty Tiemann | City Secretary | |
| HGAC | Stephan Gage | | online |
| TxDOT | Ryan Simper | Area Engineer | online |
| LCRA | Stacy Moore-Guajardo | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Wharton County Electric Cooperative | Wesley Lange | | |
| Wharton County Electric Cooperative | Shelly Schulz | Communications Specialist | online |
| Wharton County Junior College | Danny Terronez | Directory of Security/Public Safety | |
| Lost Lagoon | Kenna & Stephen Lucas | Owner | online |
| Boling Municipal Water District | Mr. Ezell | | |
| Hungerford MUD | Fred Ivy | President | Fred D. Ivy |
| Hungerford MUD | Tayler Ivy | | |
| WCID #1 | BJ Popp | Office Manager | |
| WCID #2 | Ed Vacek | Superintendent | |
| Isaacson MUD | Colette Popp | | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Coastal Bend Ground Water Conservation District | Neal Hudgin | General Manager | |
| West Wharton County Hospital District | | | |
| Wharton County ESD #1 | William "Bubba" Wilcox | | |
| Wharton County ESD #2 | Britt Whitley | | |
| Wharton County ESD #3 | Dr. Herman Wolff | | |
| Wharton County ESD #4 | | | |
| Boling ISD | Lindsay Mahalite | Secretary to Superintendent | |
| East Bernard ISD | Courtney Hudgins | Superintendent | |
| El Campo ISD | Bob Callagen | Superintendent | |
| Hallettsville ISD | Jo Ann Bludau | Superintendent | |
| Louise ISD | Dr. Garth Oliver | Superintendent | |
| Wharton ISD | Michael O'Guin | Superintendent | |
| Precinct #1 | Jessica Moreno | Admin. Assistant | Jessica Moreno |
| Precinct #2 | Bud Graves | Commissioner | Bud Graves |

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Precinct #3 | Sheryl Thonsgaard | Admin. Assistant | |
| Precinct #4 | Casey Lewis | Admin Assistant | |
| Wharton ISD | Michael O'Guin | Emergency Management Coordinator | online |
| Precinct #1 | Jessica Moreno | Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator |  |
| Precinct #1 | Richard Zehn | Comm | in-person |
| Eric Scheibe | Scheibe Consulting | Project Manager | in-person |
| Abigail Ayers | Scheibe Consulting | Graduate Engineer | in-person |
| City of Wharton | Steve Johnson | Emergency Management Cord. | in-person |
| Fort Bend County EM&HS | Rodney Grimmer | Hazard Mitigation Planner | online |
| City of Wharton | Brandi Jimenez | Assistant to the City Manager | online |
| LCRA | Mario Chapca | Business Continuity Program Manager | online |
| East Bernard ISD | Philip Gaudette | Elementary Principle | online |
| East Bernard ISD | David Janecsek | Junior High Principle | online |
| Fort Bend County HS&EM | Frank Garza | Regional Planner | online |
| City of Wharton | Joseph Pace | City Manager | online |

NOTES:

Introductions – Eric Scheibe

- Hazard Mitigation Plan Update includes Wharton County and the cities of East Bernard, Wharton, and El Campo.
 - This also involves other entities in the planning area
- The end goal is to develop a master plan and devise solutions
 - Allows for access to federal funds to help implement solutions
- Thus far have met with the cities and counties to gather data to analyze hazards and identify any changes in hazard profiles
- Based on data collection, the Scheibe team presented the hazards during the meeting
- It was noted the Scheibe team is looking for feedback and comments to better the hazard analysis

Project Overview – Abigail Ayers

- Provided link to a survey file containing important documents: 2016 Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan, Spanish Brochure, English Brochure, Goals and Objectives, Previous Mitigation Actions, Community Survey Results (as of 06/21/21), and the full Hazard Analysis document
- Explained what Hazard Mitigation
- Explained what a Hazard Mitigation Plan is
- Outlined the primary objectives of the project

Plan Components – Abigail Ayers

- Explained the six sections which the plan document is broken into
 - Planning Process
 - Community Profile
 - Demographics, critical facilities, along with other county-specific information
 - Capability Assessment
 - Risk Assessment
 - To be discussed later in the presentation
 - Mitigation Strategies
 - To be discussed in future steering committee meetings
 - Plan Adoption and Maintenance
- Hazard Mitigation Planning Process
 - Five phases
 - Organize and Review
 - Update the Risk Assessment
 - Conducted by Scheibe Consulting
 - Engage the Public
 - Form steering committee
 - Hold public meetings
 - Assemble the Updated Plan
 - Adopt/Implement the Plan

Risk Assessment – Abigail Ayers

Hazard Identification

- 14 hazards were assessed
- The shared folder contains full draft hazard analysis

Hazard Analysis

- Expansive Soils
 - Issues in Wharton County are mostly due to type D soil with high clay content

- Clay shrinking and swelling causes cracks in structures
- Can take 5 years for the moisture dome to settle under a foundation
- Damage is slow and mostly goes undocumented
- Eric noted that new developments have noticed extensive cracking on roadways shortly after completion
 - Suggested policies may be put into place for roadway construction
 - Does not only involve effects on structures
- Dam/Levee Failure
 - Dam count is based on national dam inventory and does not account for dams on private property
 - Two major dams upriver, Ceder Creek dam and Tom Miller dam, could release large quantities of water and affect Wharton County
 - The exposure level does not account for private dams which may not be analyzed for risk of failure as they are nonregulated
- Drought/Extreme Heat
 - Explained the heat level is 90 degrees Fahrenheit. This temperature combined with a relative humidity of 70% or above creates a heat index of 105.
 - This is the level at which many people experience stress.
 - Most impacts are felt in the agricultural industry
- Earthquake
 - Wharton County is not considered a high probability of occurrence
- Flood
 - Many community survey comments were in regard to flooding
- Hurricane and Tropical Storm
 - Secondary events are the main issue – hail, wind, lightning, and flooding
 - Noted the before and after-effects of flooding in the City of Wharton during hurricane Harvey
- Lightning, Wind, and Hail
 - Texas is ranked in the top 10 for lightning occurrences
- Tornado
- Wildfire
 - The figure displayed showed Wharton County areas that are non-burnable in pink and very low risk in green
 - Eric noted the data used for wildfire analysis is volunteer-driven. A greater amount of information was provided for El Campo. This is compared to no fires reported in the City of East Bernard or the City of Wharton. Based on these discrepancies the Scheibe team believes the data is skewed due to the voluntary reporting data collection method. The team believes there is a comparable risk in all cities.
- Winter Weather
- Pandemic
 - Most pandemics do not have a direct effect on the planning area
- Steve Johnson noted hazardous materials were not listed as a hazard and should be considered. Explained that there might be a risk to the county as a major railroad passes through the area. Steve further explained that there have been occurrences of spills on roadways in the planning area in the past.

Community Survey Results – Abigail Ayers

- 66 responses to English survey
- 1 response to Spanish survey
- The survey collects general information about the participant
- The survey assesses community preparedness level
- Steve Johnson noted that there are systems in place, such as RAVE, for distributing information to the community
- The survey results showed flood hazard as the highest concern rate
- Steve Johnson noted that ravine flooding differs from flash flooding
 - This results in different exposure areas and levels
- The survey collects the community's level of understanding regarding hazards
- Steve Johnson noted that homes in the area which are for sale have been advertised as located in areas that did not flood during 2017
- Audrey Scarce and Steve Johnson noted that the community has buy out programs in place, but it is difficult as once bought out the communities must maintain the space – could lead to scattered empty lots in city areas
- Steve Johnson noted that bought out properties may only be turned into green space
- Eric Scheibe noted that from the data collected for analysis and the survey results that flooding and hurricanes are of the highest priority in the planning area

Introduction of Mitigation Strategies – Abigail Ayers and Eric Scheibe

- Plan goals and objectives have been brought forward from the two previous plan iterations
 - All goals and objectives must be met with mitigation actions
 - FEMA Mitigation Ideas document provided in the shared folder is from 2013 and covers many hazards and possible mitigation actions
- Presented the mitigation actions included in the 2016 update specific for Wharton County:
 - Comments for each existing Wharton County mitigation actions from 2016:
 1. The Mitigation action is consistent with data and survey results.
 2. New data and modeling exist for the majority of the county. This could be submitted to FEMA to update mapping.
 3. Could push for the addition of ordinances. Example: raise finished floor elevation requirements.
 4. Recommended keeping in the plan for future funding opportunities.
 5. Helps to set finished floors – with new GPS survey equipment might be less of a priority.
 6. Suggested support be provided for all flood reduction projects.
 7. Goes beyond minimum FEMA requirements. Higher standards are developed. The CRS program allows for the lowering of insurance programs. Good for the general public.
 8. Roughly in place, but might be useful to create a formal structure.
 9. Currently occurring in Wharton. Opportunity to install more river gages for real-time data. Allows for access to inundation map given a certain flood stage during an event.
 10. Might be future opportunities available.
 11. Ongoing action item.
 12. Partially already done by NRCS but might have opportunities to expand.
 13. Moving towards different systems.
 14. This item is more likely handled with internal budgeting.
 15. Providing easier access to information would be helpful. Suggested to have an external website for high-risk hazards such as a flood.

