

**Multi-Jurisdictional  
Hazard Mitigation Plan: City of  
Oceanside Annex**

San Diego County, California

2023

This page is intentionally left blank.

# 1. SECTION ONE: Determine the Planning Area and Resources

## 1.1. Planning Area: City of Oceanside

The City of Oceanside is a coastal community, located within California's South Coast about 35 miles north of San Diego along the Interstate 5 corridor in North County. The City is the third-largest city in North San Diego County, California. The US Census in 2020 showed a population of 174,068. Oceanside is located just south of the military's Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.

## 1.2. Community Rating System Requirements

The Community Rating System (CRS) is a FEMA program and rewards communities that go beyond the minimum standards for floodplain management under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Communities can potentially improve their Community Rating System and lower NFIP premiums by developing a CRS Plan. **The City of Oceanside participates in NFIP.**

For more information on the National Flood Insurance Program, see <http://www.fema.gov/national-flood-insurance-program>.

Community Rating System (CRS) Planning Steps	Local Mitigation Planning Handbook Tasks (44 CFR Part 201)
Step 1. Organize	<b>Task 1:</b> Determine the Planning Area and Resources <b>Task 2:</b> Build the Planning Team 44 CFR 201.6(c)(1)
Step 2. Involve the public	<b>Task 3:</b> Create an Outreach Strategy 44 CFR 201.6(b)(1)
Step 3. Coordinate	<b>Task 4:</b> Review Community Capabilities 44 CFR 201.6(b)(2) & (3)
Step 4. Assess the hazard	<b>Task 5:</b> Conduct a Risk Assessment 44 CFR 201.6(c)(2)(i) 44 CFR 201.6(c)(2)(ii) & (iii)
Step 5. Assess the problem	
Step 6. Set goals	
Step 7. Review possible activities	<b>Task 6:</b> Develop a Mitigation Strategy 44 CFR 201.6(c)(3)(i) 44 CFR 201.6(c)(3)(ii) 44 CFR 201.6(c)(3)(iii)
Step 8. Draft an action plan	
Step 9. Adopt the plan	<b>Task 8:</b> Review and Adopt the Plan 44 CFR 201.6(c)(5)
Step 10. Implement, evaluate, revise	<b>Task 7:</b> Keep the Plan Current <b>Task 9:</b> Create a Safe and Resilient Community 44 CFR 201.6(c)(4)

## SECTION ONE | Determine the Planning Area and Resources

*TABLE 1: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 1.1 DESCRIBES THE CRS REQUIREMENTS MET BY THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN.*

Any jurisdiction or special district may participate in the hazard mitigation planning process. However, to request FEMA approval, each of the local jurisdictions must meet all requirements of 44 CFR §201.6. In addition to the requirement for participation in the process, the Federal regulation specifies the following requirements for multi-jurisdictional plans:

- The risk assessment must assess each jurisdiction's risk where they may vary from the risks facing the entire planning area. (44 CFR §201.6(c)(2)(iii))
- There must be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan. (44 CFR §201.6(c)(3)(iv))
- Each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan must document that it has been formally adopted. (44 CFR §201.6(c)(5))

The hazard mitigation plan must clearly list the jurisdictions that participated in the plan and are seeking plan approval. The San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and annexes meet all requirements.

## 2. SECTION TWO: Build the Planning Team

### 2.1. Planning Participants

City representatives met with subject matter experts and/or OES to specifically discuss hazard-related goals, objectives and actions as they related to the overall Plan. Representatives of numerous City departments involved in hazard mitigation planning, including Fire, Police, Planning, and Engineering provided input. City of Oceanside's lead planning participants were:

- David Parsons, Chief (Fire Department)
- Russ Cunningham, Principle Planner (Planning Department)
- Peter Lawrence, Chief (Fire Department)

### 2.2. Planning Process

The City of Oceanside Emergency Management Program is administered by the Oceanside Fire Department. The fire department engaged the Planning Department as a primary partner in the process.

- An employee was hired to assist and maintain the planning process.
- The primary team maintained regular communication with San Diego County OES to ensure timelines and understanding.
- The primary team held regular meetings.
- City of Oceanside subject matter experts were included as needed in regular meetings.
  - Water, Engineering, Planning, Public Works, Transportation, Fire, Police, Harbor
- Follow-up of action items was accomplished through phone and email communication.

See the *San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan's* Section Two for details about the county-wide Planning Process.

### **3. SECTION THREE: Create an Outreach Strategy**

See the *San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan's* Section Three for details about the county-wide outreach strategy.

## 4. SECTION FOUR: Review Community Capabilities

Local mitigation capabilities are existing authorities, policies, programs, and resources that reduce hazard impacts or that could be used to implement hazard mitigation activities, and must be included in a hazard mitigation plan by the planning team.

The planning team also may identify additional types of capabilities relevant to mitigation planning.

### 4.1. Capability Assessment

The primary types of capabilities for reducing long-term vulnerability through mitigation planning are:

- Planning and regulatory
- Administrative and technical
- Financial
- Education and outreach

#### 4.1.1. Planning and Regulatory

Planning and regulatory capabilities are the plans, policies, codes, and ordinances that prevent and reduce the impacts of hazards. Please indicate which of the following your jurisdiction has in place:

Plans	Yes/No Year	Does the plan address hazards?
		Does the plan identify projects to include in the mitigation strategy?  Can the plan be used to implement mitigation actions?
Comprehensive/Master Plan	Yes	The city is currently updating its General Plan to include the Safe and Resilient Environment Element, which will address all topics specified for the Safety Element in OPR’s General Plan Guidelines. The SRE will assess vulnerabilities to all HMP- listed hazards, includes policies meant to avoid and mitigate risks associated with natural disasters, and show evacuation routes.
Capital Improvements Plan	Yes	Capital Improvement Program (CIP) addresses projects to mitigate flooding from riverine and tidal waters while addressing emergency access to various parts of the city. The CIP also addresses water and sanitation facilities to help promote health and safety while minimizing the spread of disease. The CIP also addresses Essential Facility projects.

## SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities

Economic Development Plan	Yes	The City adopted an Economic Development Element (EDE) in 2017. The EDE does not identify hazard mitigation projects per se but it does include policies that encourage smart growth.
Local Emergency Operations Plan	Yes	Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) adopted by resolution in 2016. Covers main hazards as foreseen for the city based on single county mitigation planning. Mitigation actions are described in the Recovery Operations section of the EOP.
Continuity of Operations Plan	Yes	The City adopted a Pandemic COOP (2020) which serves as a plan for maintaining essential functions and services during a pandemic.
Transportation Plan	Yes	The current Circulation Element (CE) is being updated to the Integrated Mobility Element which would include evacuation route designation. The updated element will continue the policy of minimizing “disruption of the natural terrain, vegetation, and character of an area.”
Stormwater Management Plan	Yes	The City follows the State’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program as well as the County’s Regional Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Program.
Community Wildfire Protection Plan	No	
M. Real estate disclosure requirements	No	
Other special plans (e.g., brownfields redevelopment, disaster recovery, coastal zone management, climate change adaptation)	Yes	The City prepared a Coastal Hazards Vulnerability Assessment in 2019. This assessment incorporates sea level rise projections prepared by the National Research Council. The assessment will be used to implement hazard mitigation actions.

*TABLE 2: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 4.1 DATA.*

The City can expand and improve these policies and programs in the following ways:

- Ensure that the updated General Plan, and the Safe and Resilient Environment Element (SRE) in particular, serves as a decision-making tool for all City disciplines involved in hazard mitigation and emergency response. These disciplines include Development Services, Public Works, Property Management, and the Fire Department. Once the General Plan is updated, establish a General Plan implementation committee comprised of representatives of all disciplines with a role in implementing General Plan goals, policies, and actions, including those outlined in the SRE.



## SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities

- In the development review process, ensure that proposed development conforms to the goals and policies of the Safe and Resilient Environment Element.
- Monitor the location of new development to determine whether policies discouraging urban sprawl and promoting smart growth are working. Revise these policies as necessary.
- Integrate green streets policies into the CIP planning process.
- Update the Local Emergency Operations Plan to integrate protocols that address the City’s changing land use patterns (i.e., infill and redevelopment) as well as the increasing risk of coastal flooding.
- Continue to pursue beach nourishment and retention options as outlined in the sand feasibility study accepted by the City Council in 2021.
- Continue to work with the federal government to address the impacts of the Camp Pendleton Boat Basin on beach erosion.
- Reevaluate the Coastal Hazards Vulnerability Assessment in light of recent sea level rise projections that indicate a more modest rate of sea level rise relative to earlier projections.
- Reevaluate the continuity of operations plan to incorporate lessons learned from the Covid-19 pandemic.
- Complete the Vital and Sustainable Resources Element and associated zoning and grading ordinance revisions. Maintain the Wildlife Corridor Planning Zone delineated in the Draft Subarea Plan and prioritize habitat preservation in this zone.

### 4.1.2. Administrative and Technical

Administrative and technical capabilities include staff and their skills and tools that can be used for mitigation planning and to implement specific mitigation actions. For smaller jurisdictions without local staff resources, if there are public resources at the next higher-level government that can provide technical assistance, indicate so in your comments:

Administration	Yes/No	Describe capability Is coordination effective?
Planner(s) or engineer(s) with knowledge of land development and land management practices	Yes	Planning Division and Engineering Division staff have extensive training and experience in land development and hazard mitigation. Planning and Engineering staff regularly coordinate in the project review process, including CEQA review.
Engineer(s) or professional(s) trained in construction practices related to buildings and/or infrastructure	Yes	All building staff are certified inspectors, plan reviewers, permit technicians and building official.

**SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities**

Planners or Engineer(s) with an understanding of natural and/or manmade hazards	Yes	Engineering Staff have extensive training and experience in planning and designing improvements to mitigate natural and manmade hazards and threats. Land Development and CIP projects are reviewed by qualified staff to ensure planning and design efforts incorporate mitigation measures.
Mitigation Planning Committee	No	
Maintenance programs to reduce risk (e.g., tree trimming, clearing drainage systems)	Yes	Annual maintenance programs for City assets which are scheduled by frequency, inspections, geographic location and/or by community involvement. Annual tree trimming, storm drain clearing and maintenance, SLR River mowing and levee maintenance, roadway repairs and sidewalk repairs.
Mutual aid agreements	Yes	
<b>Staff</b>	<b>Yes/No FT/PT1</b>	<b>Is staffing adequate to enforce regulations? Is staff trained on hazards and mitigation?  Is coordination between agencies and staff effective?</b>
Chief Building Official	Yes	
Floodplain Administrator	Yes	The City Engineer is designated by Ordinance as the City's Floodplain Manager. The current City Engineer has extensive knowledge and experience in planning and designing mitigation efforts related to floodplain management. Engineering Staff is also trained to review Land Development and CIP projects in conjunction with FEMA for floodplain management efforts.
Emergency Manager	Yes	This position does not enforce regulations in the city but they are trained for hazards and mitigation and are highly effective with communications between agencies.
Surveyors	Yes	The City has Licensed Professionals knowledgeable and skilled in surveying practices and principals who are trained to review all projects for hazards and threat mitigation in conjunction with FEMA, the Army Corps of Engineers, and Cal-OES.
Staff with education or expertise to assess the community's vulnerability to hazards	Yes	Planning Division and Engineering Division staff are generally qualified to assess vulnerability to natural hazards, including those associated with sea level rise and coastal tidal and storm events.
Community Planner	Yes	The Planning Division establishes and implements the planning policies and zoning standards which overall assists with mitigation processes.

## SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities

Scientists familiar with the hazards of the community	No	
Civil Engineer	Yes	The City has Licensed Professionals knowledgeable and skilled in engineering practices and principals who are trained to review all projects for hazards and threat mitigation in conjunction with FEMA, the Army Corps of Engineers, and Cal-OES.
Personnel skilled in GIS and/or HAZUS	Yes	The Water Utilities Department has a trained cadre of staff and a supervisor that comprise the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Division with full GIS capabilities and equipment. Staff includes a Supervisor, Senior GIS Specialist and 2 Journey Level GIS specialists (4 Full-time staff).
Grant writers	Yes	
Other		

TABLE 3:FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 4.1 DATA CONTINUED.

The City can expand and improve these policies and programs in the following ways:

- Further clarify the roles and responsibilities of the recently created Coastal Administrator position. Consider how this position can support hazard mitigation and emergency response in non-coastal areas.
- Develop and maintain updated mapping of Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in the City’s GIS database.
- Consider emergency response training for GIS staff.
- Ensure the City’s grant writer is familiar with all sources of funding for hazard mitigation and emergency response.
- Periodically update mutual aid agreements to account for changing land use patterns and roadway improvements in all partner jurisdictions.
- Continue to work with the scientific community (e.g., Scripps Institute) to assess the City’s vulnerability to natural hazards.

### 4.1.3. Financial

Identify whether your jurisdiction has access to or is eligible to use the following funding resources for hazard mitigation:

Funding Resource	Access/ Eligibility (Yes/No)	Has the funding resource been used in past and for what type of activities? Could the resource be used to fund future mitigation actions?
Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	Yes	CDBG funds have not been used for this purpose in the past. CDBG funds can be used for this purpose if the grantee’s chief executive officer determines that emergency conditions threatening the public health and safety exist in the area and require immediate resolution.

**SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities**

Capital improvements project funding	Yes	The City has used various funding sources in the past to cover implementation of Capital Improvement Projects. The City continues to utilize these same funds to cover current and future projects. Funding Sources are from SANDAG (TransNet), Measure X, SB-1, Developer Impact Fees (Thoroughfare, Signals, Drainage, Parks, etc.), Enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Harbor), and General Funds.
Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes	Yes	Measure X and the proposed CFD for emergency services.
Fees for water, sewer, gas, or electric service	Yes	The City's Water Utilities Department collects fees for water and sewer service.
Impact fees for homebuyers or developers for new developments/homes	Yes	The City is contemplating a CFD for emergency services (see above). Fees are currently collected for public facilities, which include public safety facilities.
Incur debt through general obligation bonds	Yes	
Incur debt through special tax and revenue bonds	No	
Incur debt through private activity bonds	No	
Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)	Yes	[Same As Above] CDBG funds have not been used for this purpose in the past. CDBG funds can be used for this purpose if the grantee's chief executive officer determines that emergency conditions threatening the public health and safety exist in the area and require immediate resolution.
Capital improvements project funding	Yes	[Same As Above] The City has used various funding sources in the past to cover implementation of Capital Improvement Projects. The City continues to utilize these same funds to cover current and future projects. Funding Sources are from SANDAG (TransNet), Measure X, SB-1, Developer Impact Fees (Thoroughfare, Signals, Drainage, Parks, etc.), Enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Harbor), and General Funds
Authority to levy taxes for specific purposes	No	
<b>How can these capabilities be expanded and improved to reduce risk?</b>		
See below.		

*TABLE 4: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 4.1 DATA CONTINUED.*

## SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities

The City can expand and improve these policies and programs in the following ways:

- Include hazard mitigation and emergency response as criteria in the evaluation of potential projects to support with Measure X sales tax revenue.
- Pursue federal infrastructure funding that supports hazard mitigation and emergency response.
- Pursue funding through the California Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program.

### 4.1.4. Education and Outreach

Identify education and outreach programs and methods already in place that could be used to implement mitigation activities and communicate hazard-related information:

Program/Organization	Yes/No	Describe program/organization and how relates to disaster resilience and mitigation.  Could the program/organization help implement future mitigation activities?
Local citizen groups or non-profit organizations focused on environmental protection, emergency preparedness, access and functional needs populations, etc.	Yes	Preserve Calavera and the Sierra Club are active in promoting climate mitigation and adaptation.
Ongoing public education or information program (e.g., responsible water use, fire safety, household preparedness, environmental education)	Yes	The Green Oceanside program, administered by the City's Water Utilities Department, conducts community outreach on water and energy conservation, solid waste diversion, and other efforts to improve environmental quality and sustainability in Oceanside.
Natural disaster or safety related school programs	Yes	Prior to the Pandemic schools were actively participating in public education school safety visits that occurred regularly. These will resume this next school year.
StormReady certification	Yes	StormReady and TsunamiReady Certifications have been renewed until 06/25/25.
Firewise Communities certification	Yes	The City of Oceanside has a Firesafe Council at Pilgrim Creek, a 55+ living facility that is coordinated by a field Captain.
Public-private partnership initiatives addressing disaster-related issues	Yes	City of Oceanside's Chamber of Commerce has previously acquired training related to continuity of operations.
Other		
<b>How can these capabilities be expanded and improved to reduce risk?</b>		
The City can make relevant plans and other documents more readily available to the public through its webpage. The City can seek input on hazard mitigation planning from various appointed bodies, including the Planning Commission and the Utilities Commission, and Police and Fire Commission. The City can disseminate relevant information to the public via various means: e.g., water bills, mailed notice to property owners in high-risk hazard zones.		

TABLE 5: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 4.1 DATA CONTINUED.

**SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities**

**4.2. Safe Growth Audit**

Identify gaps in your community’s growth guidance instruments and improvements that could be made to reduce vulnerability to future development:

<b>Comprehensive Plan</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Land Use</b>		
1. Does the future land-use map clearly identify natural hazard areas?	Yes	
The City is currently in the process of updating its General Plan, which includes an update of the Safety Element. Natural hazard areas will be identified and depicted in map exhibits in the updated Safety Element.		
2. Do the land-use policies discourage development or redevelopment within natural hazard areas?	Yes	
It is anticipated that updated land use policies and mitigation measures outlined in a Programmatic Environmental Impact Report will provide guidance for new development and redevelopment within flood zones and other natural hazard areas.		
3. Does the plan provide adequate space for expected future growth in areas located outside natural hazard areas?	Yes	
As part of the General Plan Update, the City is preparing a Smart and Sustainable Corridors Specific Plan (SSCSP), which will facilitate infill and redevelopment within the City’s already urbanized areas, most of which are located outside of natural hazard areas. However, some areas with the boundary of the SSCSP are susceptible to flooding. It is anticipated that new development and redevelopment in these areas will provide for additional flood mitigation improvements that will reduce flood risk.		
<b>Transportation</b>		
1. Does the transportation plan limit access to hazard areas?		No
There are no specific policies in the current Circulation Element that speak to limiting access to hazard areas. The City will consider policies limiting access to hazard areas as part of the updating of the Circulation Element (which forthwith will be known as the Mobility Element).		
2. Is transportation policy used to guide growth to safe locations?		No
The current Circulation Element was not updated in conjunction with the updating of the Land Use Element and Safety Element. Thus, there is not policy direction in the Circulation Element that explicitly guides growth to safe locations. As part of the City’s General Plan Update, the Circulation (now Mobility) Element update will be coordinated with the updating of the Land Use Element and Safety Element, ensuring that hazard areas are acknowledged in the Circulation/Mobility Element.		
3. Are movement systems designed to function under disaster conditions (e.g., evacuation)?	Yes	
The timing of City traffic signals can be manipulated to help in evacuations. There is a standing agreement with NCTD for utilization of busses and trains to move/evacuate people, along with the City’s internal vehicles that can be used to help evacuating people.		

