



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Executive Summary Amendments to the Community Safety Element of the General Plan

HEARING DATE: MARCH 24, 2010

*Date:* March 17, 2011

*Case No.:* 2011.0087M

*Project:* General Plan Amendment- Amending the Community Safety Element of the San Francisco General Plan to reference the most recent Hazard Mitigation Plan.

*Staff Contact:* Lily Langlois – (415) 575-9083  
*lily.langlois@sfgov.org*

*Reviewed By:* Sarah Dennis-Phillips– (415) 558-6314  
*sarah.dennis@sfgov.org*

*Recommendation:* **Adopt Text Amendment to the Community Safety Element of the General Plan**

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

San Francisco has not updated the Community Safety Element since 1997. The adopted element includes an outdated reference to the Hazard Mitigation Plan. On February 24, 2011, the Planning Commission adopted Motion No. 18283, a Motion of Intention to initiate the Amendment to the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco, in order to add language to reference the most recent Hazard Mitigation Plan. This amendment would allow the City and County of San Francisco to qualify for additional funding for certain disaster recovery projects.

In October 2006, the California State Legislature passed AB 2140 (Federal Disaster Act of 2000) which became effective January 1, 2007. The Federal Disaster Act of 2000 requires local governments to adopt a comprehensive Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) to receive additional federal funding after a disaster. By law, a Hazard Mitigation Plan must describe the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction; describe the jurisdiction's vulnerability to these hazards; include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses; and, contain a plan maintenance process.

Assembly Bill (AB) 2140 limits the amount of additional state funding for certain disaster recovery projects funded by the California Disaster Assistance Act (CDAA) unless the local agency has complied with the provisions set forth in AB 2140. Among other requirements, the local agency must provide a certified copy of the Resolution of Adoption to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) demonstrating that the approved Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) has been adopted and incorporated into the Safety Element of the General Plan.

Though compliance with AB 2140 is optional, noncompliance limits the City and County of San Francisco's ability to obtain additional funding for certain disaster recovery projects. Specifically, California Government Code Section 8685.9 states, "...the state share shall not exceed 75 percent of total state eligible costs unless the local agency is located within a city, county, or city and county that has adopted a local hazard mitigation plan in accordance with the Federal Disaster Act of 2000 as part of the safety element of its general plan."

The Board of Supervisors adopted the Hazard Mitigation Plan on December 16, 2008 (Resolution number 517-08). This proposed General Plan Amendment would reference the most recent Hazard Mitigation Plan.

### **SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE**

The Community Safety Element is a required element of the General Plan, addressing the City's risk of natural or technological disasters, particularly seismic hazards. The existing Community Safety Element was approved by the Planning Commission in April 1997 (Case # 1995.679M) and was adopted by Board of Supervisors on August 15, 1997 (Resolution 758-97). The Community Safety element consists of two parts, an *Introduction* section, and an *Objectives and Policies* section. There are also two documents related to the Community Safety Element: a *Summary Background Report* describing the natural hazards facing San Francisco and the programs currently in place to address them; and an *Implementation Program* describing current and proposed projects to carry out the Objectives and Policies contained here.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

On January 31, 2011, the Major Environmental Analysis of the Department determined that the Project is Exempt from Environmental Review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment received at the initiation hearing held on February 24, 2011. Public comment will be taken at the Planning Commission hearing on March 24, 2011.

### **REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION**

On February 24, 2011, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution no. 18283, a Resolution of Intention initiating an amendment to the Community Safety Element of the General Plan. Planning Department staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a resolution approving amendments to the Community Safety Element of the General Plan, and request the Board of Supervisors adopt the amendments.

### **BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

Amending the Community Safety Element to reference the most recent Hazard Mitigation Plan will allow the City and County of San Francisco to qualify for additional funding for certain disaster recovery projects.

