



MEETING MINUTES

Date of Meeting:	January 5, 2016
Location:	1 Twin Pines Lane, Belmont, CA 94002
Subject:	Steering Committee No. 2
Project Name:	San Mateo County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update
In Attendance:	Steering Committee: David Pucci, Bart Spencer, Joe Spanheimer, Pat Halleran, Tom Maloney, Ken Anderson, Dan Ghirso, Rob Bartoli, Brian Molver Planning Team: David Pucci, Bart Spencer, Rob Flaner, and Jessica Cerutti Non-voting Attendees: Steve Mahaley; Christy Adonis; Srijesh Thapa
Not Present:	Caitlin Kelly (planning team); Dan Berumen
Summary Prepared by:	Jessica Cerutti – 1/6/2016
Quorum – Yes or No	Yes (9 voting members present)

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

Welcome and Introductions

- Rob Flaner opened the meeting and facilitated group introductions.
- The Agenda was reviewed and no modifications were made.
- Distributed handouts included: Agenda, Steering Committee Meeting #1 Minutes; Steering Committee Charter; Vision Statement; Summary of Public Involvement and Plan Review; Goal Setting Exercise Summary; Vision/Mission Statement; Critical Facilities Definition; Public Survey
- No requests for comment were made.
- No members of the public were present to address the Steering Committee.

Confirm December's Meeting Minutes, Charter, and Vision Statement

After facilitating group introductions and reviewing the agenda, Mr. Flaner asked the steering committee (SC) for any outstanding comments regarding the meeting minutes from SC#1. The SC indicated no issues and the SC#1 Meeting Minutes were approved.

Mr. Flaner brought attention to the SC Charter. The SC indicated that they were able to review the SC Charter, and Mr. Flaner explained that the only



Meeting Minutes

Item	Action
<p>outstanding issue was the quorum number. The number decided was six based on an eleven person Steering Committee.</p>	<p>Bart Spencer to confirm 11th SC member.</p>
<p>Mr. Maloney requested clarification regarding the number of voting members from San Mateo Office of Emergency Services (OES). At this time, Mr. Flaner reiterated the stakeholder types: participatory stakeholders who serve as voting members, and coordinating stakeholders who are informed non-voting member. The SC agreed that OES needs to remain a consistent presence throughout the planning process and should have a single vote from a primary participatory stakeholder or alternate. Other OES personnel present at SC meetings will be considered coordinating stakeholders.</p>	<p>Bart Spencer to confirm Capt. Geoff Balton of Colma as alternate.</p> <p>Dave Pucci and Rob Bartoli to identify their alternates.</p>
<p>The SC identified a need for alternates from the fire district, Redwood City, and county planning department.</p>	
<p>The SC voted to accept the Charter, as amended, with a designated 6-person quorum.</p>	
<p>Mr. Flaner continued on to review vision statement, clarifying that while the vision statement is not a requirement from FEMA, it serves to provide a structure that supports the planning process. Upon further discussion, the SC decided to include an economic viability component to the vision statement. The SC voted to accept the vision statement, as amended.</p>	<p>Tetra Tech to update the Charter and redistribute.</p> <p>Tetra Tech to update the vision statement and redistribute.</p>
<u>Public Involvement Strategy</u>	
<p>Ms. Cerutti initiated the discussion on the outreach strategy by reviewing SC comments on public involvement. The SC agreed that the previous plan outreach initiative only focused on a few public meetings and a more robust process is needed for this plan update. The SC agreed that this process needs to include a social media component due to the availability of such technology and the presence of large social media company headquarters (e.g. Facebook, YouTube) within San Mateo County. Mr. Maloney recommended that the ideal social media platform would be Facebook, given the platform's ability to provide real-time analytics in the form of public-facing "Likes" and "Shares." He also noted that while Twitter is another possible platform, the use of such is limited due to character confines and lack of measurability.</p>	
<p>Mr. Pucci suggested that a single entity should be identified as the major distributor of social media messaging as a way to coordinate and control a uniform message. He suggested that once this entity posts or pushes the uniformed message out, partnering organizations can share through their own platform.</p>	
<p>Mr. Halleran asked if SMCAAlert could be used in public outreach or if it served as strictly as an emergency notification system. Mr. Molver</p>	



Meeting Minutes

Item

indicated that SMCAAlert may only be used for emergency notification and using this service as a public outreach tool must be vetted and approved internally. Mr. Molver mentioned that the county Public Information Officer, Michelle Durand, could be a resource for maximizing outreach.

The SC also identified the need to designate a website lead for the development of the plan website. Mr. Flaner reminded the SC that development of a website is key in pushing out public information, particularly early on in the process. No consensus was reached regarding a solution.

Ms. Cerutti then shared the recommendation for SC members to attend community advisory committee meetings as a method of spreading the word about the HMP initiative. Mr. Pucci suggested attending the quarterly Emergency Services Council Meeting (ESCM). Upon further discussion, the SC agreed that the next ESCM on April 21st would serve as a preferred tool for both conducting the first public meeting and informing the Emergency Services Council. The SC suggested engaging community organizations, such as CERT and the American Red Cross, to make the first public meeting a multi-organization event for the community.