- Asterisk denoted mitigation actions which encompassed actions carried forward from the 2011 hazard mitigation plan
- The shared folder contains the mitigation action status for each action in the 2016 hazard mitigation plan
- Projects which have not been completed can be brought forward as action items in the updated plan
- A meeting in the next couple of weeks will be held to discuss mitigation actions

Next Steps – Abigail Ayers

- Encouraged to push for more community survey responses so that more data may be collated
 - Noted that data can be skewed if a hazard event occurs such as flooding

Questions and Comments Session

- Stephan Gage noted that the community survey results might not accurately represent the county. It reflects those who have participated in the survey. Ideal to make sure the community receives consistent information to the greatest extent possible. If information is not easily accessible, community members will obtain information from a variety of locations that might be inaccurate or inconsistent. Might result in residents taking actions that are not ideal. The county should publish, at a minimum, the basic information the public should know and guidance for residents. The first location residents look to during a hazard event is governmental websites. In the end, the county needs to publish basic, easy-to-access information to help ensure consistency.
- City of Wharton Emergency Management Intern noted that almost all survey takers noted reliable access to the internet along with a majority falling into higher household income classes. Based on this information, many groups in the county might not be able to complete the survey due to their circumstances.
- Abigail Ayers noted that the survey was distributed via the county and cities' websites and social media pages as well as the local newspapers.

Moving Forward

- Mitigation Actions
- Steering Committee members are encouraged to look at the materials provided in the folder

Hazard Mitigation Plan Update - Wharton County

Steering Committee Meeting #2

Monday, July 26, 2021 @ 1:30 P.M.

Location: Wharton County Civic Center and Zoom

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

1. Introductions
2. Land Subsidence
3. Survey Results
4. Mitigation Actions - Creating Actions
 - a. Wharton County
 - b. City of East Bernard
 - c. City of El Campo
 - d. City of Wharton
5. Comment Session
6. Next Steps

ATTENDEES SUMMARY:

Eric Scheibe – Scheibe Consulting, LLC

Abigail Ayers – Scheibe Consulting, LLC

Debbie Cenko – Wharton County – Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator

Audrey Searce – City of East Bernard – Emergency Management Coordinator

Lori Hollingsworth – City of El Campo – Emergency Management Coordinator

Stephan Gage – HGAC – Principal Planner, Transportation

Shelly Schulz – Wharton County Electric Cooperative – Communications Specialist

W.D. Bud Graves – Wharton County – Commissioner Precinct 2

Steve Johnson – City of Wharton – Emergency Management Coordinator

Andy Kirkland – Wharton County – Emergency Management Coordinator

ATTENDANCE SIGN-IN SHEET:


Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 – July 22, 2021

| Entity | Name | Title | Sign-In |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Wharton County | Debbie Cenko | Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator | <i>Debbie Cenko</i> |
| City of Wharton | Krystal Hasselmeier | Assistant to the Community Development Director | |
| City of Wharton | Gwyneth Teves | Community Development Director | |
| City of East Bernard | Audrey Searce | City Secretary | <i>Audrey Searce</i> |
| City of El Campo | Lori Hollingsworth | Emergency Management Coordinator | <i>online attendance</i> |
| City of El Campo | Kevin Thompson | Director of Public Works | |
| Colorado County | Charles Rogers | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Jackson County | Kelly Janica | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Matagorda County | Amanda Campos | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Fort Bend County | Mark Flathouse | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Fort Bend County | Alan Spears | Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Brazoria County | Steve Rosa | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| City of Kendleton | Christina Flores | City Secretary | |



Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 – July 22, 2021

| Entity | Name | Title | Sign-In |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| City of Beasley | Misty Tiemann | City Secretary | |
| HGAC | Stephan Gage | | <i>online attendance</i> |
| TxDOT | Ryan Simper | Area Engineer | |
| LCRA | Stacy Moore-Guajardo | Emergency Management Coordinator | |
| Wharton County Electric Cooperative | Wesley Lange | | |
| Wharton County Electric Cooperative | Shelly Schulz | Communications Specialist | <i>online attendance</i> |
| Wharton County Junior College | Danny Terronez | Directory of Security/Public Safety | |
| Lost Lagoon | Kenna & Stephen Lucas | Owner | |
| Boling Municipal Water District | Mr. Ezell | | |
| Hungerford MUD | Fred Ivy | President | |
| WCID #1 | BJ Popp | Office Manager | |
| WCID #2 | Ed Vacek | Superintendent | |
| Isaacson MUD | Colette Popp | | |

Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 – July 22, 2021

| Entity | Name | Title | Sign-In |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Coastal Bend Ground Water Conservation District | Neal Hudgin | General Manager | |
| Wharton County ESD #1 | William "Bubba" Wilcox | | |
| Wharton County ESD #2 | Britt Whitley | | |
| Wharton County ESD #3 | Dr Herman Wolff | | |
| Boling ISD | Lindsay Mahalitic | Secretary to Superintendent | |
| East Bernard ISD | Courtney Hudgins | Superintendent | |
| El Campo ISD | Bob Callagen | Superintendent | |
| Hallettsville ISD | Jo Ann Bludau | Superintendent | |
| Louise ISD | Dr Garth Oliver | Superintendent | |
| Wharton ISD | Michael O'Guin | Superintendent | |
| Precinct #1 | Jessica Moreno | Admin. Assistant | |
| Precinct #2 | Bud Graves | Commissioner |  |
| Precinct #3 | Sheryl Thonsgaard | Admin. Assistant | |

Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 – July 22, 2021

| Entity | Name | Title | Sign-In |
|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Precinct #4 | Casey Lewis | Admin Assistant | |
| City of Wharton | Steve Johnson | Emergency management Coordinator |  |
| East Bernard ISD | Philip Gaudette | East Bernard Elementary Principal | |
| Precinct 1 | Richard Zahn | Commissioner | |
| Fort Bend County HS&EM | Rodney Grimmer | Hazard Mitigation Planner | |
| City of Wharton | Brandi Jimenez | Assistant to the City Manager | |
| LCRA | Mario Chapa | Business Continuity Program Manager | |
| East Bernard ISD | David Janecek | Junior High Principle | |
| Fort Bend County HS&EM | Frank Garza | Regional Planner | |
| City of Wharton | Joseph Pace | City Manager | |
| Wharton County | Andy Kirkland | Emc |  |
| | | | |
| | | | |

NOTES:

Introductions – Eric Scheibe

- Introductions of all attendees

Land Subsidence – Abigail Ayers

- Most recent addition
- A majority of information was obtained from a 2020 study conducted for the Coastal Bend Ground Water Conservation District
 - Summarized two studies of land subsidence
 - Figure contained in PowerPoint was pulled for the study
 - The majority of the measurements confirmed land subsidence
- The only major occurrence of sudden land subsidence on record is the Boling Sinkhole of 1983
- Noted north of highway 59 and north-west of the City of Wharton are locations experiencing the greatest land subsidence
- Eric stated that discussions with Chris Riley at LCRA noted a gauge at Lane City Dam has subsided a substantial amount over the past 10–15-year period.
 - The cause of the subsidence has not been identified
 - Suggested monitoring needs to occur as land subsidence can affect flood risk in the area
 - Findings will be noted in the Hazard Mitigation Plan

Survey Results – Abigail Ayers

- Survey results from June 1, 2021, to July 21, 2021
 - No responses were received over the previous two-week period
- Review of Survey results
- Survey Results presented did not contain the one response received from the Spanish survey, but will be included in the final Hazard Mitigation Plan

Goals and Objectives – Abigail Ayers

- Included in the handout given to attendees
- Changes have not been made between plan updates
- Goals link to the mitigation actions
- Objectives provide further details for each goal
- Noted that FEMA requires an emphasis on new and existing structures

Mitigation Actions - Creating Actions – Abigail Ayers

- Included in the handout given to attendees
- Review of each mitigation action item
 - Alternatives, changes, and approval/removal
- Noted that each jurisdiction must have jurisdiction-specific action items
- Asterisk denotes action items from the previous hazard mitigation plan which were identified as ongoing or delayed and will be brought forward in the hazard mitigation plan update
- Wharton County Mitigation Actions
 - “Update and adopt the Wharton County Flood Insurance Study and FIRM”
 - Item will be a continual action item as updates will be made regularly
 - “Join FEMA’s CRS Program”
 - Approved as it will be a goal to reach over the next 5 years
 - “Create/Maintain a Wharton Disaster Response Team”
 - approved
 - A team of individuals exists which can be contacted to aid during a hazard event, but no formal response team exists

- “Educate homeowners on hazards”
 - wording changed from homeowners to the community to broaden the target audience
- “Collaborate with local canal owners to identify funding to improve and expand existing infrastructure”
 - Changed to also include expansive soils hazard
- “Conduct lessons learned meeting regarding COVID-19 Pandemic”
 - noted the value of holding a larger meeting with adjacent counties and local entities
- All action items were approved by the committee
- All hazards are covered by two or more action items
- No other action items were proposed
- East Bernard Mitigation Actions
 - No changes were made to the mitigation action items
 - All actions items were approved by the committee
 - “GIS mapping” was proposed as an additional mitigation action
 - This item covers expansive soils, flood, wildfire, and land subsidence hazards
 - All hazards are covered by two or more action items
- City of El Campo Mitigation Actions
 - “Outreach to vulnerable populations”
 - changed to “Outreach to vulnerable population regarding extreme heat and cold”
 - this covers extreme heat and winter weather hazards
 - “Educate homeowners on hazards”
 - wording changed from homeowners to the community to broaden the target audience
 - All action items were approved by the committee
 - No additional action items were proposed
 - All hazards are covered by two or more action items
- City of Wharton Mitigation Actions
 - “Educate homeowners on hazards”
 - wording changed from homeowners to the community to broaden the target audience
 - “Implement Reverse 911 and Warning sign”
 - Changed to “Implement Warning System”
 - Implement Reverse 911 has been completed
 - “Conduct lesson learned meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic”
 - Changed to “Conduct after-action report and improvement plan in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic”
 - This action item wording will be updated for each jurisdiction
 - All hazards are covered by two or more action items
 - All action items were approved by the committee
 - No additional action items were proposed

Comments Session

- Requested the addition of a hazardous materials section to the hazard mitigation plan
 - Addition requested due to location of railroads, highways, pipelines, fertilizer plants/storage facilities, battery storage facilities (lithium-ion battery storage containers), wind farms, solar farms, and commercial facilities in the planning area.

