Welcome and Announcements

- Rita Mancera welcomed the steering committee to the meeting.
- Roll call was done by Rita Mancera and quorum was achieved. Each member if they completed the second survey and/or shared it with other stakeholders.
- No comments from the committee were made on the agenda.
- No comments were made on the minutes from meeting #4. It was moved by David Cosgrave to adopt the minutes as is and seconded by Belen Seara. The minutes were approved without dissent.

Steering Committee Business

- Results of hazard/risk assessment
  - Presentation
    - Rob Flaner showed the risk assessment results to the committee. A more in-depth presentation was done on June 10th for members of the Core Planning Team. He explained that each hazard gets a score based upon the intersection of probability and impact (to people, property, and economy). Each hazard will then be ranked from high to low.
      - Each high hazard must have at least one action item, but that does not mean that low ranked actions can’t have highly ranked action items.
    - Rob Flaner also provided insight into the equity lens option. He said that it added granularity to the analysis because it was able to fine tune the impacts on people. He showed the baseline results and the hazard results with the equity lens. There is a distinct increase in impact to people when the equity lens option was added.
Steering Committee Questions/Comments

- Belen Seara asked why the equity lens did not change severe weather scores.
  - Rob Flaner said that since there isn’t extent location data resolution for severe weather, there was no way to get the granularity that other hazards were able to achieve.
  - Ann Ludwig said information can be included qualitatively in the annexes, especially if there is information relevant to specific San Mateo County communities.
- Belen Seara expressed concerns about extreme heat and stated that there are models (ex. transportation) available that look at the impacts of extreme heat on infrastructure and people. She understands the current risk ranking but thinks that severe weather/extreme heat can be addressed.
  - Rob Flaner expressed that those kinds of models and impacts typically do not go into mitigation plans. However, those models can be shared amongst the partners who want extreme heat to be addressed within their individual annexes.
  - Rob Flaner also mentioned the “future needs” section of the plan as a place where data such as those discussed by Belen Seara can be discussed.
  - Belen Seara shared information on the extreme heat model in the chat.
- David Cosgrave asked why tsunami was ranked as high with the equity lens even though none of the other categories above it are high.
  - Rob Flaner said that since there was a high degree of resolution in the unincorporated areas when adding the equity lens, it increased the hazard ranking.

Planning Partner Questions/Comments

- No comments were made by planning partners.

Public Questions/Comments

- Ron Snow: The matrix ‘Risk Ranking’ seems to have all the same values across the board? Is there an updated matrix with actual ranking?
  - Ron Snow asked this in the chat and said that this was due to an earlier slide where all the values were the same. Rob Flaner explained that these values were probability and impact factors. He showed the earthquake page as an example of this.
    - Ron Snow thought it was a template since he assumed certain cities would have higher ratings based upon their soil compositions and locations on fault lines.
    - Rob Flaner explained that the modeling used took soils, proximity, and building factors into account and all structures exposed have high impacts.

MJLHMP Maintenance Plan

- Rob Flaner explained that having a maintenance strategy is a required part of the plan process. Partners will submit annual reports using a platform called the BATool, and the County will combine those into an annual report to be submitted to FEMA and the board of supervisors.
  - Maintenance Plan information will be sent to partners in July
There will be two meetings organized by the County each year, one in January and the other in July.

- This window is ideal for coordination on grants
  - BRIC grant opens in August
  - Reporting is not required by FEMA, but is considered a best practice

### Planning Process

- Bart Spencer provided brief updates on the planning process for San Mateo County. All the Phase 3 workshops were well-attended by the planning partners, and the Q&A sessions with him and Rob Flaner will continue through the end of July.
- Given the constrained planning timeframe, all planning partners have a firm annex due date on July 23rd.
- No comments were made by the steering committee, the planning partners, or the public on the planning process.

### County Updates

- **Schedule review**
  - Ann Ludwig provided a recap of all June outreach activities. The second survey was released and outreach meetings/events were conducted for the public, steering committee members/planning partners, and vulnerable San Mateo County communities.
  - Ann Ludwig also discussed upcoming outreach activities and plan milestones for the months of July and August. These included the release date of the draft MJLHMP (08/05) and the plan submittal date (08/31). The plan will be reviewed concurrently by CalOES/FEMA and returned to the County, with a planned adoption date of December 2021.
- **Outreach Update**
  - Hilary Papendick provided an update on outreach activities done by the County. The County worked with 8 Community Based Organizations to put together focus groups and presentations to promote the MJLHMP. Over 600 people attended these events and digital outreach (social media, email) was distributed to over 30,000 followers and subscribers.
  - Hilary Papendick also discussed the second survey, which asked San Mateo County residents about mitigation actions. The goal of this survey is to determine how residents think the County can reduce the risk of hazards and how they can get organized/prepared before a disaster. As of June 28th, the County had received 364 responses.
- **Questions/Comments**
  - None from Steering Committee, planning partners, or public.

### Public Comment and Adjournment

- No comments made by the public and there were no additional comments from the steering committee or planning partners.

### Adjourn
The meeting ended at 3:18 PM.