TETRA TECH

MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting:	June 24, 2009
Subject:	6th Steering Committee (SC) meeting
Project Name:	Contra Costa County Hazard Mitigation Plan –Update
In Attendance:	**Steering Committee**: Teddy Terstegge, Shari Deutsch, Rich Lierly, Greg Gilbert, Steven Spedowfski, Greg Harman, Steve Frew, Jim Parrott, Marcelle Indelicato
	Planning Partners: Rich Marchoke, Ray Riordan, Steve Laren, Rod Wui, Greg Connaughton, Rich Grace, Mike Picard, David Kundent, Tim Forrester, Steve Spence, Marguerite Lawry, Michael Bond, John Hild, Wayne Reeves, Steve Waymire, Linda Weeks, Alan Biagi, Eric Imhof, Winston Rhodes, Stuart House,
	Planning Team-Rob Flaner
Summary Prepared by:	Rob Flaner- June 29, 2009
Project No.:	135-23736-08-090
Quorum- Yes or No	Yes

Item	Action

Welcome and Introductions

- Chairman Parrott opened the meeting with brief group introduction.
- Round table introductions by all in attendance.
- Agenda was reviewed and approved.
- Minutes from last meeting were reviewed and approved.
- Since this was an "all hands" meeting, Rob provided a brief overview of the plan development progress to date. A brief questions and answer period followed this briefing.

Risk Assessment Update

The first-run HAZUS analysis for the earthquake hazard was provided to the group. This analysis looked a 2 scenario events as well as the probabilistic 100-year and 500-year events for the study area. The scenario events identified by County OES were a 6.9 magnitude event on the Calaveras fault, and a 7.1 magnitude event on the Hayward fault. The data was broken down by impacts on population and impacts on economy illustrating fields such as: displaced households, short term shelter needs, number of displaced households, and debris accumulation. There was a lot of discussion on this data during this segment by the group. A summary of those discussion points are as follows:

- Population figures appear to be off. Rob informed the group that the majority of the demographic data was obtained from the 2000 US Census data set.

April 25, 2009

Infrastructure Group
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 600, Seattle, Washington 98101
Tel 206.883.9300 Fax 206.883.9301 www.tetratech.com

Item	Action

These numbers can be updated with more recent data

- To add further definition to the data, it was asked if the data could be further segregated by zip code. Rob explained to the group that the lowest level of detail the HAZUS Earthquake model can look at is the Census track level. It would be possible to break the data down to the zip code level, but this would be cumbersome. You would have to manually identify zip code boundaries in relation to the census track boundary.

- There was a lot of discussion on what is a census track and how are they defined. Rob was asked to bring a census track map to the next meeting so that the SC could see the relationship between tack boundaries and municipal boundaries.

  Rob to bring a census tract map to next SC meeting.

- Concern was expressed as to the validity of the short term shelter needs and displaced household data. The numbers appear inconsistent. Why were some numbers for cities high, while their neighboring cities were low? The data did not make sense. Rob was asked to identify the parameters for determining a displaced household.

  Rob to identify parameters for determining displaced households prior to next SC meeting.

- Rob was asked what the "margin of error" for the HAZUS model. Rob did not know the direct answer to the question, but provided some guesses as to what they might be. He was not sure if there was such a thing determined. Rob agreed to get more information on this topic.

  Rob to check to see if a "margin of error" had been established for the HAZUS model.

- There was discussion on what other data sets HAZUS could generate. Rob was asked to provide all data sets generated by HAZUS for the SC to review.

- There was discussion on how top display the data. It was requested that Hayward fault data be listed first, since that was the scenario of most concern. Also, it was asked if the epicenter for each scenario event could be listed.

- All in attendance were asked to review the data and provide comment to the planning team via e-mail. The planning team will do a 2nd run for the Earthquake Hazard and provide that data to the SC at the next meeting.

  Planning partners and SC members to review 1st-run data and provide comment to the planning team prior to the next SC meeting.

- The critical facilities component of HAZUS has not been run yet as the planning team is still trying to address data gaps in the information. A critical facilities analysis will be provided to the SC at the next scheduled meeting.