*TABLE 6: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 4.2 DATA.*

**SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities**

<b>Comprehensive Plan (continued)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Environmental Management</b>		
1. Are environmental systems that protect development from hazards identified and mapped?		No
At present, no. The City will identify and map protective ecosystems as part of the updating of the Land Use Element and Safety Element.		
2. Do environmental policies maintain and restore protective ecosystems?	Yes	
The City's Energy and Climate Action Element (ECAE) includes policies that encourage the maintenance and restoration of ecosystems, including those that serve as buffers between development and natural hazards. As part of the CEQA environmental review process, the City considers how protective ecosystems reduce the risk to new development of natural hazards.		
3. Do environmental policies provide incentives to development that is located outside protective ecosystems?	Yes	
The Environmental Resources Management Element includes policies that discourage development within protective ecosystems. The aforementioned SSCSP will provide incentives to development located outside of protective ecosystems, while also facilitating maintenance and restoration of these ecosystems.		
<b>Public Safety</b>		
1. Are the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan related to those of the FEMA Local Hazard Mitigation Plan?	Yes	
The City's Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, and Safety Element include policies and supportive information that align with the FEMA Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. These elements address flood management, erosion control, resilience to seismic activity, and emergency readiness.		
2. Is safety explicitly included in the plan's growth and development policies?	Yes	
Yes. The City's Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Management Element, and Safety Element include policies that support assessment, avoidance, and mitigation of risks associated with nature hazards. These policies are now in the process of being updated.		
3. Does the monitoring and implementation section of the plan cover safe growth objectives?		No
The current General Plan does not include specific action items or monitoring programs that cover safe growth objectives. The updated General Plan will include safe growth-oriented policies, implementation measures, and monitoring programs.		

*TABLE 7: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 4.2 DATA CONTINUED.*

<b>Zoning Ordinance</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
1. Does the zoning ordinance conform to the comprehensive plan in terms of discouraging development or redevelopment within natural hazard areas?	Yes	
The Zoning Ordinance includes site regulations that address hillside development, flood plain requirements for coastal zone properties.		

**SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities**

2. Does the ordinance contain natural hazard overlay zones that set conditions for land use within such zones?		No
3. Do rezoning procedures recognize natural hazard areas as limits on zoning changes that allow greater intensity or density of use?		No
4. Does the ordinance prohibit development within, or filling of, wetlands, floodways, and floodplains?	Yes	
Zoning Ordinance Section 3046 outlines flood plain requirements for coastal zone properties. The Zoning Ordinance does not explicitly regulate development or fill within wetlands, floodways, or floodplains outside of the coastal zone.		
<b>Subdivision Regulations</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
1. Do the subdivision regulations restrict the subdivision of land within or adjacent to natural hazard areas?	Yes	
To the extent practical. Development may occur if the proper mitigation measures are included within the design. For example, in the Special Flood Hazard Area, buildings may be constructed on either foundation systems that raise the building 1-foot above the Base Flood Elevation, or the site may be graded so that the Pad Elevation is 1-foot above the Base Flood Elevation. Buildings may also be constructed on piles driven to bedrock in hillside development. Areas that have historic or know landslides may be regraded to improve the stability of the site as well. If the Mitigation Measures cannot be completed, the development is not allowed to move forward.		
2. Do the regulations provide for conservation subdivisions or cluster subdivisions in order to conserve environmental resources?	Yes	
To the extent practical. Development in conservation areas are highly regulated to ensure the conservation zones remain undisturbed. Discharge is also highly regulated to ensure no more run-off than originally was occurring is allowed to continue to the area; discharge is also regulated so that contaminants are removed prior to discharge to these areas.		
3. Do the regulations allow density transfers where hazard areas exist?		No
Development must work within the constraints of the hazards; there are no provisions for transferring density to other areas to make up the difference in the constraints.		

*TABLE 8: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 4.2 DATA CONTINUED.*

<b>Capital Improvement Program and Infrastructure Policies</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
1. Does the capital improvement program limit expenditures on projects that would encourage development in areas vulnerable to natural hazards?		No
Most CIP projects are to rehabilitate existing infrastructure or buildings within the City’s inventory. Development is conditioned to install any necessary backbone infrastructure to serve the development. Development would be limited to comply with the various Ordinances and design manuals currently in use by the City, including all hazard mitigation requirements.		
2. Do infrastructure policies limit extension of existing facilities and services that would encourage development in areas vulnerable to natural hazards?		No
[Same As Above] Most CIP projects are to rehabilitate existing infrastructure or buildings within the City’s inventory. Development is conditioned to install any necessary backbone infrastructure to serve the development. Development would be limited to comply with the various Ordinances and design manuals currently in use by the City, including all hazard mitigation requirements.		
3. Does the capital improvement program provide funding for hazard mitigation projects identified in the FEMA Mitigation Plan?		No



## SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities

[Same As Above] Most CIP projects are to rehabilitate existing infrastructure or buildings within the City's inventory. Development is conditioned to install any necessary backbone infrastructure to serve the development. Development would be limited to comply with the various Ordinances and design manuals currently in use by the City, including all hazard mitigation requirements.		
<b>Other</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
1. Do small area or corridor plans recognize the need to avoid or mitigation natural hazards?	Yes	
2. Does the building code contain provisions to strengthen or elevate construction to withstand hazard forces?	Yes	
Our state adopted codes include provisions for the mitigation of hazards such as floods, fires and earthquakes.		
3. Do economic development or redevelopment strategies include provisions for mitigation of natural hazards?	Yes	
The City's Economic Development Element promotes infill and redevelopment within already urbanized areas.		
4. Is there an adopted evacuation and shelter plan to deal with emergencies from natural hazards?	Yes	
The EOP addresses evacuation and sheltering in the Access and Functional Needs section. Neighborhood Services Department is the lead agency for the Care and Shelter function, and will coordinate with operations during an evacuation.		

*TABLE 9: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 4.2 DATA CONTINUED.*

*Questions were adapted from Godschalk, David R. Practice Safe Growth Audits, Zoning Practice, Issue Number 10, October 2009, American Planning Association.*

The integration of the above-noted guidance instruments will occur primarily through the City's comprehensive General Plan Update, anticipated to be completed in early 2024. The updated General Plan will reference all of these guidance instruments and outline goals, policies, and action items that call for further assessment and refinement of these instruments. Hazard mitigation will be the principal focus of the Safe and Resilient Environment Element (SRE) of the General Plan, which will address all natural hazards identified in the state's general plan guidelines. The opportunity to incorporate additional hazard mitigation measures and policies will be contemplated for inclusion into the updated General Plan.

Implementing the City's land use goals and policies, the Zoning Ordinance has a direct relationship with the General Plan. The Zoning Ordinance is slated to be comprehensively updated following the adoption of the updated General Plan.

The City's land use goals and policies are also implemented through the Subdivision Ordinance, which accords with the California Map Act. The Subdivision Ordinance guides the review of parcel and subdivision maps by the Engineering Division and Planning Division. The updated General Plan will reference the Subdivision Ordinance and include goals and policies related to the subdivision of land.

## SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities

The City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is to a large extent guided by General Plan goals and policies. The updated General Plan will include language that discourages the extension of capital improvements into areas vulnerable to natural hazards.

### 4.3. National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)

As a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), a community develops capabilities for conducting flood mitigation activities. The hazard mitigation plan must describe each jurisdiction’s participation in the NFIP. Participating communities must describe their continued compliance with NFIP requirements. The mitigation plan must do more than state that the community will continue to comply with the NFIP. Each jurisdiction must describe their floodplain management program and address how they will continue to comply with the NFIP requirements. The local floodplain administrator is often the primary source for this information.

Jurisdictions where FEMA has issued a floodplain map but are currently not participating in the NFIP may meet this requirement by describing the reasons why the community does not participate. Plan updates must meet the same requirements and document any change in floodplain management programs.

List information on your community’s participation in and continued compliance with the NFIP, and identified areas for improvement that could be potential mitigation actions. Indicate the source of information, if different from the one included:

**The City of Oceanside is a participant in FEMA’s National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).** The City recently completed its 2021 Cycle Verification with the C.R.S. and has preliminarily scored as a Class 8 community. The City continues to review development for NFIP requirements, and process the usual Elevation Certificates, Letters of Map Revision, and other documents as required by the NFIP and for the annual progress reports to the CRS.

NFIP Topic	Source of Information	Comments
<b>Insurance Summary</b>		
How many NFIP policies are in the community? What is the total premium and coverage?	State NFIP Coordinator or FEMA NFIP Specialist	As of 03/02/20, there were a total of 1,232 policies in the City. The total premiums = \$852,850 while the total coverage = \$425,421,500.
How many claims have been paid in the community? What is the total amount of paid claims? How many of the claims were for substantial damage?	FEMA NFIP or Insurance Specialist	As of 03/02/20, there were a total of 184 Closed Paid Losses for a total of \$2,337,273.  There were 7 claims for substantial damages.
How many structures are exposed to flood risk within the community?	Community Floodplain Administrator (FPA)	1,119 Single Family Residences, 2-4 Family Units and “Other” Residential Units. There are 113 Non-Residential Units. 165 of the total are Condo Units.
Describe any areas of flood risk with limited NFIP policy coverage	Community FPA and FEMA Insurance Specialist	None.

## SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities

Staff Resources		
Is the Community FPA or NFIP Coordinator certified?	Community FPA	Not as a Certified Floodplain Manager – just as a Professional Licensed Engineer. Subordinate Staff is working on CFM designations.
Is floodplain management an auxiliary function?	Community FPA	Floodplain management is part of the duties of the City Engineer/Floodplain Manager. Subordinate staff is assigned to assist with the day to day management functions.
Provide an explanation of NFIP administration services (e.g., permit review, GIS, education or outreach, inspections, engineering capability)	Community FPA	Staff reviews all projects in SFHAs to determine if they meet the Floodplain Ordinance requirements. Staff works with the applicant on the Community Concurrence form for all CLOMR/LOMR applications to FEMA. Grading and Building permits are not issued until CLOMR/LOMR approval has been obtained from FEMA. All work is inspected. All hydraulic and hydrology reports are reviewed and approved as condition of permitting. Staff provides public outreach to engineers, developers and property owners to ensure the Ordinance has been met.
What are the barriers to running an effective NFIP program in the community, if any?	Community FPA	There have been no barriers, only educational challenges with the Public; these have been mitigated through public outreach and education.
Compliance History		
Is the community in good standing with the NFIP?	State NFIP Coordinator, FEMA NFIP Specialist, community records	Yes.
Are there any outstanding compliance issues (i.e., current violations)?		No.
When was the most recent Community Assistance Visit (CAV) or Community Assistance Contact (CAC)?		December 3, 2019.
Is a CAV or CAC scheduled or needed?		The next CAV is scheduled October 13, 2021.