The SC suggested that the County Planning Commission Meeting could serve as the vehicle for the second public meeting. While this was not confirmed, this is a follow-on item for later SC meetings.

Ms. Cerutti focused next on the public survey, distributing a hard copy of the survey and reviewing the comments submitted by SC members. Mr. Maloney identified additional considerations for the survey regarding special purpose districts. Mr. Halleran suggested creating a narrative hook for the introduction to make the survey more approachable. The SC agreed that more clarification was needed throughout the survey regarding whether respondents live, work, and/or go to school in San Mateo County. Finally, the SC agreed that, in addition to English, the final survey should be translated and distributed in Spanish. Mr. Flaner asked if there were any additional languages that should be considered for translation. The SC did not believe additional languages were needed beyond Spanish and English.

Plan Review

Ms. Cerutti continued by reviewing the summary of plan comments submitted by members of the SC. The SC agreed with the summary and made note of issues associated with the Freedom of Information Act. Mr. Flaner assured that the plan will not include identifying information (such

Action

Brian Molver to invite PIO Michelle Durand to the next SC meeting.

Conduct first public meeting as an open house in coordination with community organizations prior to the April 21st ESCM (approx. 2:00pm). Additional coordination details to be discussed at a later time.

Dave Pucci to present the project at ESCM.

Steering Committee to discuss further options for Public Meeting 2.

Tetra Tech to update survey based on SC #2 comments and resend to the SC for a second review.

Rob Bartoli to look into county resources for Spanish translation assistance.

SC members to return comments on survey to Tetra Tech by Tuesday – January 19th.



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

as addresses) and will remain intentionally vague for the purpose of sensitive information protection.

Ms. Cerutti reviewed the results of the goal setting exercise. She reviewed the eight selected goals that received the highest percentage of votes as well as some additional items for consideration. The steering committee discussed the inclusion of an economic viability goal, but ultimately decided that it should be included in the vision statement. Ms. Cerutti recommended consolidating the first two selected goals into an overarching, combined goal of “Protect life and property”. The SC agreed. As a result, the following seven goals were selected and approved as the 2016 San Mateo Hazard Mitigation Plan:

1. Protect life and property.
2. Provide information to residents to better understand the hazards of the region and ways to reduce their personal vulnerability to those hazards.
3. Promote hazard mitigation as an integrated public policy and as a standard business practice.
4. Increase resilience of infrastructure and critical facilities.
5. Protect the environment.
6. Develop and implement mitigation strategies that use public funds in an efficient and cost effective way.
7. Improve community emergency management capability.

After the approval of the 2016 goals, Mr. Flaner initiated the discussion on establishing a critical facilities definition for the plan. Mr. Flaner presented two examples – a general definition to suit anticipated and unanticipated need, and a specific definition that identified explicit types of facilities (e.g. libraries, primary employer facilities, etc.). Mr. Pucci indicated a preference for the more general definition and the SC agreed. The SC added additional verbiage to further generalize the definition and approved it for plan purposes. The approved definition of a critical facility for the 2016 HMP update is as follows:

A structure or other improvement, public or private, that, because of its function, size, service area, or uniqueness, has the potential to cause serious bodily harm, extensive property damage, or disruption of vital socioeconomic activities if it is destroyed or damaged or if its functionality is impaired. Critical facilities may include but are not limited to health and safety facilities, utilities, government facilities, hazardous materials facilities, or vital community economic facilities.



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

Mr. Flaner discussed the need for establishing hazard scenarios for some of the profiled hazards. The following scenarios and resources were discussed and approved by the SC for modeling:

Flood

- 10-year
- 100-year

Earthquake

- 7.9 (San Andreas)
- 7.2 (Hayward)
- 100-year Probabilistic

Dam Failure

- Daylight Scenario

During the discussion on the dam failure scenario, Ms. Adonis inquired as to how removal of dams will affect the communities and this planning effort. Mr. Flaner explained that FEMA will remap the affected areas once dam removal is completed. He indicated that current dam removal processes will not affect this plan update, but may affect the next.

Landslide

- Risk associated with soft soil on slope
- NHERP classification system

Severe Weather

- NOAA

Wildfire

- Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP) maps

Tsunami

- CalOES Tsunami Evacuation Data

Drought

- Available drought maps

During the drought discussion, Mr. Spencer brought up the coastal flower farms. He said that these companies have irrigated fields and have suffered as a result of the current drought period. Mr. Flaner made note and indicated that Tetra Tech will look into the economic impact of the drought on these companies.

Action Items for Next Meeting

Action items identified for the next meeting include the following:



Meeting Minutes

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

- Discuss detail of first public meeting
- Approve public questionnaire
- Update on the risk assessment
- Discuss the capability assessment
- Discuss plan maintenance
- Progress report update

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 AM

The next SC meeting is in person or via teleconference:

February 2, 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