

Purpose of Meeting:	Tri-Valley Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee Meeting #2
Location of Meeting:	Virtual
Date of Meeting:	8.01.2022

**Steering Committee Members and Alternates:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Shweta Bonn</b>, Senior Planner, City of Pleasanton</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Lincoln Casimere</b>, Emergency Manager, Alameda County Fire Department</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Michael Cass</b>, Principal Planner, City of Dublin (Alternate)</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Herbert Cole</b>, Emergency Manager, City of Livermore</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Stephanie Egidio</b>, Management Analyst, City of Livermore (Alternate)</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Susan Frost</b>, Special Projects Coordinator, City of Livermore</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Cary Fukada</b>, CERT</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Matt Fuzie</b>, General Manager RPD, City of Livermore</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Tracy Hein</b>, Emergency Preparedness Manager, Livermore-Pleasanton Fire Department</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Aaron Lacey</b>, Deputy Chief, Livermore-Pleasanton Fire Department</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Christine Martin</b>, Assistant City Manager, City of Livermore</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Franc Moufarrej</b>, Permit Center Manager, City of Livermore</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Adam Nelkie</b>, Assistant Director of Engineering, City of Pleasanton</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Sean O'Reilly</b>, Associate Engineer, Dublin San Ramon Services District</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Jerry Paulson</b>, Emergency Manager, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Tricia Pontau</b>, Associate Planner, City of Livermore</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Jake Potter</b>, Associate Planner, City of Livermore (Alternate)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>John Stefanski</b>, Assistant to the City Manager, City of Dublin</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

**Other Attendees:**

Ben Murray, City of Livermore  
Rob Flaner, Program Manager, Tetra Tech

Bart Spencer, Lead Project Planner, Tetra Tech  
Megan Brotherton, Support Planner, Tetra Tech

**Meeting Summary:** Discuss project coordination; approve Ground Rules; approve Mission Statement, Goals, Objectives; approve lifelines definition; approve hazards; discuss outreach and engagement.