TABLE 10: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 4.3 DATA.

NFIP Topic	Source of Information	Comments
Regulation		
When did the community enter the NFIP?	Community Status Book <a href="http://www.fema.gov/national-flood-insurance-program/national-flood-insurance-program-community-status-book">http://www.fema.gov/national-flood-insurance-program/national-flood-insurance-program-community-status-book</a>	Circa 1997 or before – available records only go back to 1997/1998.

## SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities

Are the FIRMs digital or paper?	Community FPA	Both versions are available – paper at the Development Services Lobby and Library while digital on City’s Website.
Do floodplain development regulations meet or exceed FEMA or State minimum requirements? If so, in what ways?	Community FPA	Pursuant to the CRS Program, the City’s Floodplain Ordinance exceeds FEMA requirements as outlined in the NFIP. Grading permits are not issued in SFHAs without the applicant first obtaining a CLOMR through FEMA. Building Permits are not issued until the applicant obtains a LOMR through FEMA.
Provide an explanation of the permitting process.	Community FPA, State, FEMA NFIP  Flood Insurance Manual <a href="http://www.fema.gov/flood-insurance-manual">http://www.fema.gov/flood-insurance-manual</a>  Community FPA, FEMA CRS Coordinator, ISO representative	Grading permits are not issued in SFHAs without the applicant first obtaining a CLOMR through FEMA. Grading plans are reviewed to ensure drainage does not contribute pollutants to the watershed and that the building pads are designed to be at or above the one-foot elevation mark above the base flood elevation. An Elevation Certificate is required to be submitted and approved prior to obtaining a building permit. Building Permits are not issued until the applicant obtains a LOMR through FEMA. Engineering must sign off on Elevation Certificate prior to issuance of the Building Permit.
<b>Community Rating System (CRS)</b>		
Does the community participate in CRS?	Community FPA, State, FEMA NFIP	Yes.
What is the community’s CRS Class Ranking?	Flood Insurance Manual <a href="http://www.fema.gov/flood-insurance-manual">http://www.fema.gov/flood-insurance-manual</a>	CRS Class 8.
What categories and activities provide CRS points and how can the class be improved?		Activity 310 – Elevation Certificates (38 points) Activity 320 – Map Information Service (90 points) Activity 330 – Outreach Projects (134 points) Activity 340 – Hazard Disclosure (23 points) Activity 350 – Flood Protection Information (46 points) Activity 360 – Flood Protection Assistance (55 points) Activity 420 – Open Space Preservation (16 points) Activity 430 – Higher Regulatory Standards (197 points) Activity 440 – Flood Data Maintenance (137 points) Activity 450 – Stormwater Management (32 points) Section 502 – req’s met (no points for this category) Activity 540 – Drainage System Maintenance (265 pts) Activity 630 – Dams (37 points) Activity 710 County Growth Adjustment = 1.07 Class can be improved by gaining additional Activity Points as outlined in the CRS manual

## SECTION FOUR | Review Community Capabilities

Does the plan include CRS planning requirements	Community FPA, FEMA CRS Coordinator, ISO representative	Yes.
---	---	------

*TABLE 11: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 4.3 DATA CONTINUED.*

## 5. SECTION FIVE: Conduct a Risk Assessment

The planning team conducts a risk assessment to determine the potential impacts of hazards to the people, economy, and built and natural environments of the community. The risk assessment provides the foundation for the rest of the mitigation planning process, which is focused on identifying and prioritizing actions to reduce risk to hazards.

In addition to informing the mitigation strategy, the risk assessment also can be used to establish emergency preparedness and response priorities, for land use and comprehensive planning, and for decision making by elected officials, city and county departments, businesses, and organizations in the community.

### 5.1. Hazards Summary

Summarize hazard description information and identify which hazards are most significant to the planning area:

Hazard	Location (Geographic Area Affected)	Maximum Probable Extent (Magnitude/Strength)	Probability of Future Events	Overall Significance Ranking
Avalanche	NEGLIGIBLE	WEAK	UNLIKELY	LOW
Dam Failure	SIGNIFICANT	MODERATE	UNLIKELY	LOW
Drought	EXTENSIVE	SEVERE	LIKELY	HIGH
Earthquake	EXTENSIVE	SEVERE	OCASSIONAL	MEDIUM
Erosion	NEGLIGIBLE	WEAK	LIKELY	LOW
Expansive Soils	EXTENSIVE	WEAK	LIKELY	LOW
Extreme Cold	NEGLIGIBLE	WEAK	UNLIKELY	LOW
Extreme Heat	EXTENSIVE	MODERATE	LIKELY	MEDIUM
Flood	SIGNIFICANT	MODERATE	LIKELY	MEDIUM
Hail	NEGLIGIBLE	WEAK	UNLIKELY	LOW
Hurricane	EXTENSIVE	SEVERE	UNLIKELY	LOW
Landslide	EXTENSIVE	SEVERE	LIKELY	HIGH
Lightning	EXTENSIVE	WEAK	UNLIKELY	LOW
Sea Level Rise	LIMITED	MODERATE	LIKELY	MEDIUM

## SECTION FIVE | Conduct a Risk Assessment

Severe Wind	EXTENSIVE	WEAK	LIKELY	LOW
Severe Winter Weather	NEGLIGIBLE	WEAK	UNLIKELY	LOW
Storm Surge	NEGLIGIBLE	WEAK	LIKELY	LOW
Subsidence	LIMITED	WEAK	OCCASSIONAL	LOW
Tornado	NEGLIGIBLE	WEAK	OCCASSIONAL	LOW
Tsunami	NEGLIGIBLE	WEAK	OCCASSIONAL	LOW
Wildfire	LIMITED	MODERATE	HIGHLY LIKELY	MEDIUM

TABLE 12: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 5.1 DATA.

### Definitions for Classifications

#### Location (Geographic Area Affected)

- **Negligible:** Less than 10 percent of planning area or isolated single-point occurrences
- **Limited:** 10 to 25 percent of the planning area or limited single-point occurrences
- **Significant:** 25 to 75 percent of planning area or frequent single-point occurrences
- **Extensive:** 75 to 100 percent of planning area or consistent single-point occurrences

#### Maximum Probable Extent (Magnitude/Strength based on historic events or future probability)

- **Weak:** Limited classification on scientific scale, slow speed of onset or short duration of event, resulting in little to no damage
- **Moderate:** Moderate classification on scientific scale, moderate speed of onset or moderate duration of event, resulting in some damage and loss of services for days
- **Severe:** Severe classification on scientific scale, fast speed of onset or long duration of event, resulting in devastating damage and loss of services for weeks or months
- **Extreme:** Extreme classification on scientific scale, immediate onset or extended duration of event, resulting in catastrophic damage and uninhabitable conditions

Hazard	Scale / Index	Weak	Moderate	Severe	Extreme
Drought	Palmer Drought Severity Index <sup>3</sup>	-1.99 to +1.99	-2.00 to -2.99	-3.00 to -3.99	-4.00 and below
Earthquake	Modified Mercalli Scale <sup>4</sup>	I to IV	V to VII	VII	IX to XII
	Richter Magnitude <sup>5</sup>	2, 3	4, 5	6	7, 8
Hurricane Wind	Saffir-Simpson Hurricane Wind Scale <sup>6</sup>	1	2	3	4, 5
Tornado	Fujita Tornado Damage Scale <sup>7</sup>	F0	F1, F2	F3	F4, F5

## SECTION FIVE | Conduct a Risk Assessment

### Probability of Future Events

- **Unlikely:** Less than 1 percent probability of occurrence in the next year or a recurrence interval of greater than every 100 years.
- **Occasional:** 1 to 10 percent probability of occurrence in the next year or a recurrence interval of 11 to 100 years.
- **Likely:** 10 to 90 percent probability of occurrence in the next year or a recurrence interval of 1 to 10 years
- **Highly Likely:** 90 to 100 percent probability of occurrence in the next year or a recurrence interval of less than 1 year.

### Overall Significance

- **Low:** Two or more criteria fall in lower classifications, or the event has a minimal impact on the planning area. This rating is sometimes used for hazards with a minimal or unknown record of occurrences or for hazards with minimal mitigation potential.
- **Medium:** The criteria fall mostly in the middle ranges of classifications and the event's impacts on the planning area are noticeable but not devastating. This rating is sometimes used for hazards with a high extent rating but very low probability rating.
- **High:** The criteria consistently fall in the high classifications and the event is likely/highly likely to occur with severe strength over a significant to extensive portion of the planning area.

- *Cumulative meteorological drought and wet conditions:* <http://ncdc.noaa.gov/>
- *Earthquake intensity and effect on population and structures:* <http://earthquake.usgs.gov>
- *Earthquake magnitude as a logarithmic scale, measured by a seismograph:* <http://earthquake.usgs.gov>
- *Hurricane rating based on sustained wind speed:* <http://nhc.noaa.gov>
- *Tornado rating based on wind speed and associated damage:* <http://spc.noaa.gov>

After reviewing the Hazards Summary table above, the following were identified as Oceanside's top hazards:

- **Drought:** Significant geographical area of Oceanside is affected and will likely continue for an unknown amount of time. Mitigation actions: Pure Water Program, Water Conservation Master Plan, Recycled Water Program.
- **Landslide:** Erosion of sea bluffs. Mitigation action: Require geotechnical analysis as part of the development review process.
- **Earthquake:** Proximity to local faults; older structures; potential for loss of life, injuries, and damage to property, as well as disruption of services is significant. Mitigation action: Implement seismic retrofitting requirements.
- **Wildfire:** Historically a highly likely probability of occurrence with a devastating affect to the community. Mitigation actions: Require fire safe design for any development located in fire risk areas.
- **Flood:** The San Luis Rey River exposes multiple neighborhoods to the consequences of the river bed flooding. Mitigation action: Prohibit development in FEMA-delineated floodways; ensure that all new development in floodplains is elevated at least one foot above base flood elevation.
- **Sea Level Rise:** The City continues to experience extreme beach loss, occasioned by a variety of factors. These factors include the interruption of downcoast sand transport by the Camp Pendleton Boat Basin, the channelization of the San Luis Rey River and other local



## SECTION FIVE | Conduct a Risk Assessment

waterways, the hardening of the City's coastline, and sea level rise. Mitigation action: The City has prepared a sand nourishment and retention study and is currently organizing an international design competition that will solicit innovative sand nourishment and retention concepts from coastal engineering firms. The winning concept will be implemented, contingent upon funding and regulatory approvals.

