

Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) Update
4th Steering Committee (SC) Meeting

May 1, 2013

Welcome and Introductions

SC chairperson, Jay Parrish called the meeting to order at 1:32pm.

Group Introductions

Those in attendance introduced themselves and their affiliation to the group at large.

SC members and alternates in attendance were:

Alison Talbott (SC) , PG&E	Hank Seemann (SC) , County of Humboldt Public Works
Barbara Caldwell, (Alternate) , Red Cross	Jay Parrish (SC) , City of Ferndale
Bill Gillespie (SC) , City of Eureka	Karen Diemer (SC) , City of Arcata
Daniel Larkin (SC) , County of Humboldt Office of Emergency Services	Lou Iglesias (SC) , Weott Community Services District
Dieter Schmitt (Alternate) , CAL FIRE	Stephen Underwood (SC) , Fortuna Fire Protection District

SC members absent without an alternate present were:

Jody Brundin, Blue Lake Rancheria

John Friedenbach, Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District

Judith A. Warren, Humboldt State University Regional Training Institute—Community Disaster Preparedness

Planning Partner, Public, and Agency Representatives in attendance were:

Cybelle Immitt, County of Humboldt Public Works

Danielle Allred, County of Humboldt Public Works

Dave Arden (Planning Partner), Southern Humboldt Community Healthcare District

Gary Wellborn (Planning Partner), Southern Humboldt Community Healthcare District

Pat Kaspari, GHD

Rob Flaner, Tetra Tech (present via phone-in)

Tim Petrusha (Planning Partner), Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation, and Conservation District

Review Agenda

SC chairperson, Jay Parrish, went over the agenda items and meeting objectives.

Review/approve minutes

There was no discussion of the previous meeting's minutes.

The SC chair opened the floor to motions to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Action: **Bill Gillespie** moved to approve the previous meeting's minutes; **Alison Talbott** seconded the motion. **The SC committee passed the motion unanimously.**

Public Comment/Announcements

Cybelle Immitt brought everyone up to date—the original plan technically expired in January. Jurisdictions with active grants could be impacted by this “gap.” The City of Fortuna is experiencing a delay in receiving reimbursement for some grant related expenses but this will not delay the project or impact their eligibility for funding.

There was a question about what would happen if a disaster were to occur within this “gap” time period. Rob Flaner explained that the plan makes us eligible for funds from the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) which provides grants to states and local governments to implement long-term hazard mitigation measures after a major disaster declaration. It usually takes 180 days after the declaration of a disaster to find out what the pool is. Once that’s been established, the State has a Notice of Interest (NOI) process and then there is a grant application window. It could take a year before the funds became available so there should be plenty of time to get the plan done to be eligible for the HMGP funding pool.

Risk Assessment Update

Rob reported that Tetra Tech is not going to be able to obtain the data needed to make the risk assessment as robust as had originally been hoped for. The County Assessor does not have square footage data on buildings, so a lesser level of analysis will have to be done. The assessment will be done based on a census-block or census-track level of data, rather than a “user-defined” level of data. It’s not as accurate, but it is suitable. However, this doesn’t mean that we won’t be doing HAZUS work stations as the public meetings. In the big scheme of things, the level of assessment we will be doing will be good enough for ranking risks and prioritizing hazards.

Rob suggests a countywide initiative for an action item that supports the County Assessor setting up a system for incorporating this kind of data. However, it is costly and difficult to obtain. But if we identify getting this type of data as an action, then we could be eligible for funding to support it. The County Assessor has been putting in calls for this kind of data for years. He wants it because there is a concern that we’re under-assessing the value of homes, which means lost revenue. Rob emphasized that this is a data gap that needs to be addressed, and it is a pretty high priority. We can inform the Board of Supervisors (BOS) that it’s an issue by making it an action in this plan and making it a priority.

Regarding the Flood Risk Assessment, Rob reported that new flood studies are being done in Orick and Blue Lake. These studies are being done because there’s new methodology to address levees, so this new report will be substantially different. This flood depth grid data will not be available until mid- to late-June. If we have to wait until June to complete our Flood Risk Assessment, it could set back our schedule for the meetings. **Hank Seemann** said that we need to make sure the data has FEMA review before we take it to the public but does not want to hold up the public workshops for the hazard plan update. He asked Rob if we could do the assessment with what we have, and supplement it with information from the Orick and Blue Lake studies later. Rob said that it is do-able; not desirable, but do-able. We could do a transitive report in order to keep our public process on schedule.

Cybelle asked if anyone had any objections to this course of action. There were no objections.

Critical Facilities

Data inventory/CDMS export update

Cybelle sent out an excel sheet of the updated Critical Facilities list prior to the meeting. SC members have helped update the information. **Pat Kaspari** reported that this list has become a pretty good database and that we need to move forward with what we have. Tetra Tech’s intent is to use that database in their analysis of which facilities are susceptible to hazards such as flood and earthquake. If additional facilities are brought up later, we can work them into the narrative but no HAZUS analysis will be done.

