



San Mateo County

# HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

July 2016



## VOLUME 2





# Tables of Contents

## SECTION 1: ANNEX INTRODUCTION

**Chapter 1. Planning Partner Participation..... 1**

- 1.1 Background..... 1
- 1.2 The Planning Partnership..... 1
- 1.3 Annex Preparation Process..... 3
- 1.4 Compatibility with Previous Regional Hazard Plan..... 7
- 1.5 Final Coverage under this Plan ..... 8
- 1.6 California Environmental Quality Act ..... 9

## SECTION 2: ANNEXES FOR MUNICIPAL PARTNERS

**Chapter 1. County of San Mateo (Unincorporated Area) ..... 1**

- 1.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 1
- 1.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 1
- 1.3 Capability Assessment ..... 5
- 1.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 11
- 1.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 13
- 1.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 14
- 1.7 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 15
- 1.8 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 15
- 1.9 Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability..... 34

**Chapter 2. Town of Atherton..... 36**

- 2.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 36
- 2.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 36
- 2.3 Capability Assessment ..... 37
- 2.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 42
- 2.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 42
- 2.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 42
- 2.7 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 43
- 2.8 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 43
- 2.9 Additional Comments ..... 47

**Chapter 3. City of Belmont ..... 51**

- 3.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 51
- 3.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 51
- 3.3 Capability Assessment ..... 52
- 3.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 57
- 3.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 59
- 3.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 59





3.7	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	60
3.8	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	60
<b>Chapter 4.</b>	<b>City of Brisbane .....</b>	<b>71</b>
4.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	71
4.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	71
4.3	Capability Assessment .....	73
4.4	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	77
4.5	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	79
4.6	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	79
4.7	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	80
4.8	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	81
<b>Chapter 5.</b>	<b>City of Burlingame .....</b>	<b>92</b>
5.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	92
5.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	92
5.3	Capability Assessment .....	93
5.4	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	97
5.5	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	98
5.6	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	99
5.7	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	99
5.8	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	99
<b>Chapter 6.</b>	<b>Town of Colma .....</b>	<b>111</b>
6.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	111
6.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	111
6.3	Capability Assessment .....	113
6.4	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	118
6.5	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	119
6.6	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	120
6.7	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	121
6.8	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	121
6.9	Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability.....	125
6.10	Additional Comments .....	125
<b>Chapter 7.</b>	<b>City of Daly City .....</b>	<b>129</b>
7.1	Capability Assessment .....	130
7.2	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	135
7.3	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	136
7.4	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	136
7.5	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	136
7.6	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	137
<b>Chapter 8.</b>	<b>City of East Palo Alto.....</b>	<b>143</b>
8.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	143





8.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 143

8.3 Capability Assessment ..... 144

8.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 149

8.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 150

8.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 150

8.7 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 150

8.8 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 151

**Chapter 9. City of Half Moon Bay ..... 160**

9.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 160

9.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 160

9.3 Capability Assessment ..... 161

9.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 166

9.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 167

9.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 167

9.7 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 167

9.8 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 168

**Chapter 10. Town Of Hillsborough ..... 179**

10.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 179

10.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 179

10.3 Capability Assessment ..... 181

10.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 185

10.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 186

10.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 186

10.7 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 187

10.8 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 187

10.9 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ..... 191

**Chapter 11. City of Menlo Park ..... 199**

11.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 199

11.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 199

11.3 Capability Assessment ..... 201

11.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 208

11.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 210

11.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 210

11.7 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 211

11.8 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 211

**Chapter 12. City of Millbrae ..... 222**

12.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 222

12.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 222

12.3 Capability Assessment ..... 224

12.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 232





12.5	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	233
12.6	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	233
12.7	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	234
12.8	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	234
12.9	Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability.....	237
12.10	Additional Comments .....	237
<b>Chapter 13. City of Pacifica.....</b>		<b>243</b>
13.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	243
13.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	243
13.3	Capability Assessment .....	244
13.4	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	249
13.5	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	250
13.6	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	251
13.7	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	252
13.8	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	252
13.9	Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability.....	256
13.10	Additional Comments .....	256
<b>Chapter 14. Town of Portola Valley.....</b>		<b>265</b>
14.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	265
14.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	265
14.3	Capability Assessment .....	266
14.4	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	271
14.5	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	272
14.6	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	273
14.7	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	273
14.8	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	273
<b>Chapter 15. City of Redwood City .....</b>		<b>285</b>
15.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	285
15.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	285
15.3	Capability Assessment .....	288
15.4	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	293
15.5	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	294
15.6	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	295
15.7	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	296
15.8	Status of Previous Plan Initiatives.....	296
15.9	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	299
<b>Chapter 16. City of San Bruno .....</b>		<b>313</b>
16.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	313
16.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	313
16.3	Capability Assessment .....	314





