

Draft Safety Element Update Comments and Responses

#	Date Received	From	Comment	Response
1	3/16/23	Seth Goldberg	Misspelling the mayor's name is not inspiring confidence that the rest of the document's details are well-vetted :{.	Noted. The Mayor's name has been corrected to the March version and was reuploaded.
2	3/19/23	Diana Froomin. Comments made on PDF of HE	<p>pg. 14 Should we encourage or require private property bridge inspections on a regular basis? A failed private property bridge during a disaster could require the diversion of resources from other parts of the community.</p> <p>pg. 15 How about pre-plans for use of buses/vans for evacuation of people when cars are trapped in their neighborhood? Could be pre-set agreements with local businesses with commuter buses, school districts or private busing companies.</p> <p>pg. 26 How is this possible with almost 100% of the City in the dam inundation zone? Can these structures be built above the inundation level?</p> <p>[Emergency Evacuation Assessment, pg 4] good thought process</p> <p>[Emergency Evacuation Assessment, pg 7] contra-flow lanes? Westbound in eastbound lanes?</p> <p>[Emergency Evacuation Assessment, pg 11] Should consider that two major employers have robust busing programs.</p> <p>[Emergency Evacuation Assessment, pg 12] In the scenario used, other regional cities will be evacuating. Do these roadway capacities consider the capacity of 101/92/280 and how they may negatively impact our rate of evacuation (capacity)?</p> <p>[Emergency Evacuation Assessment, pg 13] should consider a shelter in place for vulnerable populations in multi story buildings. Their evacuation could be coordinated after the vehicle evacuation is halted.</p>	<p>Noted. Staff will coordinate internally to discuss the current and future practice for private bridges.</p> <p>This level of detail / planning would be covered in an evacuation operations plan, which is an action in the Safety Element.</p> <p>Special flood hazard areas are FEMA 100 year flood zone, which is outside the Levee.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This would be covered in an Emergency operations plan.</p> <p>An Emergency operations plan would include this consideration.</p> <p>No, but as part of an operations plan the city would coordinate with Caltrans.</p> <p>Yes, that level of detail would be covered in an operations plan. This study is to evaluate evacuation capacity under more conservative assumptions.</p>

			[Emergency Evacuation Assessment, pg 15] Could plan to open the "fire road" to Redwood Shores to vehicle traffic	Noted
			[Emergency Evacuation Assessment, pg 16] Areas where public safety has the ability to increase flow as described should be prioritized in the order of greatest increased capacity. staffing is short and not all areas will be able to be covered.	Noted
			[Emergency Evacuation Assessment, pg 16] Is there the ability to remotely change a 4-way flashing red or normal functioning signal to a green for evacuation direction and red for non-evacuation directions?	The signals at the ramps for 92 and 101 are controlled by CalTrans. An operations plans would cover this coordination effort.
3	3/20/23	Terrance Washington from Cal OES	<p>The Safety Element addresses the following Natural hazards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seismic and geological hazards such as seismic shaking, liquefaction, seiche, and tsunamis • Urban fire hazards • Flood hazards, including dam inundation • Climate Change <p>When reviewing your most recently submitted FEMA approved 2021 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, we found that the identified hazards are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sea level Rise • Climate Change • Dam Failure • Earthquake • Severe Weather • Drought • Tsunami • Landslide • Wildfire <p>Below Is the link to the California Office of Planning and Research Safety Element Guidelines</p> <p>General Plan Guidelines, Chapter 4: Required Elements (ca.gov)</p> <p>Required Contents the safety element must, consistent with Government</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorporation of the MJHMP. On page 5 of the Draft Safety Element, it is noted that the MJHMP is incorporated by reference into the Safety Element. We will highlight this to make it more apparent. 2. We can improve the connection between the list of topics in Table S-1 required by the Government Code and where they are addressed in the Element or deemed to be not a risk for Foster City. We will change Table S-1 to list the requirements on the left and the section in the Element on the right or note "not a significant hazard for Foster City". 3. The reference to the hazards identified in the 2021 MJHMP may be referring to the hazards applicable to the County as a whole. On page 9-13 of Appendix B, Table 9.6.2 lists the Hazard Risk Rankings for Foster City including zero for Landslide/Mass Movements and Wildfire. We can include an explanation in the Safety Element regarding why the

			<p>Code Section 65302(g), provide for the protection of the community from any unreasonable risks associated with the effects of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure • Tsunami, seiche, and dam failure • Slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides • Subsidence • Liquefaction • Other seismic hazards identified pursuant to Chapter 7.8 (commencing with Section 2690) of Division 2 of the Public Resources Code, and other geologic hazards known to the legislative body • Flooding • Wildland and urban fires • Climate change 	<p>risks ranked as zero were not addressed further.</p>
4	4/5/23	Connie Vial	<p>I strongly oppose any redevelopment or new construction in Foster City. The California Environmental Quality Act statute should be followed and applied to any redevelopment or new construction in Foster City due to significant environmental impact because we don't have the infrastructure, no water, sewer, added fumes from extra traffic.</p> <p>I will appreciate this email is added to the public comments for the April 19, 2023 Planning Commission Special Study Session.</p>	<p>This comment does not pertain to the Safety Element and no revisions were made to the Draft.</p>

From: [Seth Goldberg](#)
To: [Draft Safety Element](#)
Subject: Typo on page 3 Jan should be Jon
Date: Thursday, March 16, 2023 12:05:57 PM

Misspelling the mayor's name is not inspiring confidence that the rest of the document's details are well-vetted :(.