- Potential action items
 - “Establish a county-wide hazardous material response team”
 - This will be added to each jurisdiction’s mitigation action item list
 - “Implementation of hazardous material warnings”
 - “Establish traffic plan to divert hazardous material transportation around risk areas”

Next Steps

- Update Mitigation Action Items in Draft
- Review/approval of Land Subsidence chapter by the committee
- Creating Hazardous Material Chapter
- Final review stage
- Public Comment period
 - Draft posted at all City halls and Wharton County courthouse
- Final Hazard Mitigation Plan submittal to FEMA for review/approval

Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Public Involvement and Participation

Wharton County and the participating communities created a brochure as a means to engage the public in the hazard mitigation planning process. The brochure contained information informing the public of what a hazard mitigation plan is as well as the benefits of participating as a community member. Also included was a list of hazards reviewed in the update with further information provided for three high-risk/impact hazards. The brochure provided the community with links and contact information for any questions or concerns regarding the update of the plan. Lastly, a link and QR code for the survey was provided for the community members to complete as a means of active participation in the update process. The brochure was distributed through the planning partners' websites, social media pages, offices, and local newspapers.

A copy of the brochure provided to community members can be found below as well as the results of the community survey.

Wharton County Brochure (English):

WHARTON COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN



What is a Hazard Mitigation Plan?

A HMP is “the representation of the jurisdiction’s commitment to reduce risks from natural hazards, serving as a guide for decision-makers as they commit resources to reducing the effects of natural hazards” (44 CFR 201.6).


Hazards Evaluated

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| • Dam/Levee Failure | • Hurricane and Tropical Storms |
| • Drought | • Lightning |
| • Expansive Soils | • Pandemic |
| • Extreme Heat | • Tornado |
| • Earthquake | • Wildfire |
| • Flood | • Wind |
| • Hail | • Winter Weather |

What are the benefits of participating in the Hazard Mitigation Plan?

- Awareness of risk and vulnerabilities
- Identification of implementable strategies and funding sources
- Reduction of hazard impact (save lives, property, and the local economy)
- Creation of partnerships and develop comprehensive approaches that enhance project grant funding opportunities
- Pooling of resources while avoiding duplication of effort
- Creation of more resilient communities; bounce-back from disasters faster!

Schedule




HAZARDS OF HIGHEST CONCERN


Flood:

- There is a 45% chance of a flash flood occurring within any given year in Wharton County.
- The base flood event, or 100-Year Flood (1% annual chance), has the capability of displacing approximately 12,928 residents in the county.
- The FEMA Flood Zone Map shows Wharton County during a 100-Year and 500-Year event (0.2% annual chance).

Populations in Floodplain




FEMA Flood Zone



Hurricanes/Tropical Storms:

Past Hurricanes and Tropical Storms Affecting Wharton County



- Wharton County is predicted to be in the direct line of a hurricane/tropical storm once every 19 years.
- Wharton County will experience the effects of a hurricane/tropical storm once every 3 years.
- During 100-year probabilistic event approximately 10% of buildings (mostly residential) are expected to sustain moderate damage.
- The annualized losses estimate (both structures and content) due to past hurricanes/tropical storm events in Wharton County is \$8,849,000.

HOW YOU CAN HELP?

Public input on the mitigation planning process is very important and residents are encouraged to educate themselves about the existing plan and offer comments on the update. A link to the public survey for the 2021 update to the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan is below. This survey will gather input and evaluate citizens' preparedness for natural disasters. **For more information about hazard mitigation visit the City of Wharton Emergency Management Department website:**
http://www.cityofwharton.com/page/em_home

Wharton County Resident? Take our survey!

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/WhartonCountyHMP>

– Or –

Scan the QR code to complete the survey



Pandemic:

What is considered a Pandemic?


An outbreak of a disease that occurs over a wide geographic area, such as multiple countries or continents, and typically affects a significant proportion of the population.

- Wharton County is predicted to experience a pandemic of some severity within the next 10 years. (See Pandemic Severity Index Table)
- According to the Cleveland Clinic, intervals between pandemics are shortening and frequency is increasing.
- Pandemics can have far-reaching effects on a community's health, economy, and social well-being.
 - The effects of a pandemic were most recently felt due to the outbreak of COVID-19 in 2020.

Pandemic Severity Index (PSI)

| Category | Case Fatality Ratio | Example |
|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Less than 0.1% | Seasonal Flu |
| 2 | 0.1 - <0.5% | Asian Flu and Hong Kong Flu |
| 3 | 0.5 - <1% | Pandemic H1N1 (2009) |
| 4 | 1.0 - <2.0% | Lassa Fever |
| 5 | 2.0% or higher | 1918 Flu Pandemic |

Confirmed COVID-19 Cases in Wharton County



For any questions about hazard mitigation or the process, please contact:

Eric Scheibe, PE, CFM






Phone: (512) 263-0418

Email: escheibe@scheibeconsulting.com



Wharton County Brochure (Spanish):

PLAN DE MITIGACIÓN DE RIESGOS DEL CONDADO DE WHARTON

¿Qué es un Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos?

El Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos forma parte del esfuerzo del Condado de Wharton de minimizar o eliminar el riesgo a largo plazo para la vida humana y la propiedad debido a peligros conocidos como sequías, inundaciones, tornados, incendios forestales y otros desastres importantes.

¿Cuáles son los beneficios de participar en un Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos?

- Nuevo conocimiento de riesgos y vulnerabilidades.
- Identificación de estrategias implementables y de recursos de fondos.
- Reducción de impactos adversos de los riesgos evaluados (para salvar vidas, proteger propiedades y la economía local)
- Habilidad de formar relaciones y desarrollar enfoques exhaustivos que aumentan oportunidades de subvenciones para proyectos locales.
- Combinación de recursos para eliminar el doble esfuerzo
- ¡Creación de una comunidad más fuerte y resistente!

Riesgos Evaluados

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| • Falla en la represa/dique | • Huracanes y Tormentas Tropicales |
| • Sequía | • Relámpagos |
| • Suelos Expansivos | • Pandemia |
| • Calor Extremo | • Tornado |
| • Terremoto | • Incendio forestal |
| • Inundación | • Vientos Fuertes |
| • Granizo | • Clima de Invierno Severo |

CALENDARIO

1ª Etapa:
Preparación
y Revisión

➔

2ª Etapa:
Actualización de
la evaluación de
Riesgos

➔

3ª Etapa:
Encuesta
Pública

➔

4ª Etapa:
Finalización del
Plan
Actualizado

➔

5ª Etapa:
Implementación del
Plan Actualizado


RIESGOS PRINCIPALES

Inundación:


- Cada año hay una probabilidad de 45% que ocurra una inundación repentina en el Condado de Wharton.
- La inundación de 100 años (inundación de un 1% probabilidad de ocurrencia cada año) tiene la capacidad de desplazar a 12,928 residentes.
- El mapa de inundaciones de FEMA muestra el impacto de inundaciones de 100-años y de 500-años (0.2% probabilidad de ocurrir cada año.)

MAPA DE INUNDACION DE FEMA

Leyenda
 Ciudad
 East Bernard
 El Campo
 Wharton
 Limite del Condado
 FEMA Zona de Inundación
 A,
 AE,
 AE, CAUCE MAYOR
 X, 0.2% PROBABILIDAD DE INUNDACION CADA AÑO




Población Dentro de la Zona de Inundación



| Localidad | Fuera de la Zona de Inundación | Zona de Inundación de 500 años | Zona de Inundación de 100 años |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ciudad de East Bernard | ~2,000 | ~1,000 | ~1,000 |
| Ciudad de El Campo | ~11,000 | ~3,000 | ~3,000 |
| Ciudad de Wharton | ~8,000 | ~2,000 | ~2,000 |
| Áreas no Incorporadas | ~18,000 | ~6,000 | ~6,000 |

Huracanes y Tormentas Tropicales:

Huracanes y Tormentas Tropicales Históricas en el Condado Wharton



- Cada 19 años el Condado de Wharton está en línea directa de un huracán o una tormenta tropical.
- Cada 3 años el condado de Wharton siente los efectos de un Huracán o una tormenta tropical.
- En el caso de un evento con un periodo de retorno de 100 años 10% de los edificios (principalmente edificios residenciales) sufrirían daños moderados.
- La pérdida anualizada debido a Huracanes y Tormentas Tropicales en el Condado de Wharton es \$8,849,000.

¿COMO PUEDO AYUDAR?

Es muy importante que la comunidad nos ayude a identificar y analizar los riesgos que los pueden afectar. Alentamos a todos los miembros de la comunidad que nos ofrezcan comentarios sobre el plan actual y su actualización. Un **enlace** con la encuesta publica sobre la actualización del Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos del Condado de Wharton se encuentre abajo.

Para más información sobre la mitigación de riesgos visite el sitio de web del Departamento de Emergencias de la Ciudad de Wharton:

http://www.cityofwharton.com/page/em_home

¿Residente del Condado de Wharton? ¡Contesta nuestra encuesta!

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/encuestawharton>

— O —

Escanea el Código QR para completar la encuesta



Pandemia:

¿Qué es una Pandemia?


Una pandemia es una epidemia de una enfermedad infecciosa que se ha propagado en un área geográficamente extensa, afectando a un número considerable de personas.

- En los próximos 10 años va a ocurrir otra pandemia de un cierto nivel de gravedad en el Condado Wharton (véase el cuadro de Gravedad de las Pandemias a continuación.)
- Según la Clínica de Cleveland las pandemias son cada vez más frecuentes con menos tiempo entre cada evento.
- Pandemias pueden tener efectos devastadores en la salud, economía, y bienestar social de una comunidad.
 - En el 2020 COVID-19 demostró los efectos que puede tener una pandemia.

