



MEETING MINUTES

Date of Meeting:	March 1, 2016
Location:	1 Twin Pines Lane, Belmont, CA 94002
Subject:	Steering Committee No. 4
Project Name:	San Mateo County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update
In Attendance:	Steering Committee: Bart Spencer, David Pucci, Joe Spanheimer, Tom Maloney, Ken Anderson, Dan Ghiorso, Rob Bartoli, Dan Berumen Planning Team: Bart Spencer, David Pucci, Caitlin Kelly, Rob Flaner, and Jessica Cerutti Non-voting Attendees: Srijesh Thapa
Not Present:	Pat Halleran; Brian Molver
Summary Prepared by:	Jessica Cerutti and Caitlin Kelly – 3/13/2016
Quorum – Yes or No	Yes (8 voting members present)

Item

Action

Welcome and Introductions, Confirm Meeting Minutes, and Public Comment

- Ms. Kelly opened the meeting and facilitated group introductions.
- The agenda was reviewed and no modifications were made.
- Distributed handouts included: Agenda, Steering Committee Meeting #3 Minutes; Objective Exercise Results; Risk Ranking Overview; Plan Maintenance; Section 1
- No requests for comment were made.
- Members of the public did not address the Steering Committee.

Plan Review

Ms. Kelly began the Plan Review discussion with an overview of the Objectives Survey Results. She noted that the over half of the participants selected the same 10 objectives. In addition, she noted that eleven additional objective received less than half of the participant support. She asked the SC if they would like to review these eleven objectives or if they were satisfied with selecting the top ten. The SC indicated that they supported the selection of the top ten objectives. Mr. Flaner suggested that the SC consider adding one additional objective that received less than half of respondent support. This objective concerns repetitively damaged structures. He said that this objective was vital for the plan. The SC agreed to add the final eleventh objective per Mr. Flaner's

Tetra Tech to incorporate alternates and redistribute SC Charter.

**Item****Action**

recommendation. The final list of objectives for the San Mateo County Hazard Mitigation Plan are as follows:

1. Improve understanding of the locations, potential impacts, and linkages among threats hazards, vulnerability, and measures needed to protect life safety and health. (State Objective)
2. Establish and maintain partnerships among all levels of government, private sector, community groups, and institutions of higher learning that improve and implement methods to protect life and property. (State Objective)
3. Develop and provide updated information about threats, hazards, vulnerabilities, and mitigation strategies to state, regional, and local agencies, as well as private sector groups. (State Objective)
4. Encourage the incorporation of mitigation measures into repairs, major alterations, new development, and redevelopment practices, especially in areas subject to substantial hazard risk. (State Objective)
5. Promote and implement hazard mitigation plans and projects that are consistent with state, regional and local climate action and adaptation goals, policies, and programs. (State Objective)
6. Advance community resilience through preparation, adoption, and implementation of state, regional and local multi-hazard mitigation plans and projects. (State Objective)
7. Encourage life and property protection measures for all communities and structures located in hazard areas.(State Objective)
8. Actively promote effective coordination of regional and local hazard mitigation planning and action among state agencies, cities, counties, special districts, tribal organizations, councils of governments, metropolitan planning organizations, and regional transportation to create resilient and sustainable communities. (State Objective)
9. Improve systems that provide warning and emergency communications.
10. Promote dialogue between government representatives, private business, non-profit organizations, and the public regarding hazard mitigation. (Adapted from San Mateo General Plan)
11. Retrofit, purchase, or relocate structures in high hazard areas, especially those known to be repetitively damaged.

Next, Ms. Kelly covered the Plan Maintenance Section. She requested clarification from the previous SC Meeting discussion regarding the role of the San Mateo County Emergency Managers Association (EMA) as the vehicle for annual review. The SC agreed that EMA will designate certain



Item

Action

meetings, approximately 2 times a year, dedicated to hazard mitigation review. During this time, SC members not normally associated with the EMA will be engaged to participate in the review. Mr. Flaner said that the plan maintenance strategy is important for both the countywide and jurisdictional maintenance process. He said that this overall strategy demonstrates an overall commitment to maintaining the plan. Additionally, Mr. Flaner stressed that, while there is no statutory requirement for annual progress reporting during this review process, such reporting provides benefits in time management during the next update.

Mr. Flaner then provided information on other best practices from other communities and counties regarding the plan maintenance strategy. He asked if the strategy would benefit from ramifications for non-participation. The SC agreed that hard ramifications would not benefit the County, however a structure and timeline conducive to open grant periods and jurisdictional progress reporting due dates is the best option. Mr. Pucci further explained that it would be the responsibility of the SC to engage jurisdictions that may be delinquent in annual progress reporting due to personnel. Mr. Ghiorso also noted that city leadership may be engaged to contact those responsible for progress reporting.

The SC agreed that plan maintenance discussion should be included as part of the Jurisdictional Annex Workshop (JAW) on April 20th.

Next, Ms. Kelly briefly reviewed Section 1 of the plan. She said that Tetra Tech will provide the SC with an electronic, editable version of the plan for providing comments. She requested that the SC provide comments in this document via track changes for easy document integration. She provided the SC with 2 weeks for Section 1 review.

Ms. Kelly's discussion of Section 1 focused on the planning process. She noted that while this 2016 initiative is technically an update to the 2010 plan, the planning process language in Section 1 noted that the 2016 plan will be treated as a new plan. She explained that the reasoning behind this language was to demonstrate alignment with federal hazard mitigation planning requirements. Additionally, she noted the inclusion of a crosswalk that identifies what has changed between the 2010 plan and the 2016 plan. Mr. Thapa recommended the inclusion of a brief overview of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) – the entity responsible for the 2010 plan. The SC agreed that this information would benefit the 2016 plan.