16.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 319

16.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 319

16.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 320

16.7 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 320

16.8 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 320

16.9 Additional Comments ..... 330

**Chapter 17. City of San Carlos ..... 336**

17.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 336

17.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 336

17.3 Capability Assessment ..... 338

17.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 343

17.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 344

17.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 345

17.7 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 345

17.8 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 346

**Chapter 18. City of South San Francisco..... 358**

18.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 358

18.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 358

18.3 Capability Assessment ..... 359

18.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 363

18.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 364

18.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 364

18.7 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 365

18.8 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 365

18.9 Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability..... 369

**Chapter 19. Town of Woodside..... 377**

19.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 377

19.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 377

19.3 Capability Assessment ..... 378

19.4 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 384

19.5 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 385

19.6 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 385

19.7 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 385

19.8 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 386

19.9 Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability..... 390

19.10 Additional Comments ..... 390

**SECTION 3: ANNEXES FOR SPECIAL DISTRICT PARTNERS**

**Part 1 - Fire Districts**

**Chapter 1. Belmont Fire Protection District ..... 1**





1.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	1
1.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	1
1.3	Planning and regulatory Capabilities .....	3
1.4	Fiscal, Administrative and Technical Capabilities .....	3
1.5	Education and Outreach Capabilities.....	4
1.6	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	4
1.7	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	5
1.8	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	6
1.9	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	6
1.10	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	6
<b>Chapter 2.</b>	<b>Colma Fire Protection District.....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	10
2.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	10
2.3	Planning and regulatory Capabilities .....	11
2.4	Fiscal, ADMINISTRATIVE and TECHNICAL Capabilities.....	11
2.5	Education and Outreach Capabilities.....	12
2.6	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	13
2.7	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	14
2.8	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	14
2.9	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	14
2.10	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	15
<b>Chapter 3.</b>	<b>Woodside Fire Protection District .....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	18
3.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	18
3.3	Planning and Regulatory Capabilities .....	20
3.4	Fiscal, Administrative and Technical Capabilities .....	20
3.5	Education and Outreach Capabilities.....	21
3.6	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	22
3.7	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	23
3.8	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	24
3.9	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	24
3.10	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	25
3.11	Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability.....	27
3.12	Additional Comments .....	28
<b>Part 2 – Water Districts</b>		
<b>Chapter 4.</b>	<b>Mid-Peninsula Water District .....</b>	<b>30</b>
4.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	30
4.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	30
4.3	Special Purpose District Critical Facilities .....	30