From: [Dana Froomin](#)
To: [Draft Safety Element](#)
Subject: Safety Element comments
Date: Sunday, March 19, 2023 3:18:12 PM
Attachments: [Safety Element Public Review Draft March 15 2023.pdf](#)

Please consider the comments within the attached file.

From: Washington.Terrance@CalOES
To: [Sofia Mangalam](mailto:Sofia.Mangalam@CalOES); [CalOES Mitigation Planning](mailto:CalOES.Mitigation.Planning)
Cc: [Thai-Chau Le](mailto:Thai-Chau.Le)
Subject: RE: City of Foster City Safety Element Update
Date: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 10:09:49 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)

Hey Sofia,

Excellent updates!

From: Sofia Mangalam <smangalam@fostercity.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 9:59 AM
To: Washington.Terrance@CalOES <Terrance.Washington@CalOES.ca.gov>; [CalOES Mitigation Planning](mailto:CalOES.Mitigation.Planning) <mitigationplanning@caloes.ca.gov>
Cc: Thai-Chau Le <tle@fostercity.org>
Subject: RE: City of Foster City Safety Element Update

This Message is From an External Sender
This message came from outside your organization.

Terrence,

Thank you for your comments on the Foster City Draft Safety Element. We have the following responses:

1. Incorporation of the MJHMP. On page 5 of the Draft Safety Element, it is noted that the MJHMP is incorporated by reference into the Safety Element. We will highlight this to make it more apparent.
2. We can improve the connection between the list of topics in Table S-1 required by the Government Code and where they are addressed in the Element or deemed to be not a risk for Foster City. We will change Table S-1 to list the requirements on the left and the section in the Element on the right or note "not a significant hazard for Foster City".

Table–S-1: Required Safety Element Hazards (CA Gov Code Section 65302(g)(1))	
Seismically Induced Surface Rupture	Subsidence
Ground Shaking*	Liquefaction (areas with shallow groundwater [<50 feet]) *
Ground Failure*	Slope Instability leading to Mudslides and Landslides
Flooding*	Other Geologic Hazards known to the legislative body
Tsunami*	Wildland and Urban Fires*
Seiche	Climate Change*
Dam Failure*	Evacuation*
Other Seismic Hazards identified under Chapter 7.8 (commencing with Section 2690) of Division 2 of the Public Resources Code	
Hazards denoted by an (*) are potential hazards relevant to Foster City.	

3. Your reference to the hazards identified in the 2021 MJHMP may be referring to the hazards applicable to the County as a whole. On page 9-13 of [Appendix B](#), Table 9.6.2 lists the Hazard Risk Rankings for Foster City including

zero for Landslide/Mass Movements and Wildfire. We can include an explanation in the Safety Element regarding why the risks ranked as zero were not addressed further.

9.6.2 Hazard Risk Ranking

Table 9-12 presents a local ranking of all hazards of concern for which this hazard mitigation plan provides complete risk assessments. As described in detail in Volume 1, the ranking process involves an assessment of the likelihood of occurrence for each hazard, along with its potential impacts on people, property, and the economy. Mitigation actions target hazards with high and medium rankings.

Table 9-12. Hazard Risk Ranking (Social Equity Lens applied)			
Rank	Hazard	Risk Ranking Score	Risk Category
1	Sea Level Rise / Climate Change	63	High
2	Flood	63	High
3	Dam Failure	42	High
4	Earthquake	42	High
5	Severe weather	24	Medium
6	Drought	9	Low
7	Tsunami	2	Low
8	Landslide/Mass Movements	0	Low
9	Wildfire	0	Low

Please let us know if this satisfies Cal OES requirements for the Safety Element update.



Sofia Mangalam
Community Development Director | City of Foster City

650-286-3239 | www.fostercity.org
610 Foster City Boulevard | Foster City, CA 94404



From: Washington, Terrance@CalOES <Terrance.Washington@CalOES.ca.gov>

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2023 2:45 PM

To: Foster City Planning Department <planning@fostercity.org>

Cc: CalOES Mitigation Planning <mitigationplanning@caloes.ca.gov>

Subject: City of Foster City Safety Element Update

Good Afternoon

Cal OES has reviewed the Safety Element Update to the General Plan. Our office has a couple of comments.

