There's only one San Francisco. Let's take care of it.
Resilience Planning in San Francisco

- Disaster mitigation and recovery policies
- Expanded definition of resilience on the 100 RC model:
  - Consider disaster preparedness and recovery for both infrastructure and communities
Critical Challenges to Resilience Planning

- Creating a sense of urgency
- Long-term planning and implementation in a political environment
- Traditional building code focus on life-safety rather than recovery
- Issues of equity, displacement, housing, demographics, and population growth
- Encouraging the private sector to address resiliency
- Lack of funding for mitigation and planning efforts
- Changes at the federal level
Neighborhoods with risk factors require additional resources for disaster response.

Place-based analysis enables impactful outreach and capacity building.
Access To Services

- Analysis compares several population measures to the City as a whole
- Allows targeted investments in communities of need
Capital Planning for Public Infrastructure Resilience

- Establishes a long-term plan of finance
- Creates the basis for investment decisions and project implementation
- Demonstrates sound financial management
- Means for communicating with a wide range of audiences
10-Year Capital Plan

- Constrained 10-year plan of finance
  - Created in 2006 to coordinate and prioritize infrastructure investments
  - Objective and transparent review and recommendation process
  - Current plan proposes to spend $35 billion through 2027

- Accomplishments
  - Over $10 billion approved since 2006
  - $3.5 billion GO bonds since 2008

- Ongoing Policies & Programs
  - Pay-As-You-Go
  - GO Bonds
  - GF Debt
  - Revenue Bonds
## G.O. Bond Debt Program

*(in $millions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Proposed Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>Seawall Fortification</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2020</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety &amp; Emergency Response</td>
<td>$290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2022</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2024</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2025</td>
<td>Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2026</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety &amp; Emergency Response</td>
<td>$290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEBT PROGRAM
General Obligation (G.O.) Bond Capacity

Capital Plan G.O. Bond Program (Certified AV 8-1-16)
FY2017 - 2027

Note: Chart does not reflect passage of Measure C in November 2016, allowing use of Seismic Safety Loan Bond Program capacity for Affordable Housing projects
San Francisco’s Great Seawall was built in 1878 and runs three miles along the waterfront.

It supports business and infrastructure on the waterfront and protects the City against flooding.

The Seawall is vulnerable to earthquakes and must be strengthened.

The estimated cost to fully replace is $2-5 billion.
Major Project:
Emergency Firefighting Water System

- Build ability to meet full water demand after an earthquake

Citywide reliability 2010
47%

Citywide reliability after projects
96%
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The Public Safety Building will provide a new earthquake-resistant facility for the SF Police Department Command Center, Southern District Police Station, and Mission Bay Fire Station. This Project is funded by the voter-approved June 2010 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond. The Executive Architect team is HOK + Mark Cavagnero Associates in collaboration with the SF DPW Bureau of Architecture. The project is designed for LEED Gold Certification.

Public Safety Building

Emergency Contact/Pankow Construction:
Department of Public Works: 415-XXX-XXXX

A Project of the City’s Ten-Year Capital Plan
There’s only one San Francisco—together we’re taking care of it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Apprentice Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>164,109</td>
<td>73,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port</td>
<td>428,513</td>
<td>114,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>2,038,136</td>
<td>856,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>606,064</td>
<td>230,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFO</td>
<td>2,147,155</td>
<td>838,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPW</td>
<td>2,981,451</td>
<td>1,027,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,365,427</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,141,151</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Seismic Hazard Rating Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHR</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHR-1</td>
<td><strong>Minor damage</strong> (good performance). Some structural or nonstructural damage and/or falling hazards may occur, but these would pose minimal life hazards to occupants. The damage can be repaired while the building is occupied and with minimum disruptions to functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR-2</td>
<td><strong>Moderate damage</strong> (fair performance). Structural and nonstructural damage and/or falling hazards are anticipated which would pose low life hazards to occupants. The damage can be repaired while the building is occupied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR-3</td>
<td><strong>Major damage</strong> (poor performance). Structural and nonstructural damage are anticipated which would pose appreciable life hazards to occupants. The building has to be vacated during repairs, or possibly cannot be repaired due to the extent and/or economic considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR-4</td>
<td><strong>Partial/total collapse</strong> (very poor performance). Extensive structural and nonstructural damage, potential structural collapse and/or falling hazards are anticipated which would pose high life hazards to occupants. There is a good likelihood that damage repairs would not be feasible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECP Leadership Academy
PROGRAM OUTCOMES

SKILLS
Empower diverse, emerging community leaders with tools and skills to create high-performing volunteer teams that identify and achieve collective goals.

TRUST
Increase the level of trust and reciprocity between neighborhood leaders and the agencies and institutions committed to their success to ensure mutual accountability.

KNOWLEDGE
Grow participant awareness of SF programs, processes and services that can help catalyze positive change.

NETWORK
Grow participant awareness of SF programs, processes and services that can help catalyze positive change.
Community Resilience

Community Resilience Indicators – 2012

The Community Resiliency Indicator System uses 38 indicators to approximate vulnerability and resiliency in San Francisco. These indicators fall into the following domains: Hazard Indicators, Environmental Indicators, Transportation Indicators, Community Indicators, Public Realm Indicators, Housing Indicators, Economy Indicators, Health Indicators, and Demographic Indicators.
Neighborhood Empowerment Network

Why it’s important

- Neighborhoods are diverse and needs are not identical
- Government must be nimble in its approach to tailor services for unique populations
- Developing leaders at the neighborhood level allows the City to expand its reach post-disaster
- Community-based partners possess unique resources that the City cannot provide