- **Extreme Heat Events:** While the City's coastal location typically provides for moderate temperatures, Oceanside has experienced extreme heat events, particularly in inland areas. Mitigation action: As part of a regional "Cool Zones" program promulgated by the County of San Diego and San Diego Gas and Electric, Oceanside operates its two senior centers as cooling centers during extreme heat events.

The hazards outlined in Table 12/Worksheet 5.1 were assessed by staff representing the City's Fire Department, Planning Division, and Engineering Division. Staff evaluated each hazard on the basis of the criteria outlined above – i.e., geographic area affected; magnitude/strength based on historic events or future probability; and probability of future events. Staff utilized historical data, map exhibits, and institutional knowledge to determine which of these hazards pose the greatest risk to the City.

The following information contributed to staff's identification of the City's top seven hazards:

- **Drought:** California has experienced five significant droughts over the past 36 years. The City currently sources a significant percentage of its potable water supply from the San Luis Rey River Aquifer. Drought conditions can significantly impact this local water supply. The City also receives water from the Colorado River, the flow of which has been steadily declining for the past two decades.
- **Wildfire:** The California Air Resources Board (CARB) indicates that climate change, primarily caused by the burning of fossil fuels, is increasing the frequency and severity of wildfires in California. With extensive wildland interface along its northern and eastern boundaries, Oceanside is highly susceptible to wildfire. The Risk Factor model indicates that more than 50 percent of the City's building inventory faces some risk from wildfire.
- **Landslide:** The City's undeveloped coastal bluffs are highly susceptible to erosion, due to erosive soils and the loss of beach sand. These bluffs are in highly trafficked areas that support a variety of City facilities and services. Consequently, bluff failures pose a threat to public safety, public facilities, and public access to the coast.
- **Earthquake:** The Rose Canyon Fault, a right-lateral, strike-slip fault running in a north-south direction, lies off of the City's coastline. Ongoing field and laboratory studies suggest the largest credible earthquake predicted on the Rose Canyon Fault is a M7. 2. Such an earthquake could result in significant structural damage, landslides, and tsunamis.
- **Flood:** The City includes three waterways that extend to the Pacific Ocean: the San Luis Rey River, Loma Alta Creek, and Buena Vista Creek and Lagoon. While the Army Corps of Engineers installed a levee along the SLR River in the 1990s, lack of levee maintenance coupled with the proliferation of invasive species have heightened flood risk for many developed properties in the San Luis Rey River Valley.
- **Sea Level Rise:** Forecasts prepared by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration indicate that Oceanside could experience as much as two feet of sea level rise by 2080.

**SECTION FIVE | Conduct a Risk Assessment**

This magnitude of sea level rise would render much of the City’s beachfront development inviable.

- Extreme Heat: ClimateCheck® indicates that Oceanside is exposed to significant risk of extreme heat events. In 2022, several high temperature records were set in Oceanside, including a 95-degree reading at Oceanside Harbor on September 4th. Extreme heat places vulnerable populations at risk of heat-induced illness and threatens agricultural resources in the South Morro Hills area.

City of Oceanside has the following list of critical assets/facilities that are of particular concern when considering the potential effects of hazards:

- Police Station - 1
- Fire Stations - 8
- City Hall/Emergency Operations Center – 1
- Hospital - 1

**5.2 Potential Hazard Exposure and Loss Estimates**

The City of Oceanside reviewed a set of jurisdictional-level hazard maps and data provided by the County of San Diego, including detailed critical facility information and localized potential hazard exposure/loss estimates related to residential, commercial, and critical asset/facilities to identify the top hazards threatening the City of Oceanside. Potential hazard exposure/loss estimates are summarized in Table 5. [2].

*TABLE 5.[2]: SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL HAZARD-RELATED EXPOSURE/LOSS IN CITY OF OCEANSIDE*

Hazard Type	Residential			Commercial		Critical Facilities	
	Exposed Population	Number of Residential Buildings	Potential Exposure Loss for Residential Buildings	Number of Commercial Buildings	Potential Exposure Loss for Commercial Buildings	Number of Critical Facilities	Potential Exposure for Critical Facilities
Coastal Storm	662	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sea Level Rise</b>							
Coastal Flooding	261	358	\$139,118,800	51	\$15,419,850	3	14,488,000
Mean Higher High Water	39	0	0	19	5,744,650	1	5,720,000
Dam Failure	25,060	10.803	\$4,198,046	318	\$96,147	26	540,026,300
<b>Earthquake (Loss)</b>							

**SECTION FIVE | Conduct a Risk Assessment**

<b>(Annualized Loss - Includes shaking, liquefaction and landslide components)</b>	811	113	203,012,175	508	224,101,820	0	0
<b>100 Year</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>500 Year</b>	130,943	40,592	15,774,051,200	1,492	451,106,200	71	1,490,229,250
<b>Floods (Loss)</b>							
<b>100 Year</b>	13,323	4,540	1,764,244,000	448	135,452,800	34	337,162,600
<b>500 Year</b>	33,750	12,611	4,900,634,600	659	199,248,650	45	412,400,700
<b>Rain-Induced Landslide</b>							
<b>High Risk</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Moderate Risk</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Tsunami</b>	3,599	1,401	\$544,428,600	53	16,024,550	6	35,448,000
<b>Wildfire/Structure Fire</b>							
<b>High Fire Hazard</b>	18,152	5,128	1,992,228,000	144	43,538,400	15	391,505,700
<b>Very High Fire Hazard</b>	14,768	1,823	708,417,800	128	38,700,800	6	136,984,600

## 6. SECTION SIX: Develop a Mitigation Strategy

The mitigation strategy serves as the long-term blueprint for reducing potential losses identified in the risk assessment. The mitigation strategy describes how the community will accomplish the overall purpose, or mission, of the planning process.

The mitigation strategy is made up of three main required components: mitigation goals, mitigation actions, and an action plan for implementation. These provide the framework to identify, prioritize, and implement actions to reduce risk to hazards.

**Mitigation goals** are general guidelines that explain what the community wants to achieve with the plan. They are usually broad policy-type statements that are long-term, and they represent visions for reducing or avoiding losses from the identified hazards.

**Mitigation actions** are specific projects and activities that help achieve the goals.

**The action plan** describes how the mitigation actions will be implemented, including how those actions will be prioritized, administered, and incorporated into the community's existing planning mechanisms. In a multi-jurisdictional plan, each jurisdiction must have an action plan specific to that jurisdiction and its vulnerabilities.

Although not required, some communities choose to develop **objectives** to help define or organize mitigation actions. Objectives are broader than specific actions, but are measurable, unlike goals. Objectives connect goals with the actual mitigation actions.

### 6.1. Mitigation Action Evaluation

Use this worksheet to help evaluate and prioritize each mitigation action being considered by the planning team. For each action, evaluate the potential benefits and/or likelihood of successful implementation for the criteria defined below.

Rank each of the criteria with a -1, 0 or 1 using the following scale:

- 1 = Highly effective or feasible
- 0 = Neutral
- -1 = Ineffective or not feasible

#### Example Evaluation Criteria:

- **Life Safety** – How effective will the action be at protecting lives and preventing injuries?
- **Property Protection** – How significant will the action be at eliminating or reducing damage to structures and infrastructure?
- **Technical** – Is the mitigation action technically feasible? Is it a long-term solution? Eliminate actions that, from a technical standpoint, will not meet the goals.

## SECTION SIX | Develop a Mitigation Strategy

- **Political** – Is there overall public support for the mitigation action? Is there the political will to support it?
- **Legal** – Does the community have the authority to implement the action?
- **Environmental** – What are the potential environmental impacts of the action? Will it comply with environmental regulations?
- **Social** – Will the proposed action adversely affect one segment of the population? Will the action disrupt established neighborhoods, break up voting districts, or cause the relocation of lower income people?
- **Administrative** – Does the community have the personnel and administrative capabilities to implement the action and maintain it or will outside help be necessary?
- **Local Champion** – Is there a strong advocate for the action or project among local departments and agencies that will support the action’s implementation?
- **Other Community Objectives** – Does the action advance other community objectives, such as capital improvements, economic development, environmental quality, or open space preservation? Does it support the policies of the comprehensive plan?

Mitigation Action	Life Safety	Property Protection	Technical	Political	Legal	Environmental	Social	Administrative	Local Champion	Other Community Objectives	Total Score
Local Plans and Regulations											
General Plan Update	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	8
Structure and Infrastructure Projects											
Water Portfolio Diversification	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
San Luis Rey Flood Control Project	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	6
Natural Systems Protection											
Local Coastal Program	1	1	1	-1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
Education and Awareness Programs											
Community Risk Reduction Officer	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	6

TABLE 13: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 6.1 DATA.