Next, Mr. Flaner introduced the concept of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Obstacles (SWOO) Session scheduled for April 5 during the next SC meeting. Mr. Flaner explained that regulation requires the identification of a comprehensive range of alternative actions. These

Tetra Tech to send updated Plan Maintenance Strategy language for review.

SC to review Plan Maintenance Strategy and Section 1 and return comments by March 22nd.

Tetra Tech to add overview of ABAG to Section 1.

Tetra Tech to provide draft word version of Section 1 for SC review.

Mr. Pucci to invite EMA and Oracle stakeholder to the April SWOO. Mr. Spencer to reach out



Meeting Minutes

Item	Action
------	--------

alternative are identified through the SWOO Session. He said that the SWOO Session will result in the development of a mitigation best practices document that will be provided to each planning partner for review and selection during the JAW. He explained the format of the SWOO Session, noting that each hazard will be discussed individually. The SC recommended inviting additional stakeholders and local subject matter experts to this session. Mr. Pucci offered to invite EMA members and Mr. Spencer offered to invite the Public Works Association. Mr. Maloney additionally recommended the participation of key private stakeholders, including Genentech, Oracle, and Facebook.

to Public Works Association and Genentech for participation in addition to coordinating overall SWOO registration.

Mr. Pucci to follow up with San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services to engage the City Managers group and Facebook.

The SC agreed that the SWOO Session should occur during the second half of the monthly SC meeting. As a result, SC meeting #5 will begin as scheduled at 9:00am on Tuesday, April 5th and invitees to the SWOO will be invited to join at approximately 10:30am.

Tetra Tech to provide registration survey.

After the SWOO Session discussion, Ms. Kelly updated the SC on the status of the risk assessment. She noted that the SC will review the risk assessment in two sections for the purpose of minimizing the review burden on the SC. She noted that Tetra Tech is still receiving data on critical facilities.

Risk Ranking

Mr. Flaner next discussed the methodology for risk ranking. He noted that the Tetra Tech approach to risk ranking provides a quantitative analysis that best illustrates the need for mitigation action. Mr. Flaner explained that there is no statutory requirement for risk ranking, however the inclusion of such a process into the plan provides a better understanding of the overall impact of each hazard on the county and jurisdictions. He said that every FEMA project grant require a benefit-cost analysis that describes how annual avoided losses and probability of occurrence is translated into monetary value – a process achieved through HAZUS. The risk ranking is further accomplished by providing numeric weights to impact – with the greatest emphasis placed on population.

Mr. Flaner further explained that the quantitative assessment conducted as part of this planning process will be provided to each participating jurisdiction at the JAW. During this time, jurisdictions will be provided with an opportunity to use qualitative knowledge to change the quantitative data.

Mr. Flaner noted that natural hazards except climate change will be assessed and ranked in this manner. Mr. Ghiorso asked if jurisdictions will have access to neighboring jurisdiction information to compare and assess risk across a smaller regional plane. Mr. Flaner said that all



Item

Action

jurisdictions will have access to each other information, even for the City of San Mateo and Foster City, who are not participating in this planning process.

Public Involvement Strategy

Ms. Kelly requested clarification regarding the first public meeting on April 21st. The SC agreed that the presentation to the Emergency Service Council (ESC) is a vital public component to the outreach strategy, but the initial concept of an outside fair is not preferred. Mr. Spencer said that the coordinators of the June Disaster Preparedness Fair have been informed of the mitigation planning initiative and are open for planning partner participation.

Mr. Spencer to provide Tetra Tech with additional coordination information regarding the June Disaster Preparedness Fair.

Ms. Kelly next asked the SC if they had any initial thoughts on conducting the public plan review meeting which she anticipated to take place in July.

Finally, Ms. Kelly requested additional information on the status of the initial press release regarding the 2016 mitigation planning initiative. Mr. Bartoli said that he would follow up with Michelle Durand about the release.

Mr. Bartoli to follow-up on status of press release.

Mr. Bartoli discussed the status of the HMP website. He said that the website is now live and contains a link to the survey, a link to the previous plan, previous SC meeting minutes, and information on the project and upcoming steering committee meetings. He said that as the planning process continues, the website will be updated to additionally include the draft plan for public review and information on public meetings. Mr. Bartoli said that the planning department intends to keep the website live for the entire 5 year interim between planning updates.

Mr. Bartoli to send SC members the link to the HMP webpage.

Ms. Kelly closed the discussion on the public outreach topic by asking where the SC stood on Silver Dragon. Mr. Anderson said that he could print 1,700 copies of what the SC decides to push out.

Tetra Tech to develop a flyer for Silver Dragon.



Item

Action

Action Items for Next Meeting

Action items identified for the next meeting include the following:

- Confirm Risk Ranking
- Strengths, Weaknesses, Obstacle, Opportunities Brainstorm
- Discuss Action Plan Development
- Review Plan Review/Adoption
- Review Section of the Plan (Part 2A)

The meeting adjourned at 11:04 AM

The next SC meeting is in person or via teleconference:

April 5, 2016 at 9:00 AM

Belmont EOC

1 Twin Pines Lane, Belmont CA

or

Meeting access number: 1-800-523-8437

Participant code: 519 767 6396