California Assembly Bill (AB) 2140 passed in 2006, prohibits the state share for any eligible project from exceeding 75% of total state eligible costs unless the local agency is located within a city, county, or city and county that has adopted a local hazard mitigation plan in accordance with the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 as part of the safety element of its general plan, in which case the Legislature may provide for a state share of local costs that exceeds 75% of total state eligible costs. The full language of AB 2140 is provided in Exhibit C.

Because the adopted Community Safety Element does not reference the current Hazard Mitigation Plan, the City and County of San Francisco would be ineligible to receive the maximum amount of funds for disaster recovery projects.

Having a consistent safety element and FEMA-approved hazard mitigation plan would help ensure that the City and County of San Francisco (and all eligible agencies with eligible reimbursements for damaged facilities located in the city/county of SF) would be eligible for additional funding from the state of California to cover some or all of the local share of any and all reimbursements for permanent repair, replacement, restoration costs for disaster-damaged facilities.

<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	<b>Approve Text Amendments to the Community Safety Element of the General Plan</b>
------------------------	--

**Attachments:**

- Exhibit A: Draft Resolution for the General Plan Amendment
- Exhibit B: California Assembly Bill AB 2140
- Exhibit C: San Francisco Hazard Mitigation Plan - Introduction
- Exhibit D: Draft Ordinance



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Planning Commission Resolution No. HEARING DATE MARCH 24, 2011

*Date:* March 17, 2011

*Case No.:* 2011.0087M

*Project:* General Plan Amendment- Amending the Community Safety Element of the San Francisco General Plan to reference the most recent Hazard Mitigation Plan.

*Staff Contact:* Lily Langlois – (415) 575-9083  
*lily.langlois@sfgov.org*

*Reviewed By:* Sarah Dennis-Phillips– (415) 558-6314  
*sarah.dennis@sfgov.org*

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

**RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND THE SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL PLAN BY: AMENDING THE COMMUNITY SAFETY ELEMENT TO ADD A REFERENCE TO THE MOST RECENT HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN; AND MAKING FINDINGS, INCLUDING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1, AND ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS**

**WHEREAS**, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco mandates that the Planning Department shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection proposed amendments to the General Plan.

The San Francisco Planning Department is seeking to amend the Community Safety Element of the General Plan to reference the most recent San Francisco Hazard Mitigation Plan. San Francisco has not updated the Community Safety Element since 1997, as such; the adopted element includes an outdated reference to the Hazard Mitigation Plan. The proposed amendment would add language to reference the most recent Hazard Mitigation Plan. This amendment would allow the City and County of San Francisco to qualify for additional funding for certain disaster recovery projects.

In October 2006, the California State Legislature passed AB 2140 (Federal Disaster Act of 2000) which became effective January 1, 2007. The Federal Disaster Act of 2000 requires local governments to adopt a comprehensive Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) to receive additional federal funding after a disaster. By law, a Hazard Mitigation Plan must describe the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction; describe the jurisdiction's vulnerability to these hazards; include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses; and, contain a plan maintenance process.

Assembly Bill (AB) 2140 limits the amount of additional state funding for certain disaster recovery projects funded by the California Disaster Assistance Act (CDAA) unless the local agency has complied

with the provisions set forth in AB 2140. Among other requirements, the local agency must provide a certified copy of the Resolution of Adoption to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) demonstrating that the approved Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) has been adopted and incorporated into the Safety Element of the General Plan.

Though compliance with AB 2140 is optional, noncompliance limits the City and County of San Francisco's ability to obtain additional funding for certain disaster recovery projects. Specifically, California Government Code Section 8685.9 states, "...the state share shall not exceed 75 percent of total state eligible costs unless the local agency is located within a city, county, or city and county that has adopted a local hazard mitigation plan in accordance with the Federal Disaster Act of 2000 as part of the safety element of its general plan."

The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

1. That existing neighborhood serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in or ownership of such businesses enhanced.

*The proposed change would not impact neighborhood serving retail uses or future opportunities for employment.*

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

*The proposed change would not have a negative impact housing and neighborhood character.*

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.