### 6.2. Mitigation Action Implementation

A mitigation action is a specific action, project, activity, or process taken to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property from hazards and their impacts. Implementing mitigation actions helps achieve the plan’s mission and goals. The actions to reduce vulnerability to threats and hazards form the core of the plan and are a key outcome of the planning process. This annex details the following mitigation action implementations:

**SECTION SIX | Develop a Mitigation Strategy**

Jurisdiction:	City of Oceanside
Hazard Addressed:	Landslide
Mitigation Action/Project Title:	<b>Landslide Hazard Maps.</b> Use GIS and USGS to identify and map properties facing significant risk of landslide. Consider designating these areas as Landslide Management Zones (LMZs) that will require enhanced geotechnical analysis for proposed development and CIP projects.
Background/Issue:	Areas within the City subject to the greatest risk of landslides include properties along coastal bluffs. Landslide hazard maps may inform the development of land use policies that discourage development in hazardous areas or require engineering solutions that mitigate dangers to proposed structures.
Ideas for Integration:	Integrate landslide hazard maps into the City’s Engineering Design Manual.
Responsible Agency:	City of Oceanside, Army Corp of Engineers, Coastal Commission, federal and state wildlife agencies
Partners:	County of San Diego, CalFire, the California Office of Emergency Services, Caltrans, Army Corps of Engineers, US Geological Survey, California Coastal Commission, federal and state wildlife agencies
Potential Funding:	City of Oceanside General Fund, Prepare California Grant Program (CAL EOS), Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (FEMA), Floodplain Management Fee, and Landslide Management Fee
Cost Estimate:	\$25,000 - \$35,000
Benefits: (Losses Avoided)	Mapping of specific landslide risks may direct proposed development and CIP projects away from Landslide Management Zones, protect properties at risk of landslide hazards, and improve communication with property owners about landslide safety measures.
Timeline:	1-2 years
Priority:	High
Worksheet Completed by:	Russ Cunningham, Principal Planner Development Services Department City of Oceanside

**SECTION SIX | Develop a Mitigation Strategy**

Jurisdiction:	City of Oceanside
Hazard Addressed:	Drought, Wildfire, Landslide, Earthquake, Flood, Sea Level Rise, and Extreme Heat
Mitigation Action/Project Title:	<b>General Plan Update.</b> Update the General Plan to establish goals and policies to address the City’s vulnerability to the identified priority hazards and establish proactive measures to minimize risk.
Background/Issue:	The City is preparing a comprehensive update of its General Plan, which includes several supportive planning initiatives – a corridor plan meant to incentivize infill and redevelopment, a community plan meant to address development pressure on remaining farmland, an active transportation plan, and a trails plan.
Ideas for Integration:	The updated General Plan will include the Safe and Resilient Environment Element (SRE), which will evaluate risks associated with natural hazards and outline strategies for mitigating these risks. The SRE will also consider how these risks are exacerbated by climate change. The SRE will be informed by the County HMP.
Responsible Agency:	City of Oceanside, Army Corps, Coastal Commission, federal and state wildlife agencies
Partners:	County of San Diego, CalFire, the California Office of Emergency Services, Army Corps of Engineers, California Coastal Commission, federal and state wildlife agencies,
Potential Funding:	City of Oceanside General Fund, surcharge on building permits, state grants
Cost Estimate:	\$100,000
Benefits: (Losses Avoided)	Coordination of fuel modification and flood mitigation efforts with habitat preservation goals, policies, and standards; enhanced resilience to fire and flood in the built environment; coordination with other local jurisdictions on coastal adaptation strategies; possible elimination of flood insurance requirements; enhanced grant eligibility.
Timeline:	The updated General Plan is tentatively scheduled for final adoption in June 2023.
Priority:	High.
Worksheet Completed by:	Russ Cunningham, Principal Planner Development Services Department City of Oceanside

**SECTION SIX | Develop a Mitigation Strategy**

Jurisdiction:	City of Oceanside
Hazard Addressed:	Drought
Mitigation Action/Project Title:	<b>Water Portfolio Diversification (Pure Water Oceanside).</b> The City of Oceanside-Water Utilities will expand the Mission Basic Groundwater Purification Facility to harvest and further treat a higher percentage of the treated wastewater it is injecting into the local aquifer. Water Utilities will also be consolidating all wastewater treatment at the San Luis Rey Wastewater Treatment Plant upon the closure of the La Salina Wastewater Treatment Plant. Doing so will bring more wastewater flow to the Pure Water facility at San Luis Rey, thereby allowing for more wastewater to be treated and injected into the local aquifer. The City currently sources roughly 15 percent of its total potable water supply from local groundwater. Increasing the capacity of the Pure Water system will further expand the City’s local water supply.
Background/Issue:	The program is currently permitted to treat and inject into the aquifer up to 3 million gallons of wastewater daily. Water Utilities is looking to increase capacity to 4.5 million gallons daily. The City’s goal is to have 50% of our water sourced from local sources to reduce dependency on imported water, by 2030. Pure Water Oceanside will help the City to achieve this goal by purifying recycled water to an extremely high level, adding minerals to the water and injecting into the Mission Groundwater Basin, where it will percolate for several months before being drawn out of the basin and treated again before entering the drinking water system.
Ideas for Integration:	This project is part of the City’s portfolio of water projects to reduce dependency on imported drinking water.
Responsible Agency:	City of Oceanside-Water Utilities
Partners:	State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water, Oceanside Community.
Potential Funding:	Water funds (ratepayer funded), WIFIA Loan through EPA, Grants (State and Federal).
Cost Estimate:	\$75.6M for all phase 2 construction (includes contingency amounts).
Benefits: (Losses Avoided)	Reduced dependency on imported potable water and creation of a drought-proof source of drinking water.
Timeline:	Project phase 2 is currently under construction, project is just beginning to produce Potable Water.



**SECTION SIX | Develop a Mitigation Strategy**

Priority:	High
Worksheet Completed by:	John McKelvey, Senior Management Analyst City of Oceanside, Water Utilities Department

**SECTION SIX | Develop a Mitigation Strategy**

Jurisdiction:	City of Oceanside
Hazard Addressed:	Flood
Mitigation Action/Project Title:	<b>San Luis Rey River Flood Risk Management Project (SLRRFRM).</b> This project includes an assessment of the San Luis Rey River levee to ensure this facility is providing adequate flood protection.
Background/Issue:	The USACE has not completed and has not turned over the SLRRFRM to the City of Oceanside. Which in-turn has not provided the City of Oceanside with the 100-year storm event flood protection.
Ideas for Integration:	Basic project deliverable for the SLRRFRM was to provide 100-year flood event capacity. Remaining/pending deliverables from USACE are removal of sediment within the flood channel, completion and acceptance of on-site and off-site mitigation properties, remaining vegetation management areas within the channel and levee repairs. Currently the City has assumed maintenance and operations of Phase 1 and 2 vegetation management within Reaches 1 through 4 as conditioned within the OMRR&R.
Responsible Agency:	The majority of the active project is under the jurisdiction of the USACE. Phases 1 and 2 within Reaches 1 through 4 have been turned over to the City for annual vegetation management.
Partners:	USACE, City of Oceanside, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife, USGS, FEMA
Potential Funding:	The Project Authorization Change Report (PACR) approved in FY2020 (\$188,209,000) presents a revised cost estimate for the new project cost. Section 902 limit for the project is \$145,226,000 FY2020. Cost sharing, 74 percent federal (\$141,157,000) and 25 percent non-federal (\$47,052,000).
Cost Estimate:	Annual vegetation management for Phase 1 and 2 performed in-house and includes biological monitoring, mowing and invasive plant removal is estimated at \$170,000. At this time no physical maintenance work is being conducted by USACE.
Benefits: (Losses Avoided)	The SLRRFRM had the goal to eliminate flood events within the San Luis Rey River Valley. With the flood protection in place residents and business owners within the area would potentially be relieved of Flood Insurance requirements.
Timeline:	Annually the City will self-perform vegetation management of Phases 1 and 2 areas within Reaches 1 through 4. The new project identified within PACR will resolve any levee deficiencies, remove sediment to achieve 100-year capacity and address required mitigation associated with impacts from repair work.
Priority:	Medium
Worksheet Completed by:	Nathan Mertz Public Works Division Manager City of Oceanside

**SECTION SIX | Develop a Mitigation Strategy**

Jurisdiction:	City of Oceanside
Hazard Addressed:	Sea Level Rise
Mitigation Action/Project Title:	<b>Local Coastal Program Update.</b> This project will include conducting a coastal vulnerability assessment and a developing coastal hazards adaptation plan that identifies coastal hazards zones and outlines coastal adaptation strategies to address wave action and inundation.
Background/Issue:	The City is in the process of updating its Local Coastal Program (LCP), a state-mandated long-range planning document intended to demonstrate the City’s conformance with the principles and policies of the California Coastal Act. The LCP address coastal resource protection, coastal access, visitor-serving uses and coastal recreation, coastal hazards, and land use.
Ideas for Integration:	The LCP will include a coastal hazards vulnerability assessment and a coastal hazards adaptation plan, both of which will inform components of the City’s General Plan (e.g. the Safe and Resilient Environment Element, the Vital and Sustainable Resources Element).
Responsible Agency:	City of Oceanside, California Coastal Commission, State Land Commission, Army Corps of Engineers, federal and state wildlife agencies
Partners:	Community members, local and regional NGOs, SANDAG, California Coastal Commission, State Land Commission, Army Corps of Engineers, federal and state wildlife agencies
Potential Funding:	State grants, City of Oceanside General Fund
Cost Estimate:	\$400,000
Benefits: (Losses Avoided)	Alignment of local coastal adaptation strategies with state policies and guidance; regional coordination on coastal adaptation; goals and policies that account for significant change within the City’s coastal zone over the past 35 years
Timeline:	The updated LCP will likely be brought forward for final adoption in late 2023.
Priority:	Medium
Worksheet Completed by:	Russ Cunningham, Principal Planner Development Services Department City of Oceanside