Approve inventory

Hank pointed out that levees were not included in the inventory. Rob explained that levees are a “linear feature” and therefore cannot be imported into the HAZUS model. The levee analysis will be done as an “exposure analysis.” They can look at where levees intersect flood plains, soft soils, etc. and make risk assessments based on that analysis. Rob said that we won’t be able to make a damage assessment on levees—they don’t have the capacity to do it because there’s no “damage function” for levees in HAZUS.

There was a question asked about the analysis for bridges. Rob said that bridges get point-located and there is a damage function for bridges. Earthquakes are the biggest damage function for bridges.

Hank stated that it would be good to note that this is not a total, comprehensive list of the critical facilities. Rob said that when it is time to identify a project, if it's not within the list, they'll make sure it gets listed in the jurisdiction's inventory. Rob emphasized that it's important to include everything that's *at risk*, and that it's okay if facilities that are not at risk are not included. It was pointed out, however, that there is hardly any place in Humboldt County that isn't at risk from earthquake. This inventory has over 4,000 facilities, which is updated from 600+ facilities from the previous plan.

There was a question about what constitutes a "field treatment site" (within the "other" category of the facilities list). It was determined that a field treatment site is a place for triage, or a shelter.

Action: Alison Talbott moved to approve the inventory; **Karen Diemer** seconded the motion. **The SC committee passed the motion unanimously.**

What is the game plan for dissemination to planning partners?

There was some discussion about what would be said about the inventory when it is distributed to the planning partners, and whether or not there would be room for them to comment on potentially missing facilities. Cybelle will email the SC approved version to the Partnership letting them know that it will be the basis for the HAZUS analysis and if they need to make additions they can be added in the narrative but not the analysis. It was suggested that an appendix be added to include facilities that are pointed out as missing. It was determined that planning partners will have space to comment about missed facilities and Cybelle will forward any such notations to Pat, who will capture those.

Progress Report

Review Draft progress report

Rob reported that they got a good response on the progress report from the planning partners. The list of actions items that action had been taken on or completed was impressive. He pointed out that it was stated in the previous "plan maintenance strategy" that a progress report would be completed every year, but that did not happen. He asked SC members to think about what they want to do with progress reporting in the next round of plan maintenance strategizing. Progress reporting creates a mechanism to be able to make changes to the plan and to change priorities in the actions.

Rob drew the group's attention to the hazard events that are contained within the report. He noted that we want to include events that caused damage in the performance period, and he asked the group if any events were missing.

It was pointed out that, in the March 11, 2011 tsunami event, no damage was reported in Humboldt County; it was subsequently asked whether this event should be included. Rob said that, by its occurrence, the event helps in determining the "probability of occurrence," so it should be included. It was also pointed out that there was a lot of expenditure for response to the event, and that evacuation responses disrupted local businesses. The group consensus was to leave this even in the report.

It was asked whether it would be worth it to note many of the smaller events to amplify the probability of occurrence. It was noted that an event does not have to be declared as a disaster by FEMA to qualify as an event. Rob explained that for some hazards--such as tsunami, wildfire, and landslides--there is no probability mapping, and probabilistic occurrence must be based on frequency of events (unlike flood; there is flood probability mapping).

Rob suggested using an aggregate bullet that says “over the planning period, the county experienced ___ # of landslides,” and then list them. This helps consolidate the text.

Rob noted that this report will be posted on the website and every planning partner should make this report available to their governing bodies for review.

It was asked whether Public Works has data on the number of landslides and other events in the last 5 years, and whether the information is easily retrievable, because it would be worth including in the plan. Hank agreed with Rob’s suggestion about aggregating the data and said he would work with Cybelle and Danielle on putting that information together.

Cybelle asked if, once this data was collected and put together in aggregate bullets, she could e-mail it to the SC and get their approval via e-mail, or should she wait until the next SC meeting to get approval?

The consensus among the group was that this process could be done via e-mail, and that Cybelle would include a deadline within the e-mail for responding with other events that should be included in the report.

Mitigation success stories

Rob emphasized that attention should be called to what worked in the plan. For example, the City of Fortuna got a grant, as did the Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District. He asked the group: what else should be called attention to as successes in this plan? He noted that some groups he has worked with put the instance of multiple jurisdictions working together as a success.

Rob said that the other purpose of the progress report is to review what didn’t work. He noted that a lot of jurisdictions made comments about “this action item needs to be re-worded,” or “this priority has changed,” etc.