*The proposed change would not impact affordable housing.*

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

*The proposed change would not impede MUNI transit services, overburden streets, or neighborhood parking.*

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

*The proposed change would not adversely affect the industrial or service sectors.*

6. That the City achieves the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

*The proposed change would not adversely affect preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.*

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

*The proposed change would not have an impact on landmarks or historic buildings.*

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

*The proposed change would not have an effect on parks and open spaces.*

Analysis of applicable General Plan Objectives and Policies has determined that the proposed action is, on balance, consistent with the General Plan as it is proposed to be amended.

WHEREAS, per Planning Code Section 340, that on February 24th, 2011, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 18283, initiating amendments to the Community Safety Element of the General Plan, and

WHEREAS, on January 31, 2011, the Major Environmental Analysis Section of the Department determined that the General Plan Amendment set forth in the Draft Board of Supervisor's Ordinance, as shown in Exhibit D, is Categorically Exempt from Environmental Review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060 (c) (2) – Nonphysical Project.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, That pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, the Planning Commission does hereby find that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendments and therefore adopts amendments to the General Plan contained in the attached ordinance, approved as to form by the City Attorney in Exhibit D, and recommends approval of these amendments to the Board of Supervisors.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the City Planning Commission on March 24, 2011.

Linda D. Avery  
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED:

BILL NUMBER: AB 2140      CHAPTERED  
BILL TEXT

CHAPTER 739  
FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE    SEPTEMBER 29, 2006  
APPROVED BY GOVERNOR    SEPTEMBER 29, 2006  
PASSED THE ASSEMBLY    AUGUST 21, 2006  
PASSED THE SENATE    AUGUST 17, 2006  
AMENDED IN SENATE    AUGUST 14, 2006  
AMENDED IN SENATE    JUNE 28, 2006  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY    MAY 9, 2006

INTRODUCED BY    Assembly Member Hancock

FEBRUARY 21, 2006

An act to add Sections 8685.9 and 65302.6 to the Government Code, relating to local planning.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2140, Hancock General plans: safety element.

(1) The California Disaster Assistance Act limits the state share for any eligible project to no more than 75% of total state eligible costs, except that the state share shall be up to 100% of total state eligible costs connected with certain events.

This bill would prohibit the state share for any eligible project from exceeding 75% of total state eligible costs unless the local agency is located within a city, county, or city and county that has adopted a local hazard mitigation plan in accordance with the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 as part of the safety element of its general plan, in which case the Legislature may provide for a state share of local costs that exceeds 75% of total state eligible costs.

(2) The Planning and Zoning Law requires that a city, county, or city and county general plan contain specified elements, including a safety element for the protection of the community from any unreasonable risks associated with the effects of seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, tsunami, seiche, and dam failure; slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, and other seismic, geologic, and fire hazards.

This bill would authorize a city, county, or a city and county to adopt with its safety element a federally specified local hazard mitigation plan that includes specified elements, and require the Office of Emergency Services to give preference to local jurisdictions that have not adopted a local hazard mitigation plan with respect to specified federal programs for assistance in developing and adopting a plan.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 8685.9 is added to the Government Code, to read:

8685.9. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including Section 8686, for any eligible project, the state share shall not

exceed 75 percent of total state eligible costs unless the local agency is located within a city, county, or city and county that has adopted a local hazard mitigation plan in accordance with the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-390) as part of the safety element of its general plan adopted pursuant to subdivision (g) of Section 65302. In that situation, the Legislature may provide for a state share of local costs that exceeds 75 percent of total state eligible costs.

SEC. 2. Section 65302.6 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65302.6. (a) A city, county, or a city and county may adopt with its safety element pursuant to subdivision (g) of Section 65302 a local hazard mitigation plan (HMP) specified in the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (P. L. 106-390). The hazard mitigation plan shall include all of the following elements called for in the federal act requirements:

(1) An initial earthquake performance evaluation of public facilities that provide essential services, shelter, and critical governmental functions.

