

draft
Minutes
MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE
CITY OF ROSEVILLE CIVIC CENTER
Planning Conference Room
October 28, 2009

The Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee was called to order on Wednesday, October 28, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. at the Roseville Civic Center.

SILENT ROLL CALL

The following Committee members were present: Grace Keller, *Chair*, Rita Brohman, *Vice Chair*, Mike Isom, George Booth, Mike Escobedo, Chris Wooden, Barbara Todd, and Jim Williams

Committee Staff/Consultant Members present: Rob Flaner, Dean Grundy, Carl Walker, Garth Gaylord, and Julia Burrows

No members of the public were present.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Grace Keller welcomed the Committee members to the October 28th meeting. She reviewed the agenda and the Committee members agreed to review the items included. Minutes for the September meeting were approved unanimously following corrections made to the list of those in attendance and a motion by Rita Brohman following a second by Mike Isom. Those not in attendance abstained from the motion.

FEMA PLAN UPDATE REQUIREMENTS

Rob Flaner reviewed the basic requirements required for a Plan Update versus a new plan. He stated the Plan Update requirements are different and the work will be based upon the 2005 Plan so the Committee is not starting from scratch.

Rob has been in discussion with the California Emergency Management Agency (CAL E-M-A) regarding the requirement to complete a 2008-09 progress report. CAL EMA noted very few communities complete annual progress reports, so Roseville is ahead as far as preparing a required summary chapter of all progress made since the 2005 Plan was adopted.

CAL EMA is recommending that a 2009 progress report be completed and that a chapter be prepared that summarizes all four progress reports. The Floodplain Management staff already prepared an update to the Floodplain Action Identifiers that was required for the Community Rating System Class 1 audit this past summer.

Julia Burrows will contact staff in the various city departments to update the 2008 progress report for natural hazard events, success stories and progress made on the action identifiers. The information will be compiled for the next Committee meeting and reviewed by the Committee as an agenda item.

The crosswalk for the Plan was handed out to the Committee as background material for reference during the Plan Update meetings.

The Plan Update includes a review of the State and County Plans to make sure Roseville is consistent. This work began at the September meeting.

The Committee discussed at length how to show if mitigation was included in the 2005 Plan or new in the 2010 Plan Update. The matrix in the 2010 Plan will include a column to indicate when the item was initiated – 2005 or 2010.

CAL EMA requires that the Plan include a public process. The public must be given the opportunity to comment on any changes at all including new data and especially new information like the dam failure analysis. The City and this Committee will reinvolve the public in ways very similar to the 2005 Plan preparation public workshops.

The Committee had a discussion regarding items to be included in the 2010 MHMP Update versus the Emergency Reponse Plan. Rita Brohman suggested that one of the hazards that will the City must be prepared for is the secondary impact of a mass evacuation where people are evacuated to Roseville.

Rob Flaner reminded the Committee that the Stafford Act states that the Plan should include mitigation measures for before a disaster occurs versus emergency response. The Stafford Act does not include any provisions for emergency response funding.

Dean Grundy described work being done for regional response planning to mega-events. The region is working to determine what would be done if people are evacuated outside of Sacramento until they can get normal services. Roseville is on the path for this evacuation.

The region is looking at things like signage along the freeway and radio capabilities to direct large numbers of people. Roseville is the first largest city up from Sacramento and we need to prepare for this.

Rob Flaner stated that the Plan and grant funding must include recommendations related to people, property and infrastructure.

Barbara Todd stated that the hospitals are planning for decontamination and for a surge in population. They also are working to prevent people from looting the hospital in the event of a large emergency and that this type of large evacuation event should be considered.

George Booth said that Sacramento is considered the most vulnerable city in the country to a large-scale flood event.

Dean Grundy said that if you look at the number of people that might be affected and the lessons learned during Hurricane Katrina when large numbers of people were evacuated to a single destination (the old model), then our region is recommending against mass evacuations to large shelters and recommending keeping the population moving. Roseville is in the path for large evacuations from Sacramento and the Bay Area.

For a mass evacuation, we need an atypical plan that keeps people moving. If an evacuee has a problem, then they come off the freeway for food, gas, medical reasons or to shelter a pet. If they do not have a problem, they keep moving.

Dean Grundy said there will be pod sites set up to screen people for medical issues and provide services that allow them to keep traveling.

Rob Flaner reminded the Committee that the definition of mitigation is a sustained, long-term issue. This Committee needs to create a linkage between the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan and the Emergency Operations Plan.

Dean Grundy stated the UASI regional plan is to include facilities in the action plan. Every hazard has secondary impacts and this could be added as a secondary impact to several of the hazards in the Roseville plan. We can recognize Roseville as an evacuation corridor and include the surge of people as a secondary impact. Serving as an evacuation corridor may have a longstanding sustained impact on the community.