A question was asked about whether tsunami preparedness activities should be noted. Cybelle said that we can expand on the example that was provided and include everything that has been accomplished related to tsunami in the last 5 years. It was noted that the Humboldt emergency services providers have made significant progress in the past 5 years in their capability to *respond* to hazards. After some discussion about mitigation vs. preparedness vs. disaster response, it was decided that there should be a success story about this increased capability. Rob said that if something that came out of the plan supported some other form of emergency management, then that is a success. That means that this plan is supporting other planning mechanisms in the planning area that are producing benefits.

Dan Larkin pointed out that this area has achieved Type-2 status for search and rescue teams. This is a big deal for a small area, and is something that can be included.

Cybelle said that she would be working on compiling the success stories, but asked that the group help her with it. Rob requested that “getting input on the events and mitigation success stories” be made an action item, and requested that comments on mitigation success stories be submitted within two weeks. There was some further discussion about how the mitigation success stories should be listed.

Task: All SC members will have a two-week period to submit their ideas and stories about successes to be included in the report. At the end of those two weeks, Cybelle will send it out via e-mail for approval. If it is not approved by everyone, then it will be re-addressed at the next meeting.

Plan Maintenance Strategy

Strategy from last plan

Rob revisited the point that the previous strategy called for an annual progress report, but that did not happen annually.

What is required?

Rob noted that an annual progress report is not required for the plan maintenance strategy and asked the group if they would like to keep it in the new strategy. Cybelle pointed out that the partnership had not been able to produce an annual report in the past and we might want to think about making it a five-year progress report that coincides with the plan update.

Karen Diemer proposed that the SC does come together once a year to at least have a discussion about what progress is being made, to help raise awareness of the plan and its purpose. Information from those meetings could then go into the five-year report.

Rob asked if the group wanted to leave in the language about the SC remaining a viable body that will convene annually. There was some discussion about the benefits of convening the group and having discussions about progress that is being made. It was noted that it can be difficult to convene members from so many jurisdictions and it was emphasized that there would need to be some shared responsibility in that endeavor.

Rob summarized that the plan maintenance strategy will be the same as the original plan, with the exception that the sections on maintaining the SC and preparing an annual progress report will be eliminated. He will incorporate language about a five-year progress report in the “Update” portion of the maintenance strategy.

Action: Karen Diemer moved to approve the amended Plan Maintenance Strategy; **Bill Gillespie** seconded the motion. **The SC committee passed the motion unanimously.**

Public Outreach-Phase 1

Questionnaire

Review Draft Survey

Cybelle explained that the committee that was formed last meeting to edit the questionnaire had convened and made several changes and modifications. She asked the group if it looked ready for dispersal.

Regarding a question on page 8 of the survey: “Is your property located near an earthquake fault?” It was asked how we defining “near”? Cybelle explained that there are some smaller faults in some neighborhoods that impact smaller communities. It was pointed out that many people may answer yes to that question because they live in Humboldt County. So, we should be prepared that this question may have a large “yes” response.

There was a suggestion that questions on page 15 about personal information, such as age and highest level of education be re-worded to include all the people residing in a household, rather than just the survey taker.

Cybelle noted that there is also a blank page that needs to be removed.

(Barbara noted that an earthquake had just taken place on the Triple Junction—a 3.9.)

It was suggested that there may be an opportunity to gather information about what would motivate people to take preparatory action, or what they need to be able to take action. A question to that effect could be added after question #6. It was suggested that a question be added, such as: “Which of the above steps are you planning to take in the next month?”

It was suggested that a question about retrofitting homes be re-worded so that it is clear we're targeting home owners, not renters.

It was proposed that a question number #6 be switched with #7 so that "How concerned are you about the following hazards..." would come before "Which of the following steps has your household taken..."

It was suggested that, after question #25 ("Who do you think has the primary responsibility for helping people during the first 12 hours after a strong earthquake or other disaster?"), a question asking, "Why did you respond the way you did?". It would be interesting to know why people think some other entity other than themselves should be responsible for them. It was pointed out that this question has been asked for 20 years, and the percentage of people who respond some entity other than themselves as having responsibility has been going up.

It was suggested that the survey direct people to the hazard plan webpage to sign up to receive updates and find links to other organizations such as FEMA, Red Cross, etc.

Approve for dissemination

Task: Cybelle will make the changes discussed above. Rob will make it available to view on the website. There will be a deadline for SC members to make comments, then it will become available to the public.

Action: **Karen Diemer** moved to approve the questionnaire, pending the changes discussed; **Barbara Caldwell** seconded the motion. **The SC committee passed the motion unanimously.**

Press release of survey

Task: Rob will draft a press release announcing the availability of the survey.

Public meeting venues

Cybelle said that we have facilities for the public meetings available in the Cities of Arcata and Fortuna.

Cybelle noted that, if we model the meetings in the way we've done it in the past, it doesn't seem to be attractive to people. She has spoken with others who have done a lot with public processes, to come up with ideas. She reported that, after talking to Rob and discussing the requirements of FEMA, having some kind of environment where he can communicate what the maps mean would be more valuable than having maps laid out for many people to view and trying to describe what they mean again and again as people passed by.