Índice de Gravedad de las Pandemias (PSI)

| Categoría | Tasa de Letalidad | Ejemplo |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Menos de 0.1% | Gripe Estacional |
| 2 | 0.1 - <0.5% | Gripe de Hong Kong |
| 3 | 0.5 - <1% | Gripe pandémica H1N1 (2009) |
| 4 | 1.0 - <2.0% | Fiebre de Lassa |
| 5 | 2.0% o Más | Gripe Española (1918) |

Casos oficiales de COVID-19 en el Condado de Wharton



Para preguntas adicionales sobre la mitigación de riesgos o este proceso por favor contacte al:

Sr. Eric Scheibe, PE, CFM

Tel: (512) 263-0418

Email: escheibe@scheibeconsulting.com




Wharton County Survey (English) Responses:

Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021

Q1 Where in Wharton County do you live?

Answered: 84 Skipped: 3




Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Wharton | 46.43% | 39 |
| East Bernard | 29.76% | 25 |
| El Campo | 8.33% | 7 |
| Boling | 7.14% | 6 |
| Hungerford | 4.76% | 4 |
| Egypt | 1.19% | 1 |
| Glen Flora | 1.19% | 1 |
| Lissie | 1.19% | 1 |
| Danevang | 0.00% | 0 |
| Lane City | 0.00% | 0 |
| Louise | 0.00% | 0 |
| Pierce | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 84 |

Q2 Do you work in Wharton County?


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0




| ANSWER CHOICES | | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|--|-----------|----|
| Yes | | 60.92% | 53 |
| No | | 39.08% | 34 |
| TOTAL | | | 87 |

Q3 Which of the following hazard events have you or anyone in your household experienced in the past 20 years within Wharton County?
(Check all that apply)

Answered: 87 Skipped: 0




Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|----|
| Hurricane and Tropical Storm | 85.06% | 74 |
| Winter Storm | 79.31% | 69 |
| Pandemic | 77.01% | 67 |
| Thunderstorm | 75.86% | 66 |
| Flood | 73.56% | 64 |
| Extreme Heat | 58.62% | 51 |
| Lightning | 57.47% | 50 |
| Hail | 52.87% | 46 |
| Drought | 48.28% | 42 |
| Windstorm | 33.33% | 29 |
| Tornado | 25.29% | 22 |
| Expansive Soils | 18.39% | 16 |
| Dam Failure | 5.75% | 5 |
| Hazardous Material Release | 2.30% | 2 |
| Land Subsidence | 2.30% | 2 |
| Pipeline Failure | 2.30% | 2 |
| Wildfire | 1.15% | 1 |
| Landslide/Channel Bank Failure | 0.00% | 0 |
| Terrorism | 0.00% | 0 |
| None | 0.00% | 0 |
| Total Respondents: 87 | | |

Q4 How prepared is your household to deal with a natural hazard event?


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---------------------|-----------|----|
| Not at all Prepared | 5.75% | 5 |
| Somewhat Prepared | 40.23% | 35 |
| Adequately Prepared | 35.63% | 31 |
| Well Prepared | 13.79% | 12 |
| Very Well Prepared | 4.60% | 4 |
| TOTAL | | 87 |

Q5 Which of the following have provided you with useful information to help you be prepared for a natural hazard event? (Check all that apply)


Answered: 86 Skipped: 1



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---|-----------|----|
| Personal experience with one or more natural hazards/disasters | 79.07% | 68 |
| Emergency preparedness information from a government source (e.g., federal, state, or local emergency management) | 63.95% | 55 |
| Locally provided news or other media information | 62.79% | 54 |
| Church | 16.28% | 14 |
| Schools and other academic institutions | 13.95% | 12 |
| Attended meetings that have dealt with disaster preparedness | 6.98% | 6 |
| Community Emergency Response Training (CERT) | 0.00% | 0 |
| None | 0.00% | 0 |
| Total Respondents: 86 | | |

Q6 Which of the following steps has your household taken to prepare for a natural hazard event? (Check all that apply)

Answered: 87 Skipped: 0




Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---|-----------|----|
| Stored flashlights and batteries | 82.76% | 72 |
| Stored medical supplies (first aid kit, medications, personal protective equipment (PPE)) | 70.11% | 61 |
| Installed smoke detectors on each level of the house | 68.97% | 60 |
| Stored food and water | 67.82% | 59 |
| Stored a fire extinguisher | 56.32% | 49 |
| Identified utility shutoffs | 54.02% | 47 |
| Natural hazard insurance (Flood, Earthquake, Wildfire) | 44.83% | 39 |
| Made a fire escape plan | 43.68% | 38 |
| Received first aid/CPR training | 40.23% | 35 |
| Prepared a disaster supply kit | 40.23% | 35 |
| Stored a battery-powered radio | 40.23% | 35 |
| Designated a meeting place | 33.33% | 29 |
| Sand bags | 4.60% | 4 |
| None | 2.30% | 2 |
| Total Respondents: 87 | | |


Q7 How concerned are you about the following natural hazards in Wharton County? (Check one response for each hazard)

Answered: 87 Skipped: 0




Q7 How concerned are you about the following natural hazards in Wharton County? (Check one response for each hazard)


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0




Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021




Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021




Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021



Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021



Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021




Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021

■ Not Concerned
 ■ Somewhat Concerned
 ■ Concerned
 ■ Very Concerned
■ Extremely Concerned


| | NOT CONCERNED | SOMEWHAT CONCERNED | CONCERNED | VERY CONCERNED | EXTREMELY CONCERNED | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|-------|
| Flood | 1.15% 1 | 8.05% 7 | 24.14% 21 | 24.14% 21 | 42.53% 37 | 87 |
| Hurricane and Tropical Storm | 1.16% 1 | 6.98% 6 | 27.91% 24 | 31.40% 27 | 32.56% 28 | 86 |
| Winter Storm | 9.41% 8 | 29.41% 25 | 30.59% 26 | 16.47% 14 | 14.12% 12 | 85 |
| Dam Failure | 49.41% 42 | 22.35% 19 | 14.12% 12 | 4.71% 4 | 9.41% 8 | 85 |
| Extreme Heat | 8.33% 7 | 26.19% 22 | 35.71% 30 | 20.24% 17 | 9.52% 8 | 84 |
| Pandemic | 18.82% 16 | 24.71% 21 | 35.29% 30 | 12.94% 11 | 8.24% 7 | 85 |
| Tornado | 11.90% 10 | 35.71% 30 | 33.33% 28 | 10.71% 9 | 8.33% 7 | 84 |
| Pipeline Failure | 32.56% 28 | 30.23% 26 | 25.58% 22 | 5.81% 5 | 5.81% 5 | 86 |
| Thunderstorm | 20.24% 17 | 22.62% 19 | 36.90% 31 | 14.29% 12 | 5.95% 5 | 84 |
| Drought | 14.29% 12 | 41.67% 35 | 30.95% 26 | 8.33% 7 | 4.76% 4 | 84 |
| Hazardous Material Release | 27.91% 24 | 34.88% 30 | 25.58% 22 | 6.98% 6 | 4.65% 4 | 86 |
| Landslide/Channel Bank Failure | 63.53% 54 | 16.47% 14 | 12.94% 11 | 2.35% 2 | 4.71% 4 | 85 |
| Wildfire | 48.24% 41 | 29.41% 25 | 14.12% 12 | 3.53% 3 | 4.71% 4 | 85 |
| Windstorm | 26.19% 22 | 29.76% 25 | 22.62% 19 | 16.67% 14 | 4.76% 4 | 84 |
| Land Subsidence | 42.35% 36 | 30.59% 26 | 18.82% 16 | 4.71% 4 | 3.53% 3 | 85 |
| Lightning | 23.53% 20 | 27.06% 23 | 31.76% 27 | 14.12% 12 | 3.53% 3 | 85 |
| Terrorism | 42.35% 36 | 29.41% 25 | 15.29% 13 | 9.41% 8 | 3.53% 3 | 85 |
| Expansive Soils | 41.67% 35 | 27.38% 23 | 17.86% 15 | 10.71% 9 | 2.38% 2 | 84 |
| Hail | 19.05% 16 | 28.57% 24 | 40.48% 34 | 9.52% 8 | 2.38% 2 | 84 |
| None | 66.67% 16 | 4.17% 1 | 16.67% 4 | 8.33% 2 | 4.17% 1 | 24 |

Q8 Which of the following methods do you think are most effective for providing hazard and disaster information? (Check all that apply)

Answered: 86 Skipped: 1



Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021




Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---|-----------|----|
| Internet (Social Media/Search Engine) | 93.02% | 80 |
| TV News/Ads | 61.63% | 53 |
| Radio News/Ads | 52.33% | 45 |
| Online City Newsletters | 48.84% | 42 |
| Word of Mouth | 46.51% | 40 |
| Public Awareness Campaign (e.g., Flood Awareness Week, Winter Storm Preparedness Month) | 44.19% | 38 |
| Newspaper | 40.70% | 35 |
| First Responders | 37.21% | 32 |
| Schools/Academic Institutions | 36.05% | 31 |
| Church (faith-based institutions) | 36.05% | 31 |
| Public Meetings | 30.23% | 26 |
| Chamber of Commerce | 23.26% | 20 |
| Public Library | 15.12% | 13 |
| Informational Brochures | 11.63% | 10 |
| Red Cross Information | 1.16% | 1 |
| Social Media (Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn) | 1.16% | 1 |
| Telephone Book | 0.00% | 0 |
| Workshops | 0.00% | 0 |
| TV Ads | 0.00% | 0 |
| Radio Ads | 0.00% | 0 |
| Outdoor Advertisements | 0.00% | 0 |
| Fire Department/Rescue | 0.00% | 0 |
| Law Enforcement | 0.00% | 0 |
| CERT Classes | 0.00% | 0 |
| Books | 0.00% | 0 |
| Academic Institutions | 0.00% | 0 |
| Community Safety Events | 0.00% | 0 |
| Fair Booths | 0.00% | 0 |
| Total Respondents: 86 | | |

Q9 Is your property located in or near a FEMA-designated floodplain?