4.4 Planning and regulatory Capabilities ..... 32

4.5 Fiscal, ADMINISTRATIVE and TECHNICAL Capabilities ..... 32

4.6 Education and Outreach Capabilities..... 33

4.7 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 34

4.8 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 34

4.9 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 35

4.10 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 35

4.11 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 36

4.12 Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability..... 38

**Chapter 5. North Coast County Water District..... 39**

5.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 39

5.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 39

5.3 Planning and Regulatory Capabilities ..... 41

5.4 Fiscal, ADMINISTRATIVE and TECHNICAL Capabilities ..... 42

5.5 Education and Outreach Capabilities..... 42

5.6 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 43

5.7 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 43

5.8 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 44

5.9 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 45

5.10 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 46

5.11 Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability..... 48

**Chapter 6. Westborough Water District..... 49**

6.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 49

6.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 49

6.3 Planning and regulatory Capabilities ..... 50

6.4 Fiscal, ADMINISTRATIVE and TECHNICAL Capabilities ..... 51

6.5 Education and Outreach Capabilities..... 51

6.6 Integration with Other Planning Initiatives ..... 52

6.7 Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History..... 53

6.8 Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities ..... 53

6.9 Hazard Risk Ranking..... 53

6.10 Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions..... 54

6.11 Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability..... 56

**Part 3 – Education Districts**

**Chapter 7. Jefferson Union High School District ..... 58**

7.1 Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact ..... 58

7.2 Jurisdiction Profile ..... 58

7.3 Planning and Regulatory Capabilities ..... 61

7.4 Fiscal, ADMINISTRATIVE and TECHNICAL Capabilities..... 62

7.5 Education and Outreach Capabilities..... 63







7.6	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	63
7.7	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	64
7.8	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	65
7.9	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	65
7.10	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	65
7.11	Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability.....	68
7.12	Additional Comments .....	68
<b>Chapter 8. Pacifica School District .....</b>		<b>69</b>
8.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	69
8.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	69
8.3	Planning and regulatory Capabilities .....	70
8.4	Fiscal, ADMINISTRATIVE and TECHNICAL Capabilities.....	71
8.5	Education and Outreach Capabilities.....	72
8.6	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	72
8.7	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	73
8.8	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	73
8.9	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	74
8.10	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	74
8.11	Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability.....	76
<b>Chapter 9. San Mateo County Community College District .....</b>		<b>77</b>
9.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	77
9.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	77
9.3	Planning and regulatory Capabilities .....	83
9.4	Fiscal, ADMINISTRATIVE and TECHNICAL Capabilities.....	83
9.5	Education and Outreach Capabilities.....	84
9.6	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	85
9.7	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	88
9.8	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	89
9.9	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	89
9.10	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	89
9.11	Future Needs to Better Understand Risk/Vulnerability.....	97
9.12	Additional Comments .....	97
<b>Part 4 – Recreation District</b>		
<b>Chapter 10. Highlands Recreation District .....</b>		<b>101</b>
10.1	Hazard Mitigation Plan Point of Contact .....	101
10.2	Jurisdiction Profile .....	101
10.3	Assets.....	102
10.4	Planning and regulatory Capabilities .....	103
10.5	Fiscal, ADMINISTRATIVE and TECHNICAL Capabilities.....	103





10.6	Education and Outreach Capabilities.....	104
10.7	Integration with Other Planning Initiatives .....	104
10.8	Jurisdiction-Specific Natural Hazard Event History.....	105
10.9	Jurisdiction-Specific Vulnerabilities .....	105
10.10	Hazard Risk Ranking.....	106
10.11	Hazard Mitigation Action Plan and Evaluation of Recommended Actions.....	107

## List of Appendices

**Appendix A** – San Mateo Planning Partner Expectations

**Appendix B** – Letters of Intent

**Appendix C** – Jurisdiction Involvement

**Appendix D** – San Mateo Linkage Procedures

**Appendix E** – Annex Instructions and Templates



# SECTION 1: ANNEX INTRODUCTION

---



# Chapter 1.

## Planning Partner Participation

### 1.1 Background

Region IX of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) both encourage multi-jurisdictional planning for hazard mitigation. Such planning efforts require all participating jurisdictions to fully participate in the process and formally adopt the resulting planning document. Chapter 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44CFR) states:

*“Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g. watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process and has officially adopted the plan.” (Section 201.6.a(4))*

In the preparation of the San Mateo County Hazard Mitigation Plan, a Planning Partnership was formed to leverage resources and to meet requirements of the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA) for as many eligible local governments in San Mateo County as possible. The DMA defines a local government as follows: “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.” There are two types of Planning Partners in this process, with distinct needs and capabilities:

- ❖ Incorporated municipalities (cities and the County)
- ❖ Special districts.

Figure 3-1 shows the special districts within San Mateo County.

### 1.2 The Planning Partnership

#### 1.2.1 Initial Solicitation and Letters of Intent

The planning team solicited the participation of the County and all County-recognized special districts with junior taxing authority at the outset of this project. Two meetings were held on October 19, 2015 (via teleconference) and October 27, 2015 to identify potential stakeholders for this process.