**SECTION SIX | Develop a Mitigation Strategy**

Jurisdiction:	City of Oceanside, Oceanside Fire Department
Hazard Addressed:	Wildfire
Mitigation Action/Project Title:	<b>Community Risk Reduction Officer – addition to staff.</b> This person would be responsible for developing and implementing a wildfire public awareness program that addresses fire resilient design, fuel modification, evacuation routes, and other preparedness measures.
Background/Issue:	The Oceanside Fire Department provides fire prevention and whole community risk reduction outreach, to include disaster preparedness. Current community outreach is performed by a part-time employee with some specialist skills. Outreach, education, and data analysis is required for improved awareness programs.
Ideas for Integration:	Education and awareness programs require resources, primarily personnel. City infrastructure and relationships are in place to provide the programs. To be fully effective, the programs require a person who combines the skills of a community risk educator, disaster preparedness coordinator, and management/leadership.
Responsible Agency:	Oceanside Fire Department – Community Risk Reduction Division and/or Emergency Management Program
Partners:	City of Oceanside City Manager’s Office, Oceanside City Council, San Diego County Office of Emergency Services
Potential Funding:	Grant funds from State Homeland Security Grant Program, City of Oceanside General Fund
Cost Estimate:	\$140,000 per year, ongoing
Benefits: (Losses Avoided)	Emergency Operations Plan stays up to date. Hazardous Mitigation Plan has a local advocate and accountable person. The City of Oceanside remains eligible for recovery of losses due to disasters such as Tsunami, flooding, wildland fire, and more.
Timeline:	3-5 years
Priority:	Medium
Worksheet Completed by:	David Parsons, Division Chief, Community Risk Reduction City of Oceanside

## 7. SECTION SEVEN: Keep the Plan Current

Hazard Mitigation Plan maintenance is the process the planning team establishes to track the plan's implementation progress and to inform the plan update. The plan must include a description of the method and schedule for monitoring, evaluating, and updating it within a 5-year cycle. These procedures help to:

- Ensure that the mitigation strategy is implemented according to the plan.
- Provide the foundation for an ongoing mitigation program in your community.
- Standardize long-term monitoring of hazard-related activities.
- Integrate mitigation principles into community officials' daily job responsibilities and department roles.
- Maintain momentum through continued engagement and accountability in the plan's progress.

Hazard Mitigation Plan updates provide the opportunity to consider how well the procedures established in the previously approved plan worked and revise them as needed. This annex is part of the most recent *San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan* update. The plan was last updated in 2018. See the *San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan* for more information.

### 7.1. Mitigation Action Progress

Plan monitoring means tracking the implementation of the plan over time. The plan must identify how, when, and by whom the plan will be monitored.

The City of Oceanside will continue to monitor the Mitigation Action Progress through a future Disaster Preparedness Coordinator/Emergency Manager. This will be conducted by implementing daily tasks into the Emergency Manager's job requirements and responsibilities. Continuation of progress towards reaching goals will be obtained by consistent communication throughout the City's multiple agencies (Engineering, Planning, Fire, Police, etc.).

# Mitigation Action Progress Report Forms

Progress Report Period	From Date: 2018	To Date: 2022
Action/Project Title	<b>Goal 1:</b> Facilitate the adoption, development or updating of Building, Engineering and Fire Codes and zoning ordinances to improve resistance to hazards and control development in high-hazard areas.	
Responsible Agency	City of Oceanside	
Contact Name	Russ Cunningham, Planning	
Contact Phone/Email	760-435-3525	
Project Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Project completed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project canceled</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> Project on schedule</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Anticipated completion date: <u>Ongoing</u></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project delayed Explain _____</li> </ul>	

## Summary of Project Progress for this Report Period

### 1. What was accomplished for this project during this reporting period?

The City of Oceanside has adopted the 2022 Building and Fire Codes. The city will consider new zoning standards that address the siting and design of new development in high-severity fire risk zones. The City has decided not to adopt a Subarea Plan but rather address habitat preservation through the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, both of which are in the process of being comprehensively updated. The fuel modification policies and action outlined in the Draft Subarea Plan will likely be incorporated into the updated General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

### 2. What obstacles, problems, or delays did the project encounter?

None.

### 3. If uncompleted, is the project still relevant? Should the project be changed or revised?

The project remains relevant.

### 4. Other comments.

None.

Progress Report Period	From Date: 2018	To Date: 2022
Action/Project Title	<b>Goal 2:</b> Promote public understanding, support and demand for hazard mitigation.	
Responsible Agency	City of Oceanside	
Contact Name	David Parsons, OFD	
Contact Phone/Email	760-435-4100	
Project Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Project completed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project canceled</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> Project on schedule</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Anticipated completion date: <u>Ongoing</u></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project delayed Explain _____</li> </ul>	

## Summary of Project Progress for this Report Period

1. What was accomplished for this project during this reporting period?

The position of a Full-Time Disaster Preparedness Coordinator was initially filled by a contractor, but the contracted employee was not qualified and is no longer employed by the City. KOCT productions were completed. Topics included pandemic and wildland fire safety. The CERT Team expanded to include Teen CERT and continued training local members on an annual basis. The City occasionally provides emergency preparedness information in the monthly e-newsletter.

2. What obstacles, problems, or delays did the project encounter?

The contractor employee model was not sustainable for the Disaster Preparedness Coordinator due to lack of qualified candidates. A part time consulting assistant filled the position; however, there are no qualified candidates available to fill the position as a part time employee. Full time funds have been consistently requested during budget discussions, but has yet to be approved.

3. If uncompleted, is the project still relevant? Should the project be changed or revised?

The Disaster Preparedness Coordinator position is still relevant and being discussed as needed. The Covid-19 pandemic delayed some training for CERT over a two-year period.

4. Other comments.

None.

Progress Report Period	From Date: 2018	To Date: 2022
Action/Project Title	<b>Goal 3:</b> Build and support local capacity and commitment to continuously become less vulnerable to hazards.	
Responsible Agency	City of Oceanside	
Contact Name	Chief Rick Robinson, OFD	
Contact Phone/Email	760-435-4100	
Project Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Project completed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project canceled</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> Project on schedule</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Anticipated completion date: <u>Ongoing</u></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project delayed Explain _____</li> </ul>	

## Summary of Project Progress for this Report Period

1. What was accomplished for this project during this reporting period?

City of Oceanside has engaged the planning department locally and has incorporated the Army Corp of Engineers to manage the vegetation in the San Luis Rey River Bed. The generator for the EOC has been obtained. The OPD has requested a Needs Assessment and a Geographic Assessment for the new headquarters, which is in process. Fire Station 1 has been designed and is in the process of going out to bid. Fire Station 8 is currently in the design process. We continue to be an active agency within Unified Disaster Council of San Diego County, we house and staff a multi-casualty apparatus for the county and participate in annual UDC drills. We are less vulnerable to tsunamis and other related disasters due to this participation.

2. What obstacles, problems, or delays did the project encounter?

The EOC was not able to be completed due to funding, but there are still alternative options being discussed for the future. Communication with the Army Corp of engineers has been intermittent.

3. If uncompleted, is the project still relevant? Should the project be changed or revised?

Fire Station 8 is not constructed yet due to funding.

4. Other comments.

None.



Progress Report Period	From Date: 2018	To Date: 2022
Action/Project Title	<b>Goal 4: Improve hazard mitigation coordination and communication with federal, state, local and tribal governments and with other jurisdictions.</b>	
Responsible Agency	City of Oceanside	
Contact Name	Chief Rick Robinson, OFD	
Contact Phone/Email	760-435-4100	
Project Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Project completed</li> <li>● Project canceled</li> <li>● <b>Project on schedule</b></li> <li>● Anticipated completion date: <u>Ongoing</u></li> <li>● Project delayed Explain _____</li> </ul>	

## Summary of Project Progress for this Report Period

1. What was accomplished for this project during this reporting period?

Mitigation coordination occurs with Army Corps of Engineers and to the State through the Emergency Management program. No accomplishments to report as these are ongoing items. The City of Oceanside EOC actively worked together with County EOC and other local EOCs for the pandemic response. The EOC was activated during the global pandemic, local events of public unrest, and flooding that occurred in the city (Action 4.A.1).

2. What obstacles, problems, or delays did the project encounter?

The lack of a Full-Time Emergency Manager is an ongoing obstacle that would allow constant coordination of any activities and projects within the city and to external agencies.

3. If uncompleted, is the project still relevant? Should the project be changed or revised?

The EOP update still remains uncompleted and is still a relevant project. This project will be prioritized moving forward (Action 4.A.2). There were delays to training city employees for emergencies due to the global pandemic, timing, and the need for social distancing (Action 4.B.1 and 4.B.2). The need for a Full-Time Emergency Manager is still relevant. The project needs to be evaluated further for relevancy once resources like time and/or personnel are available.

4. Other comments.

None.

Progress Report Period	From Date: 2018	To Date: 2022
Action/Project Title	<b>Goal 5:</b> Reduce the possibility of damage and losses to life, property and the environment, particularly to critical facilities or infrastructure, and City of Oceanside owned facilities, due to earthquakes and tsunamis.	
Responsible Agency	City of Oceanside	
Contact Name	Chief David Parsons, OFD	
Contact Phone/Email	760-435-4100	
Project Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Project completed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project canceled</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> Project on schedule</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Anticipated completion date: <u>Ongoing</u></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project delayed Explain _____</li> </ul>	

## Summary of Project Progress for this Report Period

1. What was accomplished for this project during this reporting period?

On April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2021 the City of Oceanside was granted their second renewal from NOAA, recognizing the City was StormReady and Tsunami Ready (Objective 5.A). 3 of the 5 water reservoirs have undergone retrofits to meet seismic standards. Currently, the remaining 2 reservoirs are being upgraded and are on schedule for completion mid-2023 (Action 5.A.3). The City’s current Fire Station 1 is not earthquake safe. However, the new Fire Station 1 is designed and will begin construction in 2022. Fire Station 8 is in the design phase, and it will contain all pertinent standards for Critical Infrastructure. Current Fire Station 8 is an industrial building without proper backup infrastructure.

2. What obstacles, problems, or delays did the project encounter?

Funding for the Notification and Siren system (Action 5.A.2 and 5.A.4).

3. If uncompleted, is the project still relevant? Should the project be changed or revised?

The absence of a notification system on the beaches is still relevant regardless of the replacements that have been made. The backup of installed infrastructure on a beach will provide a backup system in the event of a technology failure.

4. Other comments.

None.