Answered: 87 Skipped: 0




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Yes | 52.87% | 46 |
| No | 29.89% | 26 |
| Not Sure | 17.24% | 15 |
| TOTAL | | 87 |

Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021

Q10 Do you have flood insurance?


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Yes | 48.28% | 42 |
| No | 49.43% | 43 |
| Not Sure | 2.30% | 2 |
| TOTAL | | 87 |

Q11 Is your property located in an area at risk for wildfires?


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Yes | 3.45% | 3 |
| No | 71.26% | 62 |
| Not Sure | 25.29% | 22 |
| TOTAL | | 87 |

Q12 Have you ever had problems getting homeowners or renters insurance due to risks from natural hazards?


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Yes | 10.34% | 9 |
| No | 82.76% | 72 |
| Not Sure | 6.90% | 6 |
| TOTAL | | 87 |

Q13 Do you have any special access or functional needs within your household that would require early warning or specialized response during disasters?

Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|--|-----------|----|
| Yes | | 12.64% | 11 |
| No | | 87.36% | 76 |
| TOTAL | | | 87 |


Q14 If the answer to question # 13 was “Yes”, would you like County Emergency Management personnel to contact you regarding your access and functional needs? If yes, please enter your contact information in the following text box.

Answered: 5 Skipped: 82

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Name | 100.00% | 5 |
| Company | 0.00% | 0 |
| Address | 100.00% | 5 |
| Address 2 | 0.00% | 0 |
| City/Town | 100.00% | 5 |
| State/Province | 100.00% | 5 |
| ZIP/Postal Code | 100.00% | 5 |
| Country | 100.00% | 5 |
| Email Address | 80.00% | 4 |
| Phone Number | 80.00% | 4 |

Q15 When you moved into your home, did you consider the impact a natural disaster could have on your home?


Answered: 86 Skipped: 1



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Yes | 55.81% | 48 |
| No | 39.53% | 34 |
| Not Sure | 4.65% | 4 |
| TOTAL | | 86 |

Q15 When you moved into your home, did you consider the impact a natural disaster could have on your home?


Answered: 86 Skipped: 1



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Yes | 55.81% | 48 |
| No | 39.53% | 34 |
| Not Sure | 4.65% | 4 |
| TOTAL | | 86 |

Q16 Was the presence of a natural hazard risk zone (e.g., dam failure zone, flood zone, landslide hazard area, high fire risk area) disclosed to you by a real estate agent, seller, or landlord before you purchased or moved into your home?


Answered: 86 Skipped: 1



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Yes | 32.56% | 28 |
| No | 55.81% | 48 |
| Not Sure | 11.63% | 10 |
| TOTAL | | 86 |

Q17 Would the disclosure of this type of natural hazard risk information influence your decision to buy or rent a home?


Answered: 85 Skipped: 2



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Yes | 75.29% | 64 |
| No | 11.76% | 10 |
| Not Sure | 12.94% | 11 |
| TOTAL | | 85 |

Q18 How much money would you be willing to spend to retrofit your home to reduce risks associated with natural disasters? (for example, by clearing brush and plant materials from around your home to create a "defensible space" for wildfire, performing seismic upgrades, or replacing a combustible roof with non-combustible roofing)


Answered: 86 Skipped: 1



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|
| \$10,000 or above | 11.63% | 10 |
| \$5,000 to \$9,999 | 15.12% | 13 |
| \$1,000 to \$4,999 | 16.28% | 14 |
| Less than \$1,000 | 6.98% | 6 |
| Nothing | 12.79% | 11 |
| Not Sure | 37.21% | 32 |
| TOTAL | | 86 |

Q19 Which of the following incentives would encourage you to spend money to retrofit your home to protect against natural disasters? (Check all that apply)


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----|
| Grant funding | 70.11% | 61 |
| Insurance premium discount | 67.82% | 59 |
| Mortgage discount | 40.23% | 35 |
| Low interest rate loan | 35.63% | 31 |
| None | 9.20% | 8 |
| Total Respondents: 87 | | |

Q20 If your property were located in a designated "high hazard" area or had received repetitive damages from a natural hazard event, would you consider a "buyout" offered by a public agency?


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|--|-----------|----|
| Yes | | 43.68% | 38 |
| No | | 22.99% | 20 |
| Not Sure | | 33.33% | 29 |
| TOTAL | | | 87 |

Q21 Would you support the regulation (restriction) of land uses within known high hazard areas?


Answered: 86 Skipped: 1




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-------------------|-----------|----|
| Would Support | 69.77% | 60 |
| Would Not Support | 30.23% | 26 |
| TOTAL | | 86 |

Q22 What types of projects do you believe the County, State, or Federal government agencies should be doing in order to reduce damage and disruption from hazard events within Wharton County? Please rank each option as a high, medium, or low priority.

Answered: 85 Skipped: 2




Wharton County TX HMP Update Survey 2021



| | HIGH | MEDIUM | LOW | TOTAL |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|
| Retrofit infrastructures such as roads, bridges, drainage facilities, levees, water supply, waste water and power supply facilities. | 84.38% 27 | 15.63% 5 | 0.00% 0 | 32 |
| Acquire vulnerable properties and maintain as open space. | 35.00% 14 | 40.00% 16 | 25.00% 10 | 40 |
| Capital projects such as dams, levees, flood walls, drainage improvements and bank stabilization projects. | 61.11% 11 | 38.89% 7 | 0.00% 0 | 18 |
| Strengthen codes and regulations to include higher regulatory standards in hazard areas. | 56.25% 9 | 18.75% 3 | 25.00% 4 | 16 |
| Assist vulnerable property owners with securing funding for mitigation. | 45.00% 9 | 30.00% 6 | 25.00% 5 | 20 |
| Perform projects that mitigate the potential impacts from climate change. | 19.35% 6 | 35.48% 11 | 45.16% 14 | 31 |
| Retrofit and strengthen essential facilities such as police, fire, schools and hospitals. | 15.38% 4 | 53.85% 14 | 30.77% 8 | 26 |
| Provide better public information about risk, and the exposure to hazards within the operational area. | 30.00% 3 | 30.00% 3 | 40.00% 4 | 10 |
| Perform projects that restore the natural environments capacity to absorb the impacts from natural hazards. | 6.25% 1 | 43.75% 7 | 50.00% 8 | 16 |

Q23 Please indicate how you feel about the following statement: It is the responsibility of government (local, state and federal) to provide education and programs that promote citizen actions that will reduce exposure to the risks associated with natural hazards. (Choose one)


Answered: 86 Skipped: 1



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----|
| Strongly Disagree | 8.14% | 7 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 11.63% | 10 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 25.58% | 22 |
| Somewhat Agree | 45.35% | 39 |
| Strongly Agree | 9.30% | 8 |
| TOTAL | | 86 |

Q24 Please indicate how you feel about the following statement: It is my responsibility to educate myself and take actions that will reduce my exposure to the risks associated with natural hazards. (Choose one)


Answered: 85 Skipped: 2



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----|
| Strongly Disagree | 8.24% | 7 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 1.18% | 1 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 5.88% | 5 |
| Somewhat Agree | 36.47% | 31 |
| Strongly Agree | 48.24% | 41 |
| TOTAL | | 85 |

**Q25 Please indicate how you feel about the following statement:
Information about the risks associated with natural hazards is readily
available and easy to locate. (Choose one)**


Answered: 86 Skipped: 1



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----|
| Strongly Disagree | 13.95% | 12 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 12.79% | 11 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 18.60% | 16 |
| Somewhat Agree | 44.19% | 38 |
| Strongly Agree | 10.47% | 9 |
| TOTAL | | 86 |

Q26 Please indicate your age range:


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Under 18 | 0.00% | 0 |
| 18 to 30 | 6.90% | 6 |
| 31 to 40 | 17.24% | 15 |
| 41 to 50 | 26.44% | 23 |
| 51 to 60 | 25.29% | 22 |
| 61 or older | 24.14% | 21 |
| TOTAL | | 87 |

Q27 Please indicate the primary language spoken in your household:


Answered: 86 Skipped: 1



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| English | 97.67% | 84 |
| Spanish | 2.33% | 2 |
| Other Indo-European | 0.00% | 0 |
| Asian and Pacific Island Languages | 0.00% | 0 |
| Other (please specify) | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 86 |

Q28 Please indicate your gender:


Answered: 85 Skipped: 2



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Male | 32.94% | 28 |
| Female | 67.06% | 57 |
| TOTAL | | 85 |

Q29 Please indicate your highest level of education:


Answered: 86 Skipped: 1



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Grade School/No Schooling | 0.00% | 0 |
| Some High School | 0.00% | 0 |
| High School Graduate/GED | 6.98% | 6 |
| Some College/Trade School | 25.58% | 22 |
| College Degree | 44.19% | 38 |
| Graduate Degree | 23.26% | 20 |
| TOTAL | | 86 |

Q30 How long have you lived in Wharton County?


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--------------------|-----------|----|
| Less than 1 year | 2.30% | 2 |
| 1 to 5 years | 8.05% | 7 |
| 6 to 10 years | 11.49% | 10 |
| 11 to 20 years | 18.39% | 16 |
| More than 20 years | 59.77% | 52 |
| TOTAL | | 87 |

Q31 Do you own or rent your place of residence?


Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Own | 95.40% | 83 |
| Rent | 4.60% | 4 |
| TOTAL | | 87 |

Q32 How much is your gross household income?


Answered: 80 Skipped: 7



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------------|-----------|----|
| \$20,000 or less | 1.25% | 1 |
| \$20,001 to \$49,999 | 11.25% | 9 |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 18.75% | 15 |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 27.50% | 22 |
| \$100,000 or more | 41.25% | 33 |
| TOTAL | | 80 |

Q33 Do you have regular access to the Internet?

Answered: 87 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|----|
| Yes | 95.40% | 83 |
| No | 4.60% | 4 |
| Not Sure | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 87 |

Q34 Comments

12 answered – 75 skipped


- Drainage is my main concern outside the city limits of Wharton. I've asked for almost 10 years for a drainage ditch to be cleaned out. It's never happened. Things are getting worse and worse with each rain fall.
- My income is not your business.
- The river needs to be cleaned out ain't no telling what's in there. Why it keeps flooding
- Please please do something so that the Colorado river does not flood Hobbin oaks ever again
- "Precinct 2 needs to get out and clean the county ditches that filled up with dirt after the Harvey Flood. Every time we get a big rain, all the county ditch water backs into my yard and close to my house. If My house floods due to county negligence in maintaining ditch drainage, I will be Seeing legal representation. "
- Question #22 would only allow me to select one dot per the whole question instead of marking a dot for each statement. I highly agree that mitigation funds granted to the County needs to be allocated to areas where homeowners that have experienced flooding and lose of property/homes previously. West Wharton County along Chacos Slough needs to be addressed for cleaning out for drainage purposes. The County and TX Dot need to work together more instead of putting the land/property owner in the middle. Precint 3 has more roads, ditches etc than any other Precint in the county; more man power & funding needs to be allocated in Precint 3. Mitigation needs to be addressed in this area as well. Love our farmers! But fields are being turned over differently now and the stock/stubble of fields are washing into our drainage ditches and blocking the flow of water which in turns causes water to stop draining properly and adequately needs to be addressed.
- None at the time
- Water in ditches down 1164 was never an issue for any natural disaster before the new development Bernard Meadows was built. Now during any rain over 5" we have to worry about water coming into our homes. And natural disaster (hurricane) season is not even here yet. A proper impact study was not done before the development of this subdivision. We are upstream and water backs up and floods our properties. Properties that have never flooded before. Even during hurricane Harvey.
- Dredge the ditches in East Bernard so water can flow and sit there for weeks/months
- The lack of attention to drainage ditches in East Bernard is downright criminal! If you're a relative of a county official, you get your ditch dredged. If not, you're out of luck!
- Anything the city/county does to help educate us above and beyond. It is the responsibilities of ADULTS to look into their own welfare, and not blame others for them not taking assertive action.
- Let's cut the bull and do something!!

Wharton County Survey (Spanish) Responses:

Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton

Q1 ¿En cual ciudad del Condado de Wharton Vives?

Answered: 1 Skipped: 0




Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|---|
| Boling | 100.00% | 1 |
| Danevang | 0.00% | 0 |
| East Bernard | 0.00% | 0 |
| Egypt | 0.00% | 0 |
| El Campo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Glen Flora | 0.00% | 0 |
| Hungerford | 0.00% | 0 |
| Lane City | 0.00% | 0 |
| Lissie | 0.00% | 0 |
| Louise | 0.00% | 0 |
| Pierce | 0.00% | 0 |
| Wharton | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q2 ¿Trabajas en el Condado de Wharton?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0




| ANSWER CHOICES | | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|--|-----------|---|
| Si | | 100.00% | 1 |
| No | | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | | 1 |

Q3 ¿Durante los últimos 20 años usted o alguna otra persona en su casa ha sido directamente afectado por uno de los riesgos a continuación (Por favor, marque todos los que apliquen.)

Answered: 1 Skipped: 0




Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--|-----------|---|
| Falla en la represa/dique | 0.00% | 0 |
| Sequía | 100.00% | 1 |
| Suelos Expansivos | 0.00% | 0 |
| Calor Extremo | 100.00% | 1 |
| Inundación | 100.00% | 1 |
| Granizo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Fuga de materiales peligrosos/tóxicos | 0.00% | 0 |
| Huracán/Tormenta Tropical | 100.00% | 1 |
| Hundimiento de Tierra | 0.00% | 0 |
| Deslizamientos de tierra y aludes de barro | 0.00% | 0 |
| Relámpagos | 100.00% | 1 |
| Pandemia | 100.00% | 1 |
| Falla de una tubería | 0.00% | 0 |
| Terrorismo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Tormenta Severa/Tormenta Eléctrica | 100.00% | 1 |
| Tornado | 0.00% | 0 |
| Incendio forestal | 0.00% | 0 |
| Vientos fuertes | 100.00% | 1 |
| Clima de Invierno Severo | 100.00% | 1 |
| Ninguno | 0.00% | 0 |
| Total Respondents: 1 | | |

Q4 ¿Qué tan preparado está usted para un desastre?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--------------------|-----------|---|
| No preparado | 0.00% | 0 |
| Un poco preparado | 0.00% | 0 |
| Preparado | 100.00% | 1 |
| Bien preparado | 0.00% | 0 |
| Muy bien preparado | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q5 ¿Cual de los recursos abajo lo ayudado para prepararse para desastres naturales? (Por favor marque todos lo que apliquen.)


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--|-----------|---|
| Información gubernamental sobre preparación para casos de desastre (local, federal, o estatal) | 0.00% | 0 |
| Experiencia personal con un desastre natural | 100.00% | 1 |
| Información en las noticias/otro tipo de medias locales | 100.00% | 1 |
| Las escuelas y otros institutos académicos | 0.00% | 0 |
| Reuniones enfocadas en preparación para desastres | 0.00% | 0 |
| Community Emergency Response Training (CERT) | 0.00% | 0 |
| La iglesia | 0.00% | 0 |
| Ninguna de estas opciones | 0.00% | 0 |
| Total Respondents: 1 | | |

Q6 ¿Que preparaciones tiene usted o otro miembro de su hogar en caso de un desastre? (Por favor marque todos los que apliquen.)

Answered: 1 Skipped: 0




Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton


| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--|-----------|---|
| Curso de RCP/Primeros auxilios | 100.00% | 1 |
| Plan de escape en caso de un incendio | 0.00% | 0 |
| Lugar de encuentro en caso de emergencia | 0.00% | 0 |
| Corte de servicios públicos indentificado | 0.00% | 0 |
| Bolsas de arena | 0.00% | 0 |
| Equipo de suministros para caso de desastre | 0.00% | 0 |
| Detectores de humo instalados en todos los niveles de su hogar | 100.00% | 1 |
| Agua y comida no perecederos almanecada | 100.00% | 1 |
| Linterna y pilas de repuesto | 100.00% | 1 |
| Radio portátil y pilas o baterías de repuesto | 100.00% | 1 |
| Extintor contra incendio | 0.00% | 0 |
| Botiquín de primeros auxilios | 100.00% | 1 |
| Seguro de desastre (contra inundación, incendio, o terremoto) | 0.00% | 0 |
| Ninguna de estas opciones | 0.00% | 0 |
| Total Respondents: 1 | | |

Q7 Por favor, indique su nivel de preocupación sobre los siguientes riesgos naturales que pueden afectar su comunidad:


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0




Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton




Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton



Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton



Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton




Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton


| | NO PREOCUPADO | ALGO PREOCUPADO | PREOCUPADO | MUY PREOCUPADO | EXTREMADAMENTE PREOCUPADO | TOTAL |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|
| Falla en la represa/dique | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Sequía | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Suelos expansivos | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Calor Extremo | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Inundación | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Granizo | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Fuga de materiales peligrosos/tóxicos | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Huracán/Tormenta Tropical | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Hundimiento de Tierra | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Deslizamientos de tierra y aludes de barro | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Relámpagos | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Pandemia | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Falla de una tubería | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Terrorismo | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Tormenta Severa/Tormenta Eléctrica | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Tornado | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Incendio forestal | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Vientos fuertes | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Clima de Invierno Severo | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |

Q8 ¿Cuales de los métodos a continuación son los más efectivos para proveer información sobre los riesgos y desastres? (Por favor marque todos los que apliquen.)

Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton




Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---|-----------|---|
| El periódico | 0.00% | 0 |
| Telephone Book | 0.00% | 0 |
| Panfletos informativos | 0.00% | 0 |
| Boletín informativo de la ciudad en línea | 0.00% | 0 |
| Juntas publicas | 0.00% | 0 |
| Workshops | 0.00% | 0 |
| Escuelas/Institutos académicos | 0.00% | 0 |
| Anuncios y Noticias de televisión | 100.00% | 1 |
| TV Ads | 0.00% | 0 |
| Anuncios y Noticias en emisoras de radio | 100.00% | 1 |
| Radio Ads | 0.00% | 0 |
| El Internet (Redes sociales/Buscadores) | 100.00% | 1 |
| Outdoor Advertisements | 0.00% | 0 |
| Fire Department/Rescue | 0.00% | 0 |
| Primeros Respondedores | 0.00% | 0 |
| Law Enforcement | 0.00% | 0 |
| Iglesia (y otras instituciones basadas en fe) | 0.00% | 0 |
| CERT Classes | 0.00% | 0 |
| Campaña de concientización publica (Semana de la concienciación sobre inundaciones, etc.) | 0.00% | 0 |
| Books | 0.00% | 0 |
| Cámara de comercio | 0.00% | 0 |
| Academic Institutions | 0.00% | 0 |
| Biblioteca | 0.00% | 0 |
| Red Cross Information | 0.00% | 0 |
| Community Safety Events | 0.00% | 0 |
| Fair Booths | 0.00% | 0 |
| Recomendaciones personales | 0.00% | 0 |
| Social Media (Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn) | 0.00% | 0 |
| Total Respondents: 1 | | |

Q9 ¿Su propiedad se encuentra en una zona de inundación de FEMA?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Si | 100.00% | 1 |
| No | 0.00% | 0 |
| No estoy seguro | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q10 ¿Tiene seguro contra inundaciones?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---------------------------|-----------|---|
| Ninguna de estas opciones | 0.00% | 0 |
| Si | 0.00% | 0 |
| No | 100.00% | 1 |
| No estoy seguro | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q11 ¿Su propiedad se encuentra en una zona de alto riesgo para los incendios forestales?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Si | 100.00% | 1 |
| No | 0.00% | 0 |
| No estoy seguro | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q12 ¿Has tenido problemas obteniendo seguro para su hogar debido a riesgos naturales?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Si | 0.00% | 0 |
| No | 0.00% | 0 |
| No estoy seguro | 100.00% | 1 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q13 ¿Tiene alguna necesidad especial en su hogar que requiere una advertencia rápida o un responso especializado durante un desastre?

Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|---|
| Si | 0.00% | 0 |
| No | 100.00% | 1 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |


Q14 Si su respuesta fue “Si” para la pregunta #13, quisiera que el Departamento de Emergencias lo contacte sobre su acceso especial y necesidades? Si ese es el caso por favor llene las información abajo.

Answered: 0 Skipped: 1

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Nombre | 0.00% | 0 |
| Company | 0.00% | 0 |
| Dirección | 0.00% | 0 |
| Dirección 2 | 0.00% | 0 |
| Ciudad/Pueblo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Estado/Provincia | 0.00% | 0 |
| ZIP/Código Postal | 0.00% | 0 |
| País | 0.00% | 0 |
| Dirección de Correo electrónico | 0.00% | 0 |
| Número de teléfono | 0.00% | 0 |

Q15 ¿Cuándo se mudó a su hogar pensó en el impacto que pudieran tener los desastres naturales?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Si | 0.00% | 0 |
| No | 100.00% | 1 |
| No estoy seguro | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q16 ¿Cuando se mudo a su hogar le informó un agente de bienes raíces, vendedor o propietario sobre la presencia de una zona de riesgo de peligro natural (por ejemplo, zona de falla de presa, zona de inundación, área de riesgo de deslizamiento de tierra, área de alto riesgo de incendio)?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|--|-----------|---|
| Si | | 0.00% | 0 |
| No | | 100.00% | 1 |
| Estoy seguro | | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | | 1 |

Q17 ¿La divulgación de este tipo de información sobre riesgos de peligros naturales influiría en su decisión de comprar o alquilar una casa?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Si | 100.00% | 1 |
| No | 0.00% | 0 |
| No estoy seguro | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q18 ¿Cuánto dinero estaría dispuesto a gastar para modernizar su casa para reducir los riesgos asociados con los desastres naturales? (por ejemplo, quitando la maleza y los materiales vegetales alrededor de su casa para crear un "espacio defendible" para incendios forestales, realizando mejoras sísmicas o reemplazando un techo combustible con un techo no combustible)

Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES |
|------------------|-----------|
| \$10,000 o más | 0.00% 0 |
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 0.00% 0 |
| \$1,000-\$4,999 | 0.00% 0 |
| Menos de \$1,000 | 0.00% 0 |
| Nada | 0.00% 0 |
| No estoy seguro | 100.00% 1 |
| TOTAL | 1 |

Q19 ¿Cuál de los siguientes incentivos lo alentaría a gastar dinero para modernizar su hogar para protegerlo contra desastres naturales? (Marque todos lo que apliquen)


Answered: 0 Skipped: 1

 No matching responses.

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Descuento en la prima de seguro | 0.00% | 0 |
| Descuento hipotecario | 0.00% | 0 |
| Préstamo con tasa de interés baja | 0.00% | 0 |
| Financiamiento de subvenciones | 0.00% | 0 |
| Ninguna de estas opciones | 0.00% | 0 |
| Total Respondents: 0 | | |

Q20 Si su propiedad estuviera ubicada en un área designada de "alto riesgo" o hubiera recibido daños repetidos por un evento de riesgo natural, ¿consideraría una "compra" ofrecida por una agencia pública?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Si | 100.00% | 1 |
| No | 0.00% | 0 |
| No estoy seguro | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q21 ¿Apoyaría la regulación (restricción) de los usos de la tierra dentro de áreas conocidas de alto riesgo?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0




| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|---|
| Apoyaría | 100.00% | 1 |
| No apoyaría | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q22 ¿Qué tipo de proyectos cree que deberían llevar a cabo las agencias del gobierno federal, estatal o del condado para reducir los daños y las interrupciones causadas por eventos de peligro en el condado de Wharton? Clasifique cada opción como de prioridad alta, media o baja.

Answered: 1 Skipped: 0




Encuesta para el Plan de Mitigación de Riesgos 2021 del Condado de Wharton



| | ALTA | MEDIA | BAJA | TOTAL |
|--|--------------|------------|------------|-------|
| Modernización de infraestructuras como carreteras, puentes, instalaciones de drenaje, diques, suministro de agua, aguas residuales e instalaciones de suministro de energía. | 100.00% 1 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 1 |
| Modernizar y fortalecer instalaciones esenciales como estaciones de policías, estaciones de bomberos, escuelas y hospitales. | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Realizar proyectos que restauren la capacidad de los ambientes naturales para absorber los impactos de los riesgos naturales. | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Proyectos de capital como presas, diques, muros de inundación, mejoras de drenaje y proyectos de estabilización de bancos. | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Brindar mejor información pública sobre el riesgo y la exposición a peligros dentro del área operativa. | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Fortalecer los códigos y regulaciones para incluir estándares regulatorios más altos en áreas de alto riesgo. | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Ayudar a los propietarios vulnerables a obtener fondos para la mitigación. | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Realizar proyectos que mitiguen los impactos del cambio climático. | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |
| Adquirir propiedades vulnerables y mantenerlas como espacio abierto. | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0.00% 0 | 0 |

Q23 Por favor indica su nivel de acuerdo o desacuerdo con la siguiente observación: Es la responsabilidad del gobierno (estadal, local, y federal) proveer educación para los residentes para ayudar a minimizar/eliminar la exposición a los riesgos naturales. (Escoge una.)


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Estoy totalmente en desacuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Estoy en desacuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Estoy de acuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Estoy totalmente de acuerdo | 100.00% | 1 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q24 Por favor indica su nivel de acuerdo o desacuerdo con la siguiente observación: Es mi responsabilidad educarme y tomar los pasos necesarios para minimizar/eliminar mi exposición a los riesgos naturales (Escoge una.)


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Estoy totalmente en desacuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Estoy en desacuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Estoy de acuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Estoy totalmente de acuerdo | 100.00% | 1 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q25 Por favor indica su nivel de acuerdo o desacuerdo con la siguiente observación: Información sobre los riesgos asociados con peligros naturales es disponible y fácil de encontrar. (Escoge una.)


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Estoy totalmente en desacuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Estoy en desacuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Estoy de acuerdo | 100.00% | 1 |
| Estoy totalmente de acuerdo | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q26 ¿A qué grupo etario pertenece?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|---|
| Menor de 18 | 0.00% | 0 |
| 18-30 | 0.00% | 0 |
| 31-40 | 0.00% | 0 |
| 41-50 | 100.00% | 1 |
| 51-60 | 0.00% | 0 |
| 61+ | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q27 Idioma principal en su hogar:


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--|-----------|---|
| Inglés | 0.00% | 0 |
| Español | 100.00% | 1 |
| Otro indo europeo | 0.00% | 0 |
| Idiomas de Asia y las islas del Pacífico | 0.00% | 0 |
| Otro (por favor especifique) | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q28 ¿Cuál es su género?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------------|-----------|---|
| Masculino | 100.00% | 1 |
| Femenino | 0.00% | 0 |
| Prefiero no responder | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q29 Nivel de educación:


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| Primaria | 0.00% | 0 |
| Secundaria Incompleta | 100.00% | 1 |
| Secundaria Completa/GED | 0.00% | 0 |
| Unversitaria incompleta/Escuela de oficio | 0.00% | 0 |
| Unversitaria completa | 0.00% | 0 |
| Maestría/PhD | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q30 ¿Cuántos años has vivido en el Condado?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|---|
| Menos de 1 año | 0.00% | 0 |
| 1-5 años | 0.00% | 0 |
| 6-10 años | 0.00% | 0 |
| 11-20 años | 0.00% | 0 |
| Mas de 20 años | 100.00% | 1 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q31 ¿Usted es propietario o está alquilando su hogar?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|---|
| Propietario | 100.00% | 1 |
| Alquilando | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q32 ¿Cual es su ingreso familiar anual?


Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-------------------|-----------|---|
| \$20,000 o menos | 0.00% | 0 |
| \$20,001-\$49,999 | 0.00% | 0 |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 0.00% | 0 |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 100.00% | 1 |
| \$100,000 o mas | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q33 ¿Tiene acceso regular al internet?

Answered: 1 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|
| Si | 100.00% | 1 |
| No | 0.00% | 0 |
| No estoy seguro | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 1 |

Q34 Comentarios Adicionales

Answered: 0 Skipped: 1

Wharton County
Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

APPENDIX D.
PLAN ADOPTION RESOLUTIONS FROM
PLANNING PARTNERS

**APPENDIX D.
PLAN ADOPTION RESOLUTIONS FROM PLANNING
PARTNERS**

To Be Provided with Final Release

Wharton County

Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

APPENDIX E.