Item No.	Description	Action/Decision item(s):
1	<b>Welcome &amp; Introductions</b> 1:01 pm	N/A
	<b>Public Comments</b> None	N/A
2	<b>Project Coordination</b> (Bart Spencer) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptance of Steering Committee #1 Summary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tricia Pontau: Change meeting quorum to 8</li> <li>○ Cary Fukada: Definition of social vulnerability was discussed, but not listed as an action item</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CPT meets every other week as needed for this update. Currently ahead of schedule.</li> <li>• Steering Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ground Rules <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Choose consensus or vote to accept</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Decisions:</b>  Recommend accepting the 07.11. 2022 Steering Committee Meeting summary as corrected. Cary Fukada: Moved to approve as corrected Jerry Paulson: Seconded the motion <i>Consensus achieved</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Cary: Does consensus mean a yes vote from everyone?</li> <li>❖ Rob Flaner: The only time consensus is not achieved is if someone says “no”. Any dissenting vote can be noted. Add to ground rules: “The Steering Committee will strive for consensus. If consensus cannot be achieved, a majority vote will determine the decision.”</li> <li>▪ Public comment, when and how? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Bart Spencer: No requirement for SC to follow the Brown Act.</li> <li>❖ Rob: At the start of each meeting, we need to convey when the public can comment.</li> <li>❖ Susan Frost: City Council meetings have public comment after agenda items. At the beginning of each meeting, public can bring up items not on the agenda, but the items will not be discussed at that meeting.</li> <li>❖ Rob: Add a bullet item under each agenda item for public comment. No public comments will be accepted from prior meetings.</li> <li>❖ Cary: Allow comments after each agenda item to show transparency. Limit to 2 minutes.</li> <li>❖ Franc Moufarrej: Can public comment on other things besides the current agenda?</li> <li>❖ Bart: The public can submit comments on the HMP website.</li> <li>❖ Susan: The public can bring up items for future discussion at the end of each meeting.</li> <li>❖ Tricia Pontau: Add <i>General comments should be allowed at the beginning of each meeting on items related to hazard mitigation, then on every agenda item. 2 minute limit. Submit written comments in advance.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Mission Statement, Goals, Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Potential Goal #9 based on the State HMP: “Prioritize and direct resources to increase disaster resiliency among historically underserved populations, individuals with access and functional needs, and in communities disproportionately impacted by disasters.”</li> <li>○ Herbert Cole: The definition for social vulnerability seems too broad.</li> <li>○ Cary: Turn the goal into focused objectives. The objectives should be updated in 5 years to acknowledge gentrification in the planning area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Ground Rules as revised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision making: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Steering Committee will strive for consensus. If consensus cannot be achieved, a majority vote will determine the decision.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Public comment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ General comments related to hazard mitigation will be allowed before the meeting and on each agenda item, with a 2-minute limit. Written comments may be submitted via the plan website.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Consensus achieved</i></p> <p>Mission Statement, Goals, Objectives as revised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add Goal 9</li> <li>• Revisions to Objectives 8, 9, 12</li> </ul> <p><i>Consensus achieved</i></p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rob: The purpose of this plan is to qualify for funding. The goal of the Justice 40 Initiative is that 40 percent of the overall benefits of the funding must benefit socially vulnerable populations. Indicate in the plan that the definition is not clearly defined, data is lacking to define social vulnerability, but the definition will be revised over the next 5 years. If the plan does not define social vulnerability, FEMA will use the National Risk Index (NRI). The NRI census block resolution does not accurately represent social vulnerability.</li> <li>Cary: Are other metrics available to use as a proxy?</li> <li>Rob: The state is going to recommend a dataset.</li> <li>Cary: Recommend using the state's definition and improve upon it over the next five years.</li> <li>Tricia: Current objectives use <i>encourage</i> and <i>consider</i>. Suggest using stronger language. <i>Hazards, all hazards, or natural hazards</i> in the objectives? Objective 12, <i>social vulnerability</i> seems tacked on, suggest removing it.</li> <li>Bart: FEMA will fund natural hazards but does not fund non-natural hazards.</li> <li>Herbert: Emergency managers plan for all hazards, not just natural hazards. Social vulnerability ties to all hazards. Use the term <i>all hazards</i>.</li> <li>Aaron Lacey: Fire uses <i>all hazards</i>.</li> <li>Susan: Should there be a separate objective to address social vulnerability, or work it into another one?</li> <li>Herbert: Use objective #9 as an opportunity to educate the community.</li> <li>Bart: Change #9 to "underrepresented <i>and marginalized</i> communities"</li> <li>Cary: Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) is not defined in a standard way. Projects should be assessed and prioritized in an equitable way considering the language and culture of the community.</li> <li>Susan: #12 remove <i>and promote social equity</i></li> <li>Susan: Remove <i>natural</i> from #9</li> <li>Cary: <i>All hazards</i> or <i>hazards</i>?</li> <li>Susan: All is too encompassing. Use <i>hazards</i>.</li> <li>Tricia: Remove <i>natural</i> from #8</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Hazards Assessment &amp; Risk Assessment (Bart)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical facilities definition</li> <li>Natural Hazards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Earthquake</li> <li>Wildfire</li> <li>Mass movement/landslide</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Decisions:</b></p> <p>Lifelines Definition <i>Consensus achieved</i></p> <p>Natural Hazards and Hazards of Interest <i>Consensus achieved</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Flood</li> <li>○ Drought (qualitative assessment)</li> <li>○ Climate change</li> <li>○ Severe weather (qualitative assessment)</li> <li>○ Dam Failure</li> <li>● Hazards of Interest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Public health (e.g., pandemic)</li> <li>○ Terrorism</li> <li>○ Threats (active, biological, chemical, explosive, cyber)</li> <li>○ Cyberterrorism</li> <li>○ Civil unrest</li> <li>○ Hazardous material</li> <li>○ Pipeline</li> <li>○ Utility failure</li> <li>○ Transportation accident</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Susan: Public may question why hazards of interest are not addressed in more detail in the plan.</li> <li>● Bart: Threats (hazards of interest) are discussed in a THIRA or by other agency plans and programs (AWIA, NTSB, CPUC, etc.) FEMA makes a distinction between a hazard and a threat. Threats cannot be analyzed for frequency or severity.</li> <li>● Susan, Cary, Adam Nelkie: The HMP needs to cite the other agencies and plans that provide analysis on threats.</li> <li>● Cary: Why is public health in the lower section?</li> <li>● Bart: FEMA does not acknowledge public health (pandemic) as a natural hazard. It cannot be analyzed the same way earthquake can. No mitigation funding is available for pandemic.</li> <li>● Rob: FEMA will not even look at the non-natural hazards. Most hazards of interest are response, not mitigation. The HMP is not an emergency management plan. It only addresses actionable actions to reduce risk.</li> <li>● Cary: Awareness of an action for the fairgrounds to be better prepared for max vaccinations.</li> <li>● Rob: \$3.54 billion was allotted for mitigation of natural hazards due to COVID because of the declared disaster declaration under the Stafford Act. Pandemic may become a FEMA requirement for HMPs in the future.</li> </ul>	<p><b>TT Action Item:</b></p> <p>Include citations in the HMP for each hazard of interest to indicate which agency or plan addresses the threat/hazard.</p>
3	<p><b>Outreach and Engagement (Bart)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Livermore is hosting the HMP website with links to the other planning partners</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Social Media</li> <li>● Public Survey</li> </ul>	<p><b>SC Action Item:</b></p> <p>Promote the public hazard awareness survey.</p>

	○ Begin promoting the public hazard awareness survey	
	<b>Requests from Committee Members</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cary: Can school districts still join this plan?</li> <li>• Rob: No, the plan is too far along for additional partners to come in and catch up.</li> </ul>	N/A
4	<b>Public comments</b> None	N/A
	<b>No Steering Committee Meeting in September</b>	N/A
5	Adjourned at 2:36 pm by Susan.	N/A