(2) An inventory of private facilities that are potentially hazardous, including, but not limited to, multiunit, soft story, concrete tilt-up, and concrete frame buildings.

(3) A plan to reduce the potential risk from private and governmental facilities in the event of a disaster.

(b) Local jurisdictions that have not adopted a local hazard mitigation plan shall be given preference by the Office of Emergency Services in recommending actions to be funded from the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program, the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, and the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program to assist the local jurisdiction in developing and adopting a local hazard mitigation plan, subject to available funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The City and County of San Francisco (the City) has developed this Hazard Mitigation Plan (hereinafter referred to as the 2008 HMP) to assess risks posed by natural and human-caused hazards and to develop a mitigation strategy for reducing the City's risks. The City has prepared the 2008 HMP in accordance with the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000). The Department of Emergency Management (DEM), Division of Emergency Services, has coordinated the preparation of the 2008 HMP in cooperation with other city agencies and departments. The 2008 HMP replaces the HMP prepared by the City in 2005.

This section provides a brief introduction to hazard mitigation planning, Local Mitigation Plan requirements, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mitigation grants, and a description of the 2008 HMP.

## **1.1 HAZARD MITIGATION PLANNING**

Hazard mitigation, as defined in Title 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Subpart M, Section 206.401, is "any action taken to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk to human life and property from natural hazards." In California, the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES) has expanded this definition to include human-caused hazards. As such, hazard mitigation is any work done to minimize the impacts of any type of hazard event before it occurs. It aims to reduce losses from future disasters. Hazard mitigation is a process in which hazards are identified and profiled, people and facilities at risk are analyzed, and mitigation actions are developed. The implementation of the mitigation actions, which include long-term strategies that may involve planning, policy changes, programs, projects, and other activities, is the end result of this process.

## **1.2 LOCAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS**

In recent years, local hazard mitigation planning has been driven by a new federal law, known as the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000). On October 30, 2000, Congress passed the DMA 2000 (Public Law 106-390), which amended the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act of 1988 (Stafford Act) (Title 42 of the United States Code [USC] Section 5121 et seq.) by repealing the act's previous mitigation planning section (409) and replacing it with a new mitigation planning section (322). This new section emphasized the need for state, tribal, and local entities to closely coordinate mitigation planning and implementation efforts. This new section also provided the legal basis for the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) mitigation plan requirements for mitigation grant assistance.

To implement these planning requirements, FEMA published an Interim Final Rule in the Federal Register on February 26, 2002 (FEMA 2002) (44 CFR Part 201). The planning requirements, including plan update requirements, are identified in their appropriate sections throughout this plan.

In addition to meeting the Local Mitigation Plan requirements of the DMA 2000, this plan also addresses the Local Flood Mitigation Plan requirements of the Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) grant program. The FMA grant program was created pursuant to Section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 USC 4104c) as amended by the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-325) and the Bunning-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-264). The goal of the FMA grant program

is to reduce or eliminate flood insurance claims under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Particular emphasis for this program is placed on mitigating Repetitive Loss (RL) properties.

The new Local Plan Update FEMA crosswalk, which documents compliance with 44 CFR for both the Local Mitigation Plan and the Flood Mitigation Plan requirements, is provided in Appendix A.

### **1.3 GRANT PROGRAMS WITH MITIGATION PLAN REQUIREMENTS**

Currently, five FEMA grant programs provide funding to local entities that have a FEMA-approved Local Mitigation Plan that meet the Flood Mitigation Plan requirements. Two of the grant programs are authorized under the Stafford Act and DMA 2000, and the remaining three are authorized under the National Flood Insurance Act and the Bunning-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act.

#### **1.3.1 Stafford Act Grant Programs**

**Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP):** The HMGP provides grants to state, local, and tribal entities to implement long-term hazard mitigation measures after declaration of a major disaster. The purpose of the HMGP is to reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and to enable mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery from a disaster. Projects must provide a long-term solution to a problem (for example, elevation of a home to reduce the risk of flood damage rather than buying sandbags and pumps to fight the flood). Also, a project's potential savings must be more than the cost of implementing the project. Funds may be used to protect either public or private property or to purchase property that has been subjected to, or is in danger of, repetitive damage. The amount of funding available for the HMGP under a particular disaster declaration is limited. Under the program, the Federal government may provide a state or tribe with up to 20 percent of the total disaster grants awarded by FEMA; and may provide up to 75 percent of the cost of projects approved under the program.

**Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Program:** The PDM Program provides funds to state, local, and tribal entities for hazard mitigation planning and the implementation of mitigation projects before a disaster event. PDM grants are awarded on a nationally competitive basis. Like HMGP funding, the potential savings of a PDM project must be more than the cost of implementing the project. Funds may be used to protect either public or private property or to purchase property that has been subjected to, or is in danger of, repetitive damage. The total amount of PDM funding available is appropriated by Congress on an annual basis. In fiscal year (FY) 2008, Congress appropriated \$100M for PDM grants. The Federal government provides up to 75 percent of the cost of projects approved under the program.

#### **1.3.2 National Flood Insurance Act Grant Programs**

**Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) Grant Program:** As noted above, the goal of the FMA Grant Program is to reduce or eliminate flood insurance claims under the NFIP. This program places particular emphasis on mitigating RL properties. The primary source of funding for this program is the National Flood Insurance Fund. Grant funding is available for three types of

grants: Planning, Project, and Technical Assistance. Project grants, which use the majority of the program's total funding, are awarded to local entities to apply mitigation measures to reduce flood losses to properties insured under the NFIP. In FY 2008, FMA funding totaled \$30 million. The cost-share for this grant is 75 percent federal/25 percent nonfederal. However, a cost-share of 90 percent federal/10 percent nonfederal is available in certain situations to mitigate severe repetitive loss (SRL) properties.

**Repetitive Flood Claims (RFC) Program:** The RFC Program provides funding to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk of flood damage to residential and non-residential structures insured under the NFIP. Structures considered for mitigation must have had one or more claim payments for flood damages. In FY 2008, Congress appropriated \$10 million for the implementation of this program. All RFC grants are eligible for up to 100 percent federal assistance.

**Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) Program:** The SRL Program provides funding to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk of flood damage to residential structures insured under the NFIP. Structures considered for mitigation must have had at least four NFIP claim payments over \$5,000 each, when at least two such claims have occurred within any 10-year period, and the cumulative amount of such claim payments exceeds \$20,000; or for which at least two separate claims payments have been made with the cumulative amount of the building portion of such claims exceeding the value of the property, when two such claims have occurred within any 10-year period. Congress has authorized up to \$40 million per year from FY 2005–FY 2009. The cost-share for this grant is 75 percent federal/25 percent nonfederal. However, a cost-share of 90 percent federal/10 percent nonfederal is available to mitigate SRL properties when the state or tribal plan addresses ways to mitigate SRL properties.

## **1.4 HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN DESCRIPTION**

The remainder of this 2008 HMP consists of the sections and appendices described below.

### **1.4.1 Section 2: Prerequisites**

Section 2 addresses the prerequisites of plan adoption.

### **1.4.2 Section 3: Community Description**

Section 3 provides a general history and background of San Francisco, including historical trends for population and the demographic and economic conditions that have shaped the area. A location figure of San Francisco and the Bay Area is provided in Appendix C.

### **1.4.3 Section 4: Planning Process**

Section 4 describes the plan update process, including changes made to the 2005 Multi-Jurisdictional Local Government Hazard Mitigation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area: City and County of San Francisco Annex (hereafter referred to as the 2005 HMP). This section identifies members of the Hazard Mitigation Planning Team (Planning Team), the meetings held as part of the planning process (Appendix D), and the URS Corporation consultants (hereafter referred to as the consultants). This section also documents public outreach activities (attached as

Appendix E) and the review and incorporation of relevant plans, reports, and other appropriate information.