George Booth stated that while serving on a PDM panel, they recognized a bunkhouse in Virginia as mitigation.

The City could include mitigation such as changeable message signs along the major arteries that are portable as mitigation.

The Committee agreed to include serving as an evacuation corridor as a secondary impact, especially for flood, earthquake and wildfire measures. The Committee will determine where this impact should be included when the different hazards are reviewed. Dean Grundy will bring in the UASI draft plan and review the information with the Committee at the next meeting.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Committee reviewed the new draft language for the Goals and Objectives from the September meeting. The word global was removed from Goal 7.

- G-1: Protect lives and reduce injury
- G-2: Promote hazard mitigation as an integrated policy.
- G-3: Protect the continuity of local government to ensure no significant disruption of services during or due to a disaster
- G-4: Improve community emergency management preparedness, collaboration, and outreach
- G-5: Minimize or reduce damage to property, including critical facilities
- G-6: Develop and implement mitigation strategies that optimize public funds in an efficient and cost-effective way
- **G-7: Maintain, enhance, and restore the natural environment's capacity to deal with the impacts of natural hazards taking into account the potential impacts of global climate change.**

A motion was made by Barbara Todd and seconded by Rita Brohman to approve the Goals as amended. The Committee vote for approval was unanimous.

After discussion and a small edit to the Objectives, Mike Isom made a motion, seconded by Jim Williams, to approve the amended objectives. The Committee vote to approve the objectives was unanimous. The objectives are as follows:

- Consider the impacts of hazards on future land uses in the City of Roseville by coordinating with other planning mechanisms such as the general plan and land-use code development.
- Protect and sustain reliable local emergency operations and communication facilities during and after disasters.
- Develop new or enhance existing early warning response systems and plans.
- Seek to enhance emergency response capabilities through improvements to infrastructure and City programs.

- Enhance the understanding of all hazards that impact the City of Roseville and the risk they pose.
- Seek mitigation projects that provide the highest degree of hazard protection at the least cost.
- Seek to update information on natural, environmental, and human-caused hazards, vulnerabilities, and mitigation measures by coordinating planning efforts and creating partnerships with appropriate local, county, state, and federal agencies.
- Seek to implement codes, standards, and policies that will protect life and property, including natural habitat, from the impacts of hazards within the City of Roseville.
- Educate the public on preparedness for and mitigation of potential impacts of hazards to the City of Roseville.
- Retrofit, purchase, or relocate structures in high hazard areas, including those known to be repetitively damaged.
- **Establish partnerships among all levels of government, ~~and the business~~, community, and faith-based organizations to improve and implement methods to protect property**

RISK ASSESSMENT UPDATE

Rob Flaner said that the Tetra Tech staff member responsible for the HAZUS mapping will attend the next meeting. Ed Whitmore is based in Seattle, WA and has been working with the City GIS staff, Carl Walker, Garth Gaylord and the county assessor's office to obtain the latest information. The HAZUS mapping is occurring on a parallel process to the Steering Committee work.

Tetra Tech staff are pleased that there will be new shake maps for the earthquake section. Mr. Whitmore has already been running scenarios for every known map with seismic faults and has identified the "true scenario" for Roseville. One scenario is for an expected epicenter in Fairfield with a 6.8 magnitude quake on the Green Valley fault. This does have some impact on Roseville. The mapping detail will provide a higher benefit to multi-objective projects.

The City will now be able to compare impacts from hazards. For example, earthquake hazard can be compared to flood hazards and mitigation projects with the most benefit can be recommended for funding.

Scenarios will be run for a 100-year flood and 200-year earthquake event.

New mapping iterations will be prepared with MR-4 data that has a higher level of accuracy and information. There is a new program called the Community Data Management System (FEMA software). The City provides very good parcel data with the date of construction and when the hazards are mapped, a property specific damage assessment can be determined just by typing the address in. This will be very helpful for the community workshops. Scenarios can include if a 50-year flood event happens or a 6.8 earthquake in Fairfield happens. The impacts will be based on location, soil type, and age of structure.

At the Contra Costa workshops, the property owner could leave the workshop with a photograph of their property and a print out of the risk assessment for their property.

Julia Burrows commented that this would be helpful for economic development purposes. When a new business is considering Roseville, City staff can use print outs for the site selectors to show how safe Roseville is for their particular project.

Carl Walker provided an update on the Dam Failure Analysis. Staff from Public Works and the Placer County Flood Control District selected RBF Consulting from three bids. The contract will go to the Council on November 4th where the Council will be asked to give authorization for work to begin.