The Safety Element addresses the following Natural hazards:

- Seismic and geological hazards such as seismic shaking, liquefaction, seiche, and tsunamis
- Urban fire hazards
- Flood hazards, including dam inundation
- Climate Change

When reviewing your most recently submitted FEMA approved 2021 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, we found that the

identified hazards are as follows:

- Sea level Rise
- Climate Change
- Dam Failure
- Earthquake
- Severe Weather
- Drought
- Tsunami
- Landslide
- Wildfire

Below Is the link to the California Office of Planning and Research Safety Element Guidelines

[General Plan Guidelines, Chapter 4: Required Elements \(ca.gov\)](#)

Required Contents the safety element must, consistent with Government Code Section 65302(g), provide 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
- Other seismic hazards identified pursuant to Chapter 7.8 (commencing with Section 2690) of Division 2 of the Public Resources Code, and other geologic hazards known to the legislative body
- Flooding
- Wildland and urban fires
- Climate change

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment.

Siempre,

Terrance Washington, Emergency Services Coordinator
Local Hazard Mitigation Planning
Recovery - Hazard Mitigation Assistance Branch
California Governor's Office of Emergency Services



Cell: 916-917-4540

Desk: 916-636-2945

Terrance.Washington@caloes.ca.gov

www.caloes.ca.gov/Mitigation

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

WARNING: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the email is safe.

Elinor Bize

From: Connie Vial <vialproperties@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 11:22 AM
To: Foster City Public Comment
Cc: 6022aef50835525d85ef4bb8@mg.processing.zencity.io; Yelena Cappello; Laurie Rith; Rob Lasky; Aaron Siu; Austin Walsh
Subject: Harbor Cove Special Study Session

Planning Commission Members:

I strongly oppose any redevelopment or new construction in Foster City.
The California Environmental Quality Act statute should be followed and applied to any redevelopment or new construction in Foster City due to significant environmental impact because we don't have the infrastructure, no water, sewer, added fumes from extra traffic.

I will appreciate this email is added to the public comments for the April 19, 2023 Planning Commission Special Study Session.

Thanks,

Kindest regards,

Connie Vial, GRI
Broker/Owner
Vial Properties
Vialproperties@hotmail.com
Office: 650-578-0885
Cell & text: 650-799-0918
Website: www.vialproperties.com
CalBRE: #00833411

Thank you for referring your family and friends!

Sent from my iPad

From: [Leslie Carmichael](#)
To: [Sofia Mangalam](#)
Cc: [Thai-Chau Le](#); [Hannah Chan Smyth](#)
Subject: FW: Foster City Safety Element - CGS comments
Date: Thursday, April 27, 2023 12:55:45 PM

FYI

Leslie Carmichael

URBAN PLANNING PARTNERS, INC.

388 17th Street, Suite 230
Oakland, CA 94612
650.468.7890
lcarmichael@fostercity.org

From: Frost, Erik@DOC <Erik.Frost@conservation.ca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2023 11:52 AM
To: Leslie Carmichael <lcarmichael@fostercity.org>
Subject: Foster City Safety Element - CGS comments

Hello Leslie Carmichael,

The California Geological Survey (CGS) has received and reviewed the draft updated Safety Element of the Foster City General Plan. This email conveys the following recommendations from CGS concerning geologic issues related to the planning area:

1. Seismic Hazards

The Safety Element discusses liquefaction hazards and provides a map of liquefaction susceptibility (Figure S-3), which appears to be taken from USGS mapping. The CGS has also mapped zones of required investigation for liquefaction in the City. These zones, and their regulatory impact, should be discussed and displayed in the Safety Element. Additional information is available at the links below:

<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>
[https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?
map=regulatorymaps](https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps)

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Erik

Dr. Erik Frost

Senior Engineering Geologist | Seismic Hazards Program

California Geological Survey

715 P Street, MS 1901, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 205-8255
erik.frost@conservation.ca.gov

From: [Draft Safety Element](#)
To: [Erin Pang](#); [Draft Safety Element](#)
Subject: RE: Safety Element Feedback Deadline
Date: Thursday, July 20, 2023 8:12:55 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)

Hello,






I apologize for missing your emails. The Safety Element is going before Planning Commission tonight for a consideration to City Council: <https://fostercity.primegov.com/Portal/Meeting?meetingTemplateId=5022>

You can still provide comments and feedback to the Safety Element and we will have it as part of the record for Planning Commission and City Council considerations as well.

Best regards,
Thai

Thai-Chau Le
Planning Manager
Planning/Code Enforcement Division



(650) 286-3244 | www.fostercity.org | [CDD](#)
610 Foster City Boulevard
Foster City, CA 94404
    

From: Erin Pang <epang@savesfbay.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 5, 2023 10:36 AM
To: Draft Safety Element <safetyelement@fostercity.org>
Subject: RE: Safety Element Feedback Deadline

Hello,

I just wanted to follow up and see if there is still opportunity to provide feedback on the city's Safety Element draft? Is the best way to provide feedback to contact this email address?

Thank you,
Erin

From: Erin Pang
Sent: Wednesday, June 28, 2023 11:10 AM
To: safetyelement@fostercity.org
Subject: Safety Element Feedback Deadline

Hello,

Are you still accepting feedback on the Safety Element draft, and is there a deadline for providing feedback?

Thank you,

Erin Pang

POLICY ASSOCIATE

epang@savesfbay.org | 510-463-6809 | www.saveSFbay.org

Pronouns: she, her



[Protect and Restore San Francisco Bay](#)

[For People and Wildlife](#)