A planning process kickoff meeting was held in Belmont on November 18, 2015 to solicit planning partners and inform potential partners of the benefits of participation in this effort. All eligible local governments within the planning area were invited to attend. Various agency and citizen stakeholders were also invited to this meeting. The goals of the meeting were as follows:

- ❖ Provide an overview of the Disaster Mitigation Act.



- ❖ Outline the San Mateo County plan update work plan.
- ❖ Describe the benefits of multi-jurisdictional planning.
- ❖ Solicit planning partners.
- ❖ Confirm a Steering Committee.

All interested local governments were provided with a list of planning partner expectations developed by the planning team and were informed of the obligations required for participation. Local governments wishing to join the planning effort were asked to provide the planning team with a “notice of intent to participate” that agreed to the planning partner expectations (see Volume 2, Appendix A) and designated a point of contact for their jurisdiction. In all, formal commitment was received from 29 planning partners by the planning team, and the San Mateo County Planning Partnership was formed. Figure 3-1 in Section 3 – Special Districts – shows the location of participating special districts. Maps for each participating city are provided in the individual annex for that city.

### 1.2.2 Planning Partner Expectations

The planning team developed the following list of planning partner expectations, which were confirmed at the kickoff meeting held on November 18, 2015:

- ❖ Each partner will provide a “Letter of Intent to Participate.”
- ❖ Each partner will support and participate in the selection and function of the Steering Committee overseeing the development of the update. Support includes allowing this body to make decisions regarding plan development and scope on behalf of the partnership.
- ❖ Each partner will provide support 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 such activities, and attendance records will be used to track and document participation for each planning partner. No minimum level of participation will be established, but each planning partner should attempt to attend all such activities.

- ❖ Each partner will be expected to perform a “consistency review” of all technical studies, plans, and ordinances specific to hazards identified within the planning area to determine the existence of plans, studies or ordinances not consistent with the equivalent documents reviewed in preparation of the County plan. For example: if a planning partner has a floodplain management plan that makes recommendations that are not consistent with any of the County’s basin plans, that plan will need to be reviewed for probable incorporation into the plan for the partner’s area.



- ❖ 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 will be up to each partner.
- ❖ Each partner will be expected to review the mitigation recommendations chosen for the overall county and determine if 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 determine their benefits and costs.
- ❖ Each partner will be required to create its own action plan that identifies each project, who will oversee the task, how it will be financed and when it is estimated to occur.
- ❖ Each partner will be required to formally adopt the plan.

It should be noted that by adopting this plan, each planning partner also agrees to the plan implementation and maintenance protocol established in Volume 1. All jurisdictions covered under this plan fulfilled the planning partner expectations outlined in this section.

### 1.2.3 Linkage Procedures

Eligible local jurisdictions that did not participate in development of this hazard mitigation plan update may comply with DMA requirements by linking to this plan following the procedures outlined in Volume 2, Appendix D.

## 1.3 Annex Preparation Process

### 1.3.1 Templates

Templates were created to help the Planning Partners prepare their jurisdiction-specific annexes. Since special districts operate differently from incorporated municipalities, separate templates were created for the two types of jurisdictions. The templates were created so that all criteria of Section 201.6 of 44CFR would be met, based on the partners' capabilities and mode of operation. Each partner was asked to participate in a technical assistance workshop during which key elements of the template were completed by a designated point of contact for each partner and a member of the planning team. The templates were set up to lead each partner through a series of steps that would generate the DMA-required elements that are specific for each partner. The templates and their instructions can be found in Appendix E to this volume of the Hazard Mitigation Plan.

### 1.3.2 Workshop

A workshop was held on April 20th for Planning Partners to learn about the templates and the overall planning process. Topics included the following:

- ❖ DMA
- ❖ San Mateo County plan background
- ❖ The templates
- ❖ Risk ranking 2.2 pp



- ❖ Developing your action plan
- ❖ Cost/benefit review

Separate sessions were held for special districts and municipalities, in order to better address each type of partner's needs. The sessions provided technical assistance and an overview of the template completion process. In the risk-ranking exercise, planning partners were provided an overview of the methodology associated with establishing jurisdiction-specific risk rankings based on the impact on its population or facilities. Cities based this ranking on probability of occurrence and the potential impact on people, property and the economy. Special districts based this ranking on probability of occurrence and the potential impact on their constituency, their vital facilities and the facilities' functionality after an event. The methodology followed that used for the county-wide risk ranking presented in Volume 1. A principal objective of this exercise was to familiarize the partnership with how to use the risk assessment as a tool to support other planning and hazard mitigation processes. Tools utilized during these sessions included the following:

