

DRAFT
Minutes
MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE
CITY OF ROSEVILLE CIVIC CENTER
311 Vernon Street, Meeting Rooms 1 & 2
September 23, 2009

The Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee was called to order on Wednesday, September 23, 2009 at 6:10 p.m. at the Roseville Civic Center.

SILENT ROLL CALL

Members – please verify; we are missing sign in sheet.

The following Committee members were present: Grace Keller, Mike Escobedo, Ben Salo, George Booth, Young (Rod) Rodriguez, Jim Williams, Barbara Todd, Russ Palchak, , Clair Alway, and Chris Wood.

Committee Staff/Consultant Members present: Rob Flaner, Sandi Bumpus, Carl Walker, and Garth Gaylord.

No members of the public were present.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Grace Keller opened the meeting with brief introductions. A new member to the committee, Chris Wood, was introduced to the group. The agenda was reviewed and as well as the minutes from the last meeting. Clair Alway asked that the minutes be revised to reflect that she was in attendance at that meeting. The minutes were approved as amended.

STEERING COMMITTEE HOUSEKEEPING

Finalized “ground rules” document based on revisions approved by the committee at the last meeting was provided to the committee. Agenda included discussion on the FEMA plan update requirements. This discussion was tabled until the next meeting due to the absence of numerous members from the committee. Rob will e-mail the handout to the committee prior to the next meeting for their review.

The committee was also provided a brief update on the solicitation process for the dam failure assessment by Carl Walker and Garth Gaylord. Proposals are due by 9/24/09. The selected consultant will be under contract by 11/4/09. CA DWR has agreed to provide LIAR data for this analysis as soon as it is available. The Bureau of Reclamation, which operates Folsom Dam, has been apprised of the project.

STATE AND COUNTY PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

At the last meeting, each member was asked to review the revised CA State Hazard Mitigation Plan, as well as the Placer County Hazard Mitigation Plan. This segment of the meeting was dedicated to comments/observations from this review. Some of the Steering committee members provided e-mail feedback to Rob prior to the meeting. This feedback was shared with the group. Some observations discussed on the State plan included:

- The plan converted from a standard State plan to an Enhanced plan, which establishes the opportunity for increased funding for the State and its local governments.
- The update cycle for the plan changed from 5 years to 3 years.
- The plan identified hazard exposure by County which was a change from the original plan. This makes it easier for each local government to identify the hazards of concern for their planning area.
- The plan did a good job of promoting regional coordination.
- The State plan does address Climate change.

Grace assigned an action item for the committee to continue its review of the state plan with an emphasis on identifying and understanding State Mandates such as AB-2140.

The Committee also had discussion on the County Plan. Comments on the County plan were as follows:

- The county plan includes an extensive list of critical facilities. It was suggested that update to the Roseville plan attempt to coordinate its critical facility list with that of the County.
- The layout and format of the plan appears to be unchanged.
- No inconsistencies with the Roseville plan were identified.

PROGRESS REPORT-Update

At the last meeting, the SC as asked to review the 2008 Progress report. A 2009 PR will not be prepared since this is a step in the comprehensive update process. The 2009 progress report will in essence be the revised plan. The SC was asked to review the 2008 report, and identify any “parking lot” items to be added to those identified in the prior year’s progress reports. The parking lot items are those changes to be included in the next addition of the plan. The only item brought forth was to have the plan include a catalog of funding sources for the different type actions.

REVIEW/UPDATE OF OTHER PROGRAMS

This discussion segment was tabled until the next meeting since key speakers on the subject matter were not available to lead this discussion.

REVIEW GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The SC was asked to review the goals and objectives identified in the initial plan. They were asked to review them in the following context:

- Are they still viable?
- Are they still feasible?
- Are there any recommended additions, deletions or enhancements?

It was the consensus of the group, that there needs to be a goal that deals with climate change. It was felt that Goal # 7 could be enhanced to address this need. A motion was moved and seconded to approve the goals as amended. The goals for the updated plan will be as follows:

- 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.**

The 10 objective statements were reviewed as well. It was still the consensus of the group that objectives be stand alone elements and not be subsets of goals. That the objectives identified would meet multiple goals. The SC felt that is was important to ad an objective statement that promoted partnerships, especially building a bridge to the County plan. Therefore an 11th objective was added to the list. A motion was moved and seconded to approve the objectives as amended. The objectives for the updated plan will be 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 to improve and implement methods to protect property**

OUTREACH STRATEGY

Under this segment, Rob explained to the group the requirements of re-engaging the public for plan updates. Rob discussed what was done last time, and stressed what is required this time. Basically, there is no difference between initial planning efforts and update planning efforts. You must engage the public through all phases of the planning process. Like last time, the Steering

Committee meets some of this requirement, because its makeup includes citizens. The SC expressed that they liked using questionnaires, because it gave them viable feedback of the local perspective. Rob asked the group to come to the next meeting with a list of questions they would like to see presented to the public. There was also discussion on public meetings and scheduling. The tentative time frame for the first round of public meetings is in November. This is contingent upon the availability of hazard data to support the revised risk assessment. We should have a good gauge of that availability by the next meeting. The website will also play a key role in the public involvement strategy. This will be a one-stop shop for information on the plan update progress and process.

ACTION ITEMS

Grace Keller listed the Action Items for follow-up after tonight's meeting.

1. Rob will send the FEMA plan update to all by e-mail
2. Each person's focus on their section should be consistency between Roseville's, Placer County's and the State's plan.
3. Add a funding source catalog to the plan - including discussion of leverage quotient
4. Add action items that deal with partnering to the plan, e.g. flood control, critical facilities, and dam failure
5. Synchronize Placer County and Roseville critical facilities list
6. Consider adding an invasive plant project (multi-hazard) to the plan
7. Add Objective O-11 regarding emergency partnerships
8. Consider adding a Goal regarding Climate Control

The next meeting will be Wednesday, October 28, 2009 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. in Civic Center Meeting Rooms 1 and 2.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was given.

ADJOURNMENT

The Steering Committee adjourned at 8:10 p.m.