#### **1.4.4 Section 5: Hazard Analysis**

Section 5 describes the process through which the Planning Team identified, screened, and selected the hazards to be profiled in the 2008 HMP. The hazard analysis includes the nature, history, location, extent, and probability of future events for each hazard. Extra detail is given to the flood hazard profile to meet the FMA planning requirements. Historical and location hazard figures are provided in Appendix C.

#### **1.4.5 Section 6: Vulnerability Analysis**

Section 6 identifies potentially vulnerable assets — people, residential, nonresidential, and mixed use building structures, critical and non-critical facilities, major utilities, and transportation systems — in the County limits of San Francisco. For this version of the plan, City-owned assets located outside of the County limits were not included. This data was compiled by assessing the potential impacts from each hazard using Geographic Information System (GIS) data. The resulting information identifies the full range of hazards that San Francisco could face and the potential social impacts, damages, and economic losses.

#### **1.4.6 Section 7: Capability Assessment**

Section 7 identifies and evaluates human and technical, financial, and legal and regulatory resources available for hazard mitigation within San Francisco. In addition, this section lists current, ongoing, and completed mitigation projects and programs within the City.

#### **1.4.7 Section 8: Mitigation Strategy**

The mitigation strategy (Section 8) provides a blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the vulnerability analysis. The Planning Team reviewed and revised the 2005 HMP's mitigation goals and potential actions to create a list of over two-dozen new mitigation projects. Through an evaluation and prioritization process described in this chapter, the Planning Team selected high-priority projects to be included in the implementation strategy.

#### **1.4.8 Section 9: Plan Maintenance**

Section 9 describes the formal plan maintenance process to ensure that the 2008 HMP remains an active and applicable document. The process includes monitoring, evaluating, and updating the 2008 HMP (Appendix G); implementation through existing planning mechanisms; and continued public involvement.

#### **1.4.9 Section 10: References**

Section 10 lists the reference materials used to prepare the 2008 HMP.

**1.4.10 Appendix A**

Appendix A provides the FEMA crosswalk, which documents compliance with 44 CFR for both the Local Mitigation Plan requirements and the Flood Mitigation Plan requirements.

**1.4.11 Appendix B**

Appendix B provides the Adoption Resolution.

**1.4.12 Appendix C**

Appendix C includes the figures that identify known hazard areas, previous hazard occurrences, population density, building stock, critical and non-critical facilities, major utilities, and transportation systems.

**1.4.13 Appendix D**

Appendix D contains the Planning Team meeting information for meetings #1, #2, and #3.

**1.4.14 Appendix E**

Appendix E provides public outreach information, including information posted on DEM's website and the Disaster Preparedness Coordinators' Meeting presentation.

**1.4.15 Appendix F**

Appendix F lists the name and neighborhood of each public asset included in the vulnerability analysis.

**1.4.16 Appendix G**

Appendix G provides the plan maintenance documents.

**1.4.17 Appendix H**

Appendix H provides an electronic version of the 2008 HMP on a CD.

1 [General Plan Amendment –Community Safety Element]

2  
3 **Ordinance amending the San Francisco General Plan by amending the Community**  
4 **Safety Element to reference the most recent Hazard Mitigation Plan; and making**  
5 **findings, including findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority**  
6 **policies of Planning Code Section 101.1, and environmental findings.**

7 NOTE: Additions are single-underline italics Times New Roman;  
8 deletions are ~~strike-through italics Times New Roman~~.  
9 Board amendment additions are double-underlined;  
Board amendment deletions are ~~strikethrough normal~~.

10 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

11 Section 1. Section 1. Findings.

12 A. Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides  
13 that the Planning Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors, for  
14 approval or rejection, proposed amendments to the General Plan.

15 B. On \_\_\_\_\_, the Board of Supervisors received from the Planning  
16 Department proposed General Plan amendments to the Community Safety Element of the  
17 General Plan, which was adopted by the Planning Commission on \_\_\_\_\_.

18 C. Section 4.105 of the City Charter further provides that if the Board of  
19 Supervisors fails to Act within 90 days of receipt of the proposed General Plan Amendment,  
20 then the proposed amendment shall be deemed approved.