The work will include;

1. Data collection
2. A scenario evaluation which the Committee should be able to see on December 9
3. Committee presentation of work in January 2010 and the inundation mapping should be complete in late January 2010.

Staff has been successful in convincing the State of California to give Roseville the topography maps known as LiDAR. This will greatly improve the HAZUS analysis!

REVIEW/UPDATE OF OTHER PROGRAMS

Roseville General Plan

Mike Isom provided an update on the City's General Plan Update process.

The last comprehensive General Plan Update was in 1992 when the City prepared the current 2010 General Plan with a General Plan Committee. Since 1992, the City has approved seven specific plans and each time, the General Plan has been amended. The specific plan process means that for all new growth areas, we plan in large blocks of land. The City has 12 specific plans total with the most recent being the Downtown Specific Plan, the Riverside Gateway Specific Plan and the West Roseville Specific Plan.

The City is a charter city under the CA Constitution and so Roseville is not limited to only amending the General Plan four times a year as are general law cities.

AB 2140 Compliance

Mike Isom provided an update to the Committee regarding Roseville compliance with AB 2140. AB 2140 is a state law passed in 2006. The law is voluntary and encourages local jurisdictions to adopt their Hazard Mitigation Plan as part of the Safety Element of their General Plan. Referencing the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan makes the jurisdiction eligible for additional funding should a disaster occur in the jurisdiction. The CA Disaster Act states that cities are eligible for up to 75% reimbursement for eligible costs. If the state has available monies, and the city is in compliance with AB 2140, then the state has the option of providing a portion of the local match.

The City of Roseville Planning Department took a General Plan Amendment to the City Council on September 23, 2009 to amend the Flood Control component of the Safety Element in order to indicate that new development will be in compliance with the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC). A key component of the SPFC is to require all new development to be above the 200-year surface water elevation which the City currently requires per the City's Improvement Standards. As part of the General Plan Amendment, the City incorporated by reference the City's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan into the City's Safety Element to comply with AB 2140.

Climate Action Plan

Julia Burrows informed the Committee that the city operations Climate Action Plan will be reviewed by the City Council on November 4, 2009. The Climate Action Plan lists actions that

can reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions (GHGs) that are created from city operations – namely our fleet, buildings, and wastewater treatment plants.

The Plan includes an economic analysis that shows the costs and benefits of the different options. Staff is recommending Plan C which will reduce emissions 22.8% through 2015. The city begins to see a net positive cash flow in year 4 of the Climate Action Plan if the measures are adopted by the City.

Following approval of the city operations Climate Action Plan, the City will begin work on a Sustainability Action Plan for the entire community. Work on this Plan will include appointment of a Green Task Force comprised of community members who will give guidance on the plan preparation. Julia stated that she envisions a joint meeting of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Steering Committee and the Green Task Force to talk about climate change adaptability.

The city operations Climate Action Plan will be referenced in the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan.

George Booth suggested that another Plan to coordinate Roseville work with is the update to the Watershed Master Plan currently being prepared by Sacramento.

OUTREACH STRATEGY

Originally, the Steering Committee calendar included a first public meeting in November with additional meetings after the new year. The outreach will be done in two phases. The first phase is to introduce the new data to the public and the second phase is to receive public comment on the draft plan.

The Committee agreed to conducting public outreach in January with programs on Channel 14/73, information on the website, and a survey on Survey Monkey. Rob will send the original questions from the 2004 survey and the Committee will look at suggestions for new questions.

The Committee set the next meeting for Wednesday, December 9 at 6 p.m. at the Roseville Civic Center.

ACTION ITEMS

Julia Burrows listed the Action Items for follow-up after tonight's meeting.

1. Staff will coordinate a review of the 2008 Progress Report matrix, update the matrix with data from 2008-09 and bring the update back to the Committee at the next meeting.
2. The Committee will include Roseville as an evacuation corridor (secondary impact) in the Plan Update. Dean Grundy will bring the UASI draft plan to the Committee for information to consider in the MHMP Update.
3. Staff will coordinate updates to the Watershed Master Plans currently being prepared by Sacramento.
4. Public Works staff will continue working with the State of California to obtain the LiDAR maps in November 2009 for the MHMP Update HAZUS modeling.
5. City staff will determine a public meeting schedule for winter 2010.
6. Rob Flaner will forward the survey questions from 2004-05 and forward new suggestions for questions for the online survey to be conducted as part of the Plan Update.

The next meeting will be Wednesday, December 9, 2009 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. in the Planning Conference Room.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was given.

ADJOURNMENT

The Steering Committee adjourned following a motion by Rita Brohman and a second by Mike Escobedo at 7:45 p.m.