Public Outreach-Questionnaire

The final draft of the hard copy questionnaire was provided to the group. All changes requested at the last meeting have been implemented. An electronic version of the questionnaire was provided to all SC members via e-mail by the due date specified at the last SC meeting. The planning team has printed 5000 hard copies of the questionnaire. Those questionnaires were available at the meeting for distribution to planning partners.

A web based version of the questionnaire has also been created using Survey Monkey. They version is ready to deploy. All attendees were provided a print-out copy of the Survey Monkey questionnaire.

There was also discussion during this segment on ways to disseminate the hard-copy

Item	Action

questionnaires. Rob informed the group that there was not budget in the grant to cover the cost of mailing. That did not mean that any planning partner could not mail it on their own. They will not be reimbursed for the costs if they chose to do so. Rob expressed concern over data entry for a large number of completed hard-copy questionnaires. Rob expressed his desire to have the questionnaire completed on-line. This should be promoted via what ever means of dissemination utilized.

There was discussion on some additional edits to the questionnaire. Unfortunately, these could not be addressed in those questionnaires already printed. But they could be addressed in any additional prints of the questionnaire, as well as the web-based version. The requested edits included:

- Shortening the URL reference to a more user friendly listing.

- Removing "volcanic eruption" reference

- Clarification on whether survey should be completed by all who get it, or limit it to a specified number per household.

- Create a separate on-line survey targeting businesses

- Rob was asked to e-mail the artwork from the questionnaire to all planning partners for use in establishing a web-link to survey website.

(Action: Rob to e-mail artwork to all planning partners)

There was also some discussion during this segment on how this questionnaire was generated and approved. The questionnaire was mocked-up by the Steering Committee based on examples provided by the planning team from other hazard mitigation planning efforts from around the country. A mock-up was prepared by the planning team based upon input from the SC. This mock-up was then reviewed and approved as edited by the SC at the last meeting in May. This version was considered to be the print ready version. All content from the print-ready version was transferred over to the on-line version for consistency. The final version of the questionnaire was not directly e-mailed to all planning partners. The SC has been selected and confirmed by all planning partners to make decisions on behalf of the entire partnership for this effort. The development of this questionnaire was one of those decisions. All planning partners are cc'd on all SC meeting minutes, and are also welcome to attend any and all SC meetings. All planning partners are notified of SC meetings dates, time and location.

Public Outreach-Public Meeting Schedule

The next segment dealt with identifying a public meeting schedule and format. There was a great deal of discussion on the numerous resources within the county that could be tapped for engaging the [public. These include: Public Safety Fairs, local community events such as Art and Wine festivals, County Board of Supervisor Meetings. Rob explained to the group that these were all excellent resources for continued public involvement once the plan is completed. However, to get the plan done, we need to commit to defined public meeting strategy, get it scheduled, and get it done! Rob explained that "open-house" format meetings have been successful in the past, especially in these early phases of plan development. They allow for the public to come and go as they please and allows for more "one-on-one" interaction. The key to any successful public meeting is the advertisement of that meeting. In a County the Size of Contra Costa, this advertisement will need to utilize multiple media.

After discussion on the topic, the group decided that 4 open-house format meetings

Item	Action

should be held over a 2-week period. These meetings will run from 6:00 to 9:00 PM and will be located in the West, East, Central and South portions of the County. The following jurisdictions volunteered to sponsor these meetings by providing facilities:

- Central County- Central Contra Costa Sanitary District
- East County-Antioch
- West County-Pinole
- South County- San Ramon

The time frame targeted for these meetings was the last week of July through the first 2 weeks of August. Each sponsor will notify the planning team of facility availability ASAP so that the public meeting schedule can be confirmed and advertised.

Each Public meeting sponsor to e-mail space availability to the planning team no later than July 17, 2009.

Goal Setting

This subject was tabled until the next meeting due to time constraints. All in attendance were provided with a goal setting exercise to be utilized at the next SC meeting.

The Meeting was adjourned by Chairman Parrott at 3:10 PM

The next meeting date is on:

Wednesday, July 22nd, 2009
1:00 to 3:00PM
Contra Costa County Department of Public Works
Conference Room A
255 Glacier Dr.
Martinez, CA 94553

Meeting location will be confirmed via e-mail