- ❖ The San Mateo County risk assessment results
- ❖ Hazard mitigation catalogs
- ❖ Federal funding and technical assistance catalogs
- ❖ Hazard information for presidentially declared disasters for San Mateo County
- ❖ Aggregate county data for non-declared hazard events from the Spatial Hazard Events and Losses Database (SHELDUS)
- ❖ Copies of partners' prior annexes (Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), if applicable)

Eight participating jurisdictions elected to hold an individual jurisdictional workshop that focused on the above bullets with stakeholders from various departments. Of these eight jurisdictions, two participated in the overall jurisdictional workshop and six elected to hire a contractor to guide them through the annex development process:

- ❖ Unincorporated San Mateo County
- ❖ Colma – facilitated by contractor
- ❖ East Palo Alto
- ❖ Redwood City– facilitated by contractor
- ❖ San Carlos– facilitated by contractor
- ❖ Colma Fire Protection District– facilitated by contractor
- ❖ San Mateo County Community College– facilitated by contractor
- ❖ Woodside Fire Protection District– facilitated by contractor

These jurisdictions elected to hold individual workshops because they established jurisdictional subcommittees comprised of planners, building officials, public works personnel, public information officers, and other stakeholders to fulfill the planning partner expectations. Table 1-1 illustrates the additional effort undertaken by these jurisdictions in fulfilling the planning partner expectations beyond minimum requirements.



TABLE 1-1. JURISDICTION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Jurisdiction	Jurisdictional Lead	Date	Topics Covered
Unincorporated San Mateo County	Roberto Bartoli	February 3, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Jurisdictional overview review</li> <li>▪ Capability assessment review</li> </ul>
		March 2, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overview of Public Involvement Strategy</li> <li>▪ County SWOO</li> </ul>
		April 6, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review of Risk Assessment and Plan Maintenance</li> </ul>
		May 3, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Discussion of Action Plan Development</li> </ul>
		June 8, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review of Draft Annex</li> <li>▪ Plan approval process discussion</li> </ul>
Colma	Michael Laughlin	March 18, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Jurisdictional overview review</li> <li>▪ Capability assessment review</li> </ul>
		April 26, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Workshop items</li> </ul>
Redwood City	David Pucci	February 29, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Jurisdictional overview review</li> </ul>
		April 13, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capability assessment review</li> </ul>
		May 18, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Workshop items</li> </ul>
San Carlos	Tara Peterson	March 18, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Jurisdictional overview review</li> <li>▪ Capability assessment review</li> </ul>
		May 2, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Workshop items</li> </ul>
Colma Fire Protection District	Geoff Balton	May 2, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site walkthrough</li> <li>▪ Jurisdictional overview review</li> <li>▪ Capability assessment review</li> <li>▪ Workshop items</li> </ul>
San Mateo County Community College District	Joseph Fullerton	May 3, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Jurisdictional overview review</li> <li>▪ Capability assessment review</li> <li>▪ Workshop items</li> </ul>
Woodside Fire Protection District	Daniel Ghorso	May 2, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Jurisdictional overview review</li> <li>▪ Capability assessment review</li> <li>▪ Workshop items</li> </ul>

### 1.3.3 Prioritization

44CFR requires actions identified in the action plan to be prioritized (Section 201.c.3.iii). The planning team and steering committee developed a methodology for prioritizing the action plans that meets the needs of the partnership and the requirements of 44CFR. The actions were prioritized according to the following criteria:

- ❖ **High Priority**—Project meets multiple plan objectives, benefits exceed cost, funding is secured under existing programs, or is grant eligible, and project can be completed in 1 to 5 years (i.e., short term project) once funded.





- ❖ **Medium Priority**—Project meets at least 1 plan objective, benefits exceed costs, requires special funding authorization under existing programs, grant eligibility is questionable, and project can be completed in 1 to 5 years once funded.
- ❖ **Low Priority**—Project will mitigate the risk of a hazard, benefits exceed costs, funding has not been secured, project is not grant eligible, and time line for completion is long term (5 to 10 years).