EXAMPLE PROGRESS REPORT

APPENDIX E.

EXAMPLE PROGRESS REPORT

Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Annual Progress Report

Reporting Period: 2021-2025

Background: Wharton County and the Cities of East Bernard, El Campo, and Wharton developed a hazard mitigation plan to reduce risk from all hazards by identifying resources, information, and strategies for risk reduction. The federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 requires state and local governments to develop hazard mitigation plans as a condition for federal disaster grant assistance. To prepare the plan, the participating partners organized resources, assessed risks from natural hazards within the planning area, developed planning goals and objectives, reviewed mitigation alternatives, and developed an action plan to address probable impacts from natural hazards. By completing this process, the jurisdictions maintained compliance with the Disaster Mitigation Act, achieving eligibility for mitigation grant funding opportunities afforded under FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Assistance grants. The plan can be viewed online at:

<http://www.co.wharton.tx.us/>

Summary Overview of the Plan's Progress: The performance period for the Hazard Mitigation Plan became effective on [REDACTED], 2021, with the final approval of the plan by FEMA. The initial performance period for this plan will be 5 years, with an anticipated update to the plan to occur before [REDACTED], 2025. As of this reporting period, the performance period for this plan is considered to be [REDACTED]% complete. The Hazard Mitigation Plan has targeted 68 hazard mitigation actions to be pursued during the 5-year performance period. As of the reporting period, the following overall progress can be reported:

- [REDACTED] out of [REDACTED] actions ([REDACTED] %) reported ongoing action toward completion
- [REDACTED] out of [REDACTED] actions ([REDACTED] %) were reported as being complete
- [REDACTED] out of [REDACTED] actions ([REDACTED] %) reported no action taken

Purpose: The purpose of this report is to provide an annual update on the implementation of the action plan identified in the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update. The objective is to ensure that there is a continuing and responsive planning process that will keep the Hazard Mitigation Plan dynamic and responsive to the needs and capabilities of the partner jurisdictions. This report discusses the following:

- Natural hazard events that have occurred within the last year
- Changes in risk exposure within the planning area (all of Wharton County)
- Mitigation success stories
- Review of the action plan
- Changes in capabilities that could impact plan implementation
- Recommendations for changes/enhancement

- The Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee: The Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee, made up of planning partners and stakeholders within the planning area, reviewed and approved this progress report at its annual meeting held on _____, 202_. It was determined through the plan's development process that a Steering Committee would remain in service to oversee the maintenance of the plan. At a minimum, the Steering Committee will provide technical review and oversight on the development of the annual progress report. It is anticipated that there will be turnover in the membership annually, which will be documented in the progress reports. For this reporting period, the Steering Committee membership is as indicated in Table 1.

Natural Hazard Events within the Planning Area: During the reporting period, there were natural hazard events in the planning area that had a measurable impact on people or property. A summary of these events is as follows:

- Changes in Risk Exposure in the Planning Area:** *(Insert a brief overview of any natural hazard event in the planning area that changed the probability of occurrence or ranking of risk for the hazards addressed in the hazard mitigation plan)*

E - 2

Review of the Action Plan: Table 2 reviews the action plan, reporting the status of each action. Reviewers of this report should refer to the Hazard Mitigation Plan for more detailed descriptions of each action and the prioritization process.

Address the following in the “status” column of the following table:

- Was any element of the action carried out during the reporting period?
- If no action was completed, why?
- Is the timeline for implementation for the action still appropriate?

If the action was completed, does it need to be changed or removed from the action plan?

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

| Action No. | Title | Action Taken? (Yes or No) | Timeline | Priority | Status Comments | Status (√, O, X) |
|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|
| WHARTON COUNTY | | | | | | |
| 1 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the County (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | | | | | |
| 2 | Update and adopt the Wharton County Flood Insurance Study and FIRM | | | | | |
| 3 | Adopt “Higher Standard” Riverine Flood Damage Prevention Ordinances and Standards | | | | | |
| 4 | Join FEMA’s CRS Program | | | | | |
| 5 | Create/Maintain a Wharton Disaster Response Team | | | | | |
| 6 | Implement a Wharton County Flood Warning/Monitoring System | | | | | |
| 7 | Install emergency backup generators at critical facilities | | | | | |
| 8 | Educate the community on hazards | | | | | |
| 9 | Drainage Master Plan Update | | | | | |
| 10 | Update Subdivision Ordinance | | | | | |
| 11 | Collaborate with Regional Flood Planning Group | | | | | |
| 12 | Collaborate with local canal owners to identify funding to improve and expand existing infrastructure | | | | | |
| 13 | Collaborate with local MUD Districts to establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | | | | | |
| 14 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | | | | | |
| 15 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | | | | | |

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

| Action No. | Title | Action Taken? (Yes or No) | Timeline | Priority | Status Comments | Status (✓, O, X) |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|
| 16 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | | | | | |
| 17 | Establish a county-wide hazardous material response team | | | | | |
| CITY OF EAST BERNARD | | | | | | |
| 1 | Purchase Public Hazard Alert System | | | | | |
| 2 | Organize outreach program for vulnerable populations | | | | | |
| 3 | Prepare and adopt a stormwater drainage plan and ordinance | | | | | |
| 4 | Update emergency response plan | | | | | |
| 5 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | | | | | |
| 6 | Install emergency generators at critical facilities | | | | | |
| 7 | Implementation of Zoning Ordinance | | | | | |
| 8 | Update Comprehensive Plan | | | | | |
| 9 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | | | | | |
| 10 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | | | | | |
| 11 | Collaborate with local MUD Districts to establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | | | | | |
| 12 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | | | | | |
| 13 | GIS Mapping | | | | | |

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

| Action No. | Title | Action Taken? (Yes or No) | Timeline | Priority | Status Comments | Status (√, O, X) |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|
| 14 | Establish a hazardous material response team | | | | | |
| CITY OF EL CAMPO | | | | | | |
| 1 | Provide education on water conservation techniques | | | | | |
| 2 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | | | | | |
| 3 | Adopt freeboard ordinance | | | | | |
| 4 | Adopt IBC and IRC | | | | | |
| 5 | GIS mapping | | | | | |
| 6 | Outreach to vulnerable populations regarding extreme and adverse weather/conditions | | | | | |
| 7 | Implement Master Drainage Plan (7 projects) | | | | | |
| 8 | Educate the community on all hazards | | | | | |
| 9 | Alternative notification/alert system | | | | | |
| 10 | Establish Post Disaster Temporary Transfer Center | | | | | |
| 11 | Establish/implement drought/expansive soils contingency plan | | | | | |
| 12 | Update Drainage master plan | | | | | |
| 13 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | | | | | |
| 14 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | | | | | |
| 15 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | | | | | |
| 16 | Establish an all hazards response team | | | | | |
| 17 | Install emergency generators at critical facilities | | | | | |

**TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX**

| Action No. | Title | Action Taken? (Yes or No) | Timeline | Priority | Status Comments | Status (✓, O, X) |
|------------------------|--|------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|
| CITY OF WHARTON | | | | | | |
| 1 | Clean and repair storm drains routinely | | | | | |
| 2 | Increase freeboard requirements for permitting structures in the floodplain | | | | | |
| 3 | Implement a comprehensive watershed ordinance for new development | | | | | |
| 4 | Acquire, reuse, and preserve open spaces adjacent to flood-prone areas | | | | | |
| 5 | Educate the community on the hazards | | | | | |
| 6 | Minimize the impact of flooding by installing berms and levees where appropriate | | | | | |
| 7 | Develop flood-reduction / stream restoration/channelization projects to ensure adequate drainage/diversion of stormwater | | | | | |
| 8 | Establish a reserve fund for emergency and public mitigation measures | | | | | |
| 9 | Strengthen and harden at-risk critical facilities | | | | | |
| 10 | Acquisition and relocation, elevation and “demo-rebuild” of flood-prone structures | | | | | |
| 11 | Install emergency backup generators at critical facilities | | | | | |
| 12 | Use impact fees to help fund public hazard mitigation projects related to land development | | | | | |

TABLE 2.
ACTION PLAN MATRIX

| Action No. | Title | Action Taken? (Yes or No) | Timeline | Priority | Status Comments | Status (√, O, X) |
|--|---|------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|
| 13 | Implement warning systems | | | | | |
| 14 | Establish/implement drought/expansive soil contingency plan | | | | | |
| 15 | Update/implement Drainage Master Plan | | | | | |
| 16 | Improve drainage infrastructure throughout the city (Bridge, culvert, channel, levee, and dam projects) | | | | | |
| 17 | Develop a plan to improve Pandemic response | | | | | |
| 18 | Conduct after-action report and improvement plan meeting in regard to COVID-19 Pandemic | | | | | |
| 19 | Collaborate with local groundwater district to monitor land subsidence | | | | | |
| 20 | Establish a hazardous material response team | | | | | |
| <p>Completion statues legend:</p> <p>√ = Project Completed</p> <p>O = Action ongoing toward completion</p> <p>X = No progress at this time</p> | | | | | | |

Changes That May Impact Implementation of the Plan: (Insert a brief overview of any significant changes in the planning area that would have a profound impact on the implementation of the plan. Specify any changes in technical, regulatory, and financial capabilities identified during the plan’s development)

Recommendations for Changes or Enhancements: Based on the review of this report by the Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee, the following recommendations will be noted for future updates or revisions to the plan:

- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Public review notice: *The contents of this report are considered to be public knowledge and have been prepared for total public disclosure. Copies of the report have been provided to the governing boards of all planning partners and local media outlets and the report is posted on the Wharton County Hazard Mitigation Plan website. Any questions or comments regarding the contents of this report should be directed to:*

Insert Contact Info Here