21 D. San Francisco Planning Code Section 340 provides that an amendment to the  
22 General Plan may be initiated by a resolution of intention by the Planning Commission, which  
23 refers to, and incorporates by reference, the proposed General Plan amendment. Planning  
24 Code Section 340 further provides that the Planning Commission shall adopt the proposed  
25 General Plan amendment after a public hearing if it finds from the facts presented that the

1 public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendment or any  
2 part thereof. If adopted by the Planning Commission in whole or in part, the proposed  
3 amendment shall be presented to the Board of Supervisors, which may approve or reject the  
4 amendment by a majority vote.

5 E. On February 24th, 2011, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. R-  
6 \_\_\_\_\_ initiating an amendment to the General Plan, at a duly noticed public  
7 hearing. A copy of Planning Commission Resolution No. R- \_\_\_\_\_ is on file with  
8 the Clerk of the Board in File No. \_\_\_\_\_.

9 F. On January 31, 2011, the Major Environmental Analysis of the Department  
10 determined that the Project is Exempt from Environmental Review under CEQA Guidelines  
11 Section 15378.

12 G. The Board of Supervisors finds, pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, that the  
13 General Plan Amendment set forth in the documents on file with the Clerk of the Board in File  
14 No. \_\_\_\_\_ will serve the public necessity, convenience and general  
15 welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_  
16 and incorporates those reasons herein by reference.

17 H. The Board of Supervisors finds that the General Plan Amendment, as set forth  
18 in the documents on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. \_\_\_\_\_, are  
19 in conformity with the General Plan, as it is amended by this Ordinance, and the eight priority  
20 policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission  
21 Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_. The Board hereby adopts the findings set forth in Planning  
22 Commission Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_ and incorporates those findings herein by reference.

23 Section 2. The Board of Supervisors hereby approves the following amendments to  
24 the General Plan, as recommended to the Board of Supervisors by the Planning Commission  
25 in Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_ and as shown in the Element on file with the Clerk of the

1 Board in File No. \_\_\_\_\_. Described generally, these amendments to the text of  
2 the Community Safety Element revise the reference to the San Francisco Hazard Mitigation  
3 Plan in the Community Safety Element of the General Plan to better describe the role of the  
4 Plan as an implementation program of the Community Safety Element. The text of the  
5 Introduction to the Community Safety Element, "Relationship to Other Plans and Programs,  
6 Hazard Mitigation Plan" is amended as follows:

7 Hazard Mitigation Plan: Another related plan is the Hazard Mitigation Plan, required by  
8 federal law as a condition of receiving hazard mitigation grants after a declared disaster. ~~The~~  
9 ~~City prepared a Hazard Mitigation Plan after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. It was developed by~~  
10 ~~an inter-departmental team coordinated by the Chief Administrative Officer, and adopted by the Board~~  
11 ~~of Supervisors in 1990. It contained background information similar to the Community Safety Element,~~  
12 ~~and a list of earthquake mitigation projects proposed by City departments. The Hazard Mitigation Plan~~  
13 ~~was updated, to include the projects proposed to reduce hazards from high wind and storms, such as~~  
14 ~~occurred during the winter of 1995-1996, which was a declared disaster in San Francisco. That update~~  
15 ~~is expected to cover the declared disasters of the January 1997 storms. By law, a Hazard Mitigation~~  
16 ~~Plan must describe the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction;~~  
17 ~~describe the jurisdiction's vulnerability to these hazards; include a mitigation strategy that provides the~~  
18 ~~jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses; and, contain a plan maintenance process.~~

19 The Hazard Mitigation Plan serves as one of the Implementation Programs of the Community  
20 Safety Element, and contains programs that implement its policies. The Board of Supervisors regularly  
21 adopts updates to the San Francisco Hazard Mitigation Plan.

22 APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
23 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

24 By:

25   
Susan Cleveland-Knowles  
Deputy City Attorney