These priority definitions are dynamic and can change from one category to another based on changes to a parameter such as availability of funding. For example, a project might be assigned a medium priority because of the uncertainty of a funding source, but be changed to high once a funding source has been identified. The prioritization schedule for this plan will be reviewed and updated as needed annually through the plan maintenance strategy.

### 1.3.4 Benefit/Cost Review

44CFR requires the prioritization of the action plan to emphasize a benefit/cost analysis of the proposed actions. Because some actions may not be implemented for up to 10 years, benefit/cost analysis was qualitative and not of the detail required by FEMA for project grant eligibility under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) and Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) grant program. A review of the apparent benefits versus the apparent cost of each project was performed. Parameters were established for assigning subjective ratings (high, medium, and low) to costs and benefits as follows:

- ❖ Cost ratings:
  - **High**—Existing funding levels are not adequate to cover the costs of the proposed action; implementation would require an increase in revenue through an alternative source (for example, bonds, grants, and fee increases).
  - **Medium**—The action could be implemented with existing funding but would require a re-apportionment of the budget or a budget amendment, or the cost of the action would have to be spread over multiple years.
  - **Low**—The action could be funded under the existing budget. The action is part of or can be part of an existing, ongoing program.
- ❖ Benefit ratings:
  - **High**—The action will have an immediate impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property.
  - **Medium**—The action will have a long-term impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property or will provide an immediate reduction in the risk exposure to property.
  - **Low**—Long-term benefits of the action are difficult to quantify in the short term.

Using this approach, projects with positive benefit versus cost ratios (such as high over high, high over medium, medium over low, etc.) are considered cost-beneficial and are prioritized accordingly.





It should be noted that for many of the strategies identified in this action plan, funding might be sought under FEMA’s HMGP or PDM programs. Both of these programs require detailed benefit/cost analysis as part of the application process. These analyses will be performed on projects at the time of application preparation. The FEMA benefit-cost model will be used to perform this review. For projects not seeking financial assistance from grant programs that require this sort of analysis, the Partners reserve the right to define “benefits” according to parameters that meet their needs and the goals and objectives of this plan.

### 1.4 Compatibility with Previous Regional Hazard Plan

The jurisdictions listed in Table 1-2 previously participated in the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) regional hazard mitigation planning effort. The table lists the dates that each of these jurisdictions adopted its annex under the ABAG plan.

TABLE 1-2. ABAG PARTICIPANTS - 2010

Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction Adoption Date (2010 ABAG)
San Mateo County	March 19, 2012
Atherton	August 17, 2011
Brisbane	March 5, 2012
Burlingame	August 15, 2011
Daly City	March 12, 2011
East Palo Alto	February 21, 2012
Foster City*	November 21, 2011
Half Moon Bay	July 19, 2011
Hillsborough	July 11, 2011
Menlo Park	October 18, 2011
Millbrae	March 13, 2012
Pacifica	March 12, 2012
Portola Valley	May 11, 2011
San Bruno	March 13, 2012
San Mateo, City of*	November 21, 2011

\*Did not participate in the 2016 San Mateo County Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The ABAG plan identified over 300 regional strategies in the following categories:

- ❖ Infrastructure
- ❖ Health
- ❖ Housing
- ❖ Economy
- ❖ Government
- ❖ Education
- ❖ Land Use

During the San Mateo County Hazard Mitigation Plan development process, the Steering Committee reviewed the ABAG strategies and concluded that the previous strategy did not adequately provide measurable actions for successful implementation. The Steering Committee reviewed the previous strategy to determine which are relevant to the intent and structure of the San Mateo County planning effort to be carried forwards into





the 2016 plan. The results of this review are located in Volume 1, Appendix E. Each adopted ABAG strategy was identified with one of the following implementation status findings:

- ❖ ABAG strategy has been removed or is no longer feasible due to a lack of clarity, or non-mitigation related implementation of such action.
- ❖ ABAG strategy has been carried over to the current hazard mitigation plan as an alternative action identified in Volume I, Section 3, Chapter 2 (this applies to **bold** alternative actions).
- ❖ ABAG strategy is considered to be addressed by the goals and objectives of the 2016 hazard mitigation plan.
- ❖ ABAG Strategy was eliminated due to duplication (this applies to all strategies that are not listed in the implementation status table of the current plan located in Volume 1, Appendix E).