After much discussion, it was proposed that smaller events, such as farmers' markets, be attended where bits of information and surveys can be distributed and the public workshops can be promoted. It was noted that farmers' markets are interesting because you could reach a wide audience. Information cards, etc. will be produced and handed out at a variety of events. Two workshops will take place with a presentation followed by an open house.

There was some discussion about how to increase interest in and attendance at the meetings. It was noted that these meetings are also an opportunity to showcase our success stories.

Hank proposed recording the public meetings and showing them on the public access television. People might not be motivated to go to a meeting in the evening, but they might watch it on TV. It was decided that scheduling the meetings on a weekday evening would be best.

The second week in July is the target date for holding the public meetings. Cybelle will check to make sure no other major community events coincide with this. There was some discussion about possible

venues; the River Lodge in Fortuna is a potential option; the Fortuna Fire Station may also be an option. Other disaster preparedness information and resources will be made available at these meetings.

Cybelle asked if the group could agree to go ahead and have the primary presentation at workshop/meetings in Arcata and in Fortuna, and then broadcast it via Public Access.

The group was in consensus on aiming to hold the two public meetings during the second week of July in Arcata and Fortuna. Dan will contact Public Access about recording the presentation and broadcasting it.

Action Items for Next Meeting

Risk Assessment Update:

- Cybelle - Add an Action Item/Project into the County plan to pursue funding for the County Assessor to update the Assessor's database to provide additional building level data at the parcel level to allow for more detailed damage assessments during the next plan update.
- Rob- Coordinate with Hank Seemann on pursuing the updated FEMA Flood Plain data for Orick and Blue Lake and, if available in a timely manner, Tetra Tech will include in the HAZUS analysis.

Critical Facilities:

- Cybelle - email the SC approved version to the Partnership letting them know that it will be the basis for the HAZUS analysis and if they need to make additions they can be added in the narrative but not the analysis.
- Cybelle/Pat-Create an appendix/spreadsheet with comments received by jurisdictions on Critical Facilities that were missed in the current database. Cybelle will forward on any comments to Pat, and he will add to the Critical Facilities database for use on the next 5-year update.
- Pat and Rob - follow up on levees and why they can't be treated as dams or some other analysis in HAZUS and why there are some point coordinates for the Redwood Creek levees in the Critical Facilities database.

Progress Report:

- Cybelle/Hank -Will work on an aggregate landslide bullet point to the list of Natural Hazard Events.
- Cybelle-Will get information on other floods in the past 5 years (particularly the one that almost topped the Eel River Bridge near Ferndale)
- Pat-Will write up the Fortuna and HBMWD grant successes to include under Mitigation Success stories and get to Cybelle
- Cybelle/Dan – Will work on improvements in response coordination among the Fire Districts, etc. to include as a Mitigation Success Story.
- Cybelle – Will create another bullet item that talks about general success stories in things such as seismic retrofits to include in the Mitigation Success story section.
- SC Members-Will get any other success stories to Cybelle within the next two weeks.
- Cybelle-Will update the Progress Report with the above information and distribute to SC for approval

Plan Maintenance Strategy:

- Rob-Will delete the Steering Committee and Progress Reporting sections

Public Outreach:

- Questionnaire
 - Rob-Add a question under Section 4 asking how many people are in the household.
 - Cybelle/Rob-Question 6, add questions on which one of these steps do you feel is the most important for you to take and/or what would it take for you to implement these steps. Cybelle to refine wording and get to Rob.
 - Cybelle/Rob-Add to Question 6, "Which one do you plan to do in the next month?"

- Rob-reword questions 21 & 22 to direct it toward home owners, i.e. add “If you own your home...”
- Rob-Question 25, add “For whomever you selected above, why do you believe that it is their responsibility?”
- Cybelle- add a statement on the survey to the effect of, “Go to the hazard plan website if you would like more information or to be added to an information list.
- Rob-Will finalize the survey and notify Cybelle.
- Cybelle-Will send survey around to SC members for one final e-mail approval.
- Rob-Will do any final edits and activate survey link and send to Cybelle.
- Cybelle-Will put link on web site and send link around to other SC members and jurisdictions to add to their Web site.
- SC Members and Jurisdictions will add to their web sites and send around to their list serves or other distribution lists.
- Public Meetings
 - Cybelle-Will finalize the Public Meeting arrangements for a meeting in Fortuna and a meeting in Arcata, likely the 2nd week in July.
 - Dan - contact Public Access about recording the presentation and broadcasting it.

Adjourn

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 5th from 1:30pm to 3:30pm in the GHD Conference Room.

The SC chairperson adjourned the meeting at 3:28pm.