Progress Report Period	From Date: 2018	To Date: 2022
Action/Project Title	<b>Goal 6:</b> Reduce the possibility of damage and losses to life, property, and the environment, particularly critical facilities or infrastructure and City of Oceanside owned facilities, due to flooding and sea level rise.	
Responsible Agency	City of Oceanside	
Contact Name	Chief David Parsons - OFD, Chief Peter Lawrence - OFD, Andrew Bartleet - Engineering and Russ Cunningham - Planning	
Contact Phone/Email	760-435-4100	
Project Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Project completed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project canceled</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Project on schedule</b></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Anticipated completion date: <u>Ongoing</u></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project delayed Explain _____</li> </ul>	

## Summary of Project Progress for this Report Period

1. What was accomplished for this project during this reporting period?

The US Army Corps of Engineers has assisted with the removal of vegetation in the reaches of the San Luis Rey River between College and Foussat, funded by the City of Oceanside (Action 6.A.1). The City recently completed its 2021 Cycle Verification with the C.R.S. and has preliminarily scored as a Class 8 community. The City continues to review development for NFIP requirements and process the usual Elevation Certificates, Letters of Map Revision, and other documents as required by the NFIP and for the annual progress reports to the CRS (Action 6.A.3). The City has also completed a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment in late 2019 and the City was provided with a Coastal Hazard Vulnerability Assessment (Action 6.B.1). Oceanside Police Department's beach substation is complete and has been moved 20 feet away from shore. The Lifeguard headquarters are being evaluated for replacement (Objective 6.A).

2. What obstacles, problems, or delays did the project encounter?

The City has faced environmental constraints regarding habitat as an obstacle, preventing some management of vegetation (Action 6.A.1).

3. If uncompleted, is the project still relevant? Should the project be changed or revised?

Yes, the project remains relevant and there is no change.

4. Other comments.

None.

Progress Report Period	From Date: 2018	To Date: 2022
Action/Project Title	<b>Goal 7:</b> Reduce the possibility of damage and losses to life, property, and the environment, particularly critical facilities or infrastructure and City of Oceanside owned facilities, due to wildfires.	
Responsible Agency	City of Oceanside	
Contact Name	Chief Rick Robinson, OFD	
Contact Phone/Email	760-435-4100	
Project Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Project completed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project canceled</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> Project on schedule</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Anticipated completion date: <u>Ongoing</u></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project delayed Explain _____</li> </ul>	

## Summary of Project Progress for this Report Period

1. What was accomplished for this project during this reporting period?

The City is utilizing vegetation management programs on a case-by-case basis, as developments are proposed, to include annual maintenance requirements (Action 7.A.1). The City actively adopts fire codes and Wildland Urban Interface Building Standards on a 3-year cycle (Action 7.A.2).

2. What obstacles, problems, or delays did the project encounter?

The main obstacle the City faces is the continuously changing laws and regulations that are being implemented. The City does not have the staffing to stay up to date with all of the new laws.

3. If uncompleted, is the project still relevant? Should the project be changed or revised?

Coordination with federal and state agencies is difficult due to staff availability. The coordination between all jurisdictions at all levels is still relevant and the City relies on State outreach for coordination.

4. Other comments.

Coordination will become easier as new state laws are implemented regarding wildland fire severity zones and new maps are released by the state.

Progress Report Period	From Date: 2018	To Date: 2022
Action/Project Title	<b>Goal 8:</b> Reduce the possibility of damage and losses to life, property, and the environment, particularly critical facilities or infrastructure and City of Oceanside owned facilities, due to coastal storms, erosion, and severe weather (e.g., drought and extreme temperatures).	
Responsible Agency	City of Oceanside	
Contact Name	Chief Rick Robinson, OFD	
Contact Phone/Email	760-435-4100	
Project Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Project completed</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> Project canceled</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project on schedule</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Anticipated completion date: <u>Ongoing</u></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project delayed</li> </ul> Explain _____	

## Summary of Project Progress for this Report Period

1. What was accomplished for this project during this reporting period?  
 The City has provided public education regarding weather-related processes, such as water conservation and dry vegetation hazards through the City’s website social media. The City and Fire Department’s Public Information Offices continue these efforts.
  
2. What obstacles, problems, or delays did the project encounter?  
 The City was unable to develop GIS-based severe weather maps. This was not completed due to the lack of an Emergency Manager to submit and coordinate the request with GIS.
  
3. If uncompleted, is the project still relevant? Should the project be changed or revised?  
 GIS weather maps no longer remain relevant for the City. This will be changed to incorporate further implementation of the Climate Action Plan (CAP). The City will continue to implement the advancement and usage of infrastructure related to sewer and storm drains maintenance and upgrades.
  
4. Other comments.  
 None.

Progress Report Period	From Date: 2018	To Date: 2022
Action/Project Title	<b>Goal 9:</b> Reduce the possibility of damage and losses to life, property, and the environment, particularly critical facilities or infrastructure and City of Oceanside owned facilities, due to human caused hazards.	
Responsible Agency	City of Oceanside	
Contact Name	Chief Rick Robinson, OFD	
Contact Phone/Email	760-435-4100	
Project Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Project completed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project canceled</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Project on schedule</b></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Anticipated completion date: <u>Ongoing</u></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Project delayed Explain _____</li> </ul>	

## Summary of Project Progress for this Report Period

1. What was accomplished for this project during this reporting period?

The City continues to mitigate cyber-attacks through the use of next generation firewalls/anti-virus/malware solutions. The City implements services from the Department of Homeland Security, such as Albert, which monitors the City 24/7 and has weekly vulnerability scans performed (Action 9.A.1 and 9.A.2). The City continues to report any information regarding potential threats or criminal activity to the public through social media and the San Diego Law Enforcement Coordination Center (SDLECC). The City also has a Terrorism Liaison Officer (TLO) program to send and receive information from SDLECC (Action 9.A.4).

2. What obstacles, problems, or delays did the project encounter?

None.

3. If uncompleted, is the project still relevant? Should the project be changed or revised?

The City has an ongoing relationship with the San Diego Hazardous Incident Response Team, but with concerns. The City is reevaluating the cost of return with this agreement, but the mitigation processes are still relevant (Action 9.A.3).

• Other comments.

None.

## 7.2. Plan Update Evaluation

Plan Section	Considerations	Explanation
Planning Process	Should new jurisdictions and/or districts be invited to participate in future plan updates?	San Diego County Water Authority; California Coastal Commission; San Diego County Vector Control Program; San Diego County Farm Bureau; San Diego Climate Collaborative; San Diego Regional Water Quality Board.
	Have any internal or external agencies been invaluable to the mitigation strategy?	City of Oceanside Fire Department; City of Oceanside Development Services Department; CalFire.
	Can any procedures (e.g., meeting announcements, plan updates) be done differently or more efficiently?	Formal designation of responsible staff, with attention to relevant training and experience, workload, resources, etc. Establishing an interdisciplinary team and assigning clear and manageable roles and responsibilities to all participants.
	Has the Planning Team undertaken any public outreach activities?	No.
	How can public participation be improved?	The City could make draft worksheet responses available for public comment.
	Have there been any changes in public support and/or decision-maker priorities related to hazard mitigation?	Growing interest in climate adaptation among community members; recognition that conformance to HMP requirements enhances the City's eligibility for emergency funding.
Capability Assessment	Have jurisdictions adopted new policies, plans, regulations, or reports that could be incorporated into this plan?	Updated general plan elements (e.g., safety elements); coastal hazard vulnerability assessments; coastal hazard adaptation plans.
	Are there different or additional administrative, human, technical, and financial resources available for mitigation planning?	Federal ARP funds; federal infrastructure funds; state infrastructure grants; state planning grants.
	Are there different or new education and outreach programs and resources available for mitigation activities?	Oceanside Fire Department is moving focus from Fire Prevention to Community Risk Reduction. Data driven decisions will assist overall mitigation activities.
	Has NFIP participation changed in the participating jurisdictions?	The City continues to review development for NFIP requirements, and process the usual Elevation Certificates, Letters of Map Revision, and other documents as required by the NFIP and for the annual progress reports to the CRS.
Risk Assessment	Has a natural and/or technical or human-caused disaster occurred?	No.
	Should the list of hazards addressed in the plan be modified?	Yes.

Are there new data sources and/or additional maps and studies available? If so, what are they and what have they revealed? Should the information be incorporated into future plan updates?	The City has completed a F Vulnerability Assessment in late 2019, which provided the City with a Coastal Hazard Vulnerability Assessment. This Assessment provided a multitude of maps depicting different hazards depending on geographical location in the City.
Do any new critical facilities or infrastructure need to be added to the asset lists?	Fire stations; water distribution facilities (i.e., pump stations); police substation.
Have any changes in development trends occurred that could create additional risks?	Infill and redevelopment is focusing growth in already urbanized areas, which could increase risks associated with structure fires, earthquakes, and extreme heat events.
Are there repetitive losses and/or severe repetitive losses to document?	Yes, according to the 2022 FEMA Repetitive Loss Summary Report, the City of Oceanside had 13 Repetitive Loss properties, but no Severe Repetitive Loss properties.

**TABLE 14: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 7.2 DATA.**

<b>Plan Section</b>	<b>Considerations</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Mitigation Strategy	Is the mitigation strategy being implemented as anticipated? Were the cost and timeline estimates accurate?	Generally, yes. Costs and timelines are not accurate.
	Should new mitigation actions be added to the Action Plan? Should existing mitigation actions be revised or eliminated from the plan?	The current plan update process is adding, removing, and revising mitigation actions.
	Are there new obstacles that were not anticipated in the plan that will need to be considered in the next plan update?	There are no new obstacles.
	Are there new funding sources to consider?	Federal ARP funds; federal infrastructure funds; state infrastructure funds.
	Have elements of the plan been incorporated into other planning mechanisms?	Safety elements.
Plan Maintenance Procedures	Was the plan monitored and evaluated as anticipated?	No. The lack of a full-time emergency manager who administers the plan is a severe impediment.
	What are needed improvements to the procedures?	Assignment of staff responsible for implementation; dedicated funding; community engagement strategies.

**TABLE 15: FEMA LOCAL MITIGATION PLANNING HANDBOOK WORKSHEET 7.2 DATA CONTINUED**