### 1.4.1 The City of Redwood City 2010 Hazard Mitigation Plan

The City of Redwood City conducted a hazard mitigation planning process outside of the 2010 ABAG initiative. As such, their jurisdictional annex reflects the status of previous mitigation actions, including action status and carryover, where appropriate.

## 1.5 Final Coverage under this Plan

Of the 29 committed planning partners, all fully met the participation requirements specified by the Steering Committee. Overall, 28 partners attended the workshop or held their own jurisdictional workshop, 1 partner was individually counseled by members of the Planning Team and Steering Committee, and all subsequently submitted completed templates. Therefore, all participating jurisdictions are included in this volume and will seek DMA compliance under this plan. Each planning partner identified their mitigation strategy and added general actions (G-#) to round out the action item plan. The remaining jurisdictions will need to follow the linkage procedures described in Appendix D of this volume. Table 1-3 lists the jurisdictions that submitted letters of intent and their ultimate status in this plan.

TABLE 1-3. JURISDICTIONAL PARTNER PARTICIPATION STATUS

Jurisdiction	Letter of Intent Date	Attended Workshop?	Completed Template?	Will be covered by this plan?
Unincorporated San Mateo County	December 21, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Atherton	December 15, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Belmont	December 2, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Brisbane	November 5, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Burlingame	December 1, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Colma	November 20, 2015	Yes <sup>a</sup>	Yes	Yes
Daly City	December 2, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
East Palo Alto	November 18, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Half Moon Bay	December 1, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes



TABLE 1-3. JURISDICTIONAL PARTNER PARTICIPATION STATUS

Jurisdiction	Letter of Intent Date	Attended Workshop?	Completed Template?	Will be covered by this plan?
Hillsborough	November 3, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Menlo Park	December 9, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Millbrae	December 16, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pacifica	November 5, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Portola Valley	November 25, 2015	No <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes
Redwood City	December 7, 2015	Yes <sup>a</sup>	Yes	Yes
San Bruno	December 1, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Carlos	December 2, 2015	Yes <sup>a</sup>	Yes	Yes
South San Francisco	January 4, 2016	Yes	Yes	Yes
Woodside	November 9, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Belmont Fire Protection District	November 18, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Colma Fire Protection District	December 7, 2015	Yes <sup>a</sup>	Yes	Yes
Highlands Recreation District	December 8, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jefferson Union High School District	November 20, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pacifica School District	December 7, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Mateo Community College District	January 13, 2016	Yes <sup>a</sup>	Yes	Yes
Westborough Water District	November 30, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Woodside Fire Protection District	December 17, 2015	Yes <sup>a</sup>	Yes	Yes
North Coast County Water District	December 1, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mid-Peninsula Water District	December 4, 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes

<sup>a</sup> Conducted jurisdiction-specific workshop

<sup>b</sup> Counseled by members of the Steering Committee and Planning Team in lieu of workshop attendance

## 1.6 California Environmental Quality Act

The County and the unincorporated areas have sought exemption from CEQA for the Hazard Mitigation Plan based on four different sections of the CEQA Guidelines:

- ❖ **Section 15183(d):** “The project is consistent with...a general plan of a local agency, and an EIR was certified by the lead agency for the...general plan.”
- ❖ **Section 15262:** “A project involving only feasibility or planning studies for possible future actions which the agency, board or commission has not approved, adopted, or funded does not require the preparation of an EIR or negative declaration but does require consideration of environmental factors. This section does not apply to the adoption of a plan that will have a legally binding effect on later activities.”
- ❖ **Section 15306:** “(Categorical Exemption) Class 6 consists of basic data collection, research, experimental management, and resource evaluation activities which do not result in a serious or major disturbance to an environmental resource. These may be strictly for information gathering purposes,



or as part of a study leading to an action which a public agency has not yet approved, adopted or funded.”

- ❖ **Section 15601(b)(3):** "...CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA."

Planning partners may seek exemption at their discretion.

