

Draft Minutes
MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE
CITY OF ROSEVILLE CIVIC CENTER
311 Vernon Street, Meeting Rooms 1 & 2
November 16, 2004 – 6:30 p.m.

The Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee was called to order on Tuesday, November 16, 2004, 6:45 p.m. at the Roseville Civic Center.

SILENT ROLL CALL

The following Committee members were present: Chair Grace Keller, Clair Alway, David Benedetti, George H. Booth, Don Snow, Sue Webb, Jerry Erickson, Jim Williams, Jerry Erickson, Mary Lou Pierce, and Mike Isom.

Committee Members Absent: Kim Kelley and Dan Dimick

Committee Staff/Consultant Members present: Julia Burrows and Garth Gaylord

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Grace Keller asked that those in attendance introduce themselves given that the Committee has new members. Grace reviewed the agenda and outlined the objectives of the meeting which were to finalize the Table of Contents, Critical Facilities definition and inventory, set Objectives for the Plan, discuss the seismic risk assessment, determine the public involvement strategy and receive an update on the Sacramento County plan.

Grace asked if there were any changes to the minutes. Jerry Erickson noted several corrections to the minutes. The Committee approved the minutes as amended.

CRITICAL FACILITIES DEFINITION

The Committee discussed the critical facilities definition. Mike Isom commented that the definition as written does not reflect the potential for a disaster that might occur at facilities where large groups of people might congregate such as the Galleria. The Committee agreed that the definition should be amended should reflect

Steve Pease suggested that the definition be amended to include the words “or catastrophic impact” after the words economic impact. The definition would then state a *critical facility is defined as “vital for the City’s ability to provide essential services and protect life and property and/or the loss of which would have a severe economic or catastrophic impact.”*

Jerry Erickson made the motion and Don Snow seconded to amend the critical facilities definition. The Committee approved unanimously and finalized the critical facilities definition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Committee reviewed the Table of Contents prepared by Rob Flaner. Sue Webb suggested that the contents be amended to include human health hazards such as West Nile Virus that the medical care providers need to be prepared for.

The Committee agreed to the format provided in the Table of Contents and the addition of Human Health Hazards to the list of risks to be evaluated.

STATE AND COUNTY PLAN REVIEW

No comments were received on the Placer County Chapters 1, 2, and 3.

Comments were received based on the flooding section of the other plans. Clair Alway discussed the flood section that she reviewed. She said that it should be a prerequisite that the agency have a policy to protect the floodplain. There are several parcels that have been grandfathered in that continuously flood and are developed.

Linda Creek, Dry Creek, and Pleasant Grove Creek creekbeds have developed properties that need to be protected. Some have repeatedly flooded.

Clair continued by saying the City needs to protect more open space to allow a place for the water to go. The City is being impacted heavily because there is growth occurring around us. The City, State and Placer County should address the open space issue.

Garth said that flooding would be worse with development in the future. The City does have a policy that is enforced that requires that floodplain be dedicated as open space. The difficulty the City is having is with mitigation for what was built prior to our floodplain policies.

Jerry Erickson commented about two items. First, if there is a flood on Linda Creek it causes erosion. There are old trees that are undermined and are falling across the creek. The City maintenance crews need to be aware of where the soil is unstable and falling. Second, there are sewer lines that are bare pipes and taking force and weight during the flood. There might be contaminated water and exposed water mains underneath the creeks.

He commented that there is also a gas line. If in a flood, City crews cannot get to a pipe or an eight-inch main – that would be a real problem!

The Committee discussed that the mitigation needs to identify the utilities at risk for erosion. The Environmental Utilities staff will have sewer and water lines that are encased in concrete. There are 24-inch pipes. The City needs an inventory of these lines – maybe through the storm water utility as one source.

Garth said there is a Memorandum of Understanding with Fish and Game to clean debris from the streams. The trees are likely to fall in. These will most likely be removed. We have a right to remove a tree if it is threatening public safety.

Grace suggested we identify what is included in the state and Placer County plan.

George said that the DMA 2000 plan will be available on Thursday at the Sacramento County website. There is a public meeting on December 6th the County will hold a public meeting to discuss.

Sac County is not as concerned about flooding as Placer County. Brian Keating with the Placer County Flood Control district is doing a good job in the unincorporated area. Roseville and Rocklin staff is also doing good work to mitigate flood impacts. George said there needs to be a dialogue with the citizens of Roseville. There of course is always the chance of litigation with Roseville if there is any future flooding that affects Sac County downstream.

For additional flood information, Jerry Erickson suggested that we go to the insurance agencies to discuss flood history. They might have photos. And, State Farm in Roseville might be a source because properties need flood insurance for mortgage. Garth said that there would not be data prior to 1977 when Roseville entered the flood insurance program. Prior to that, the insurance companies would not have records of flood incidents in Roseville. The actual federal flood insurance program began in 1975.

Julia Burrows commented that they were going to review the newspapers reports from the early 1970's at the Press Tribune offices. Staff will copy the articles regarding flooding prior to the federal records that are available to the City and Tetra Tech.

Sue Webb commented that the Plan should be consistent when referring to no fatalities or injuries from each historical flooding event. Some sections note that no one was injured or died and some sections do not. Garth said that there were no injuries or fatalities from flooding except for 1986 when a driver tried to cross Folsom Blvd and his car was swept away.

Sue stated there are ancillary affects after flooding such as pneumonia and *E coli*. Garth said there are no documented claims on file with the City. Grace added that mold after a flood is a likelihood for houses and public facilities that can cause secondary health impacts.

The Committee discussed that there are ancillary impacts after a disaster such as a flood, for example, mold and biological impacts. – A mitigation measure could be to set up a reporting system to the City any secondary impacts following a disaster. Sue Webb also said that the Placer County Public Health Department will receive reports after the fact if there are clusters of health issues and we will be able to gather those reports.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR MULTI-HAZARD PLAN

Grace began the goals and objectives discussion by stating that last meeting we created a list of seven goals. This evening, we are to review the catalog of objectives that were provided by Tetra Tech and select which objectives fall under each of the goals.

Grace asked that the attendees divide into pairs and assigned a goal to each pair. Then each pair was asked to mark any of the 38 objectives in the catalog that applied to their assigned goal on a master chart prepared by Grace. The purpose of the exercise was to find those objectives that support as many goals as possible.

The seven Goals approved by the Committee at the October meeting are:

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

Staff at the October meeting distributed the 38 objectives when the goal brainstorming occurred.

Table 1. Objectives and Goals for Roseville Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan

	G-1	G-2	G-3	G-4	G-5	G-6	G-7	Total
O-1		1	1					2
O-2			1		1			2
O-3		1			1		1	3
O-4					1	1		2
O-5	1		1		1			3
O-6							1	1
O-7				1	1			2
O-8	1		1	1	1			4
O-9			1	1			1	3
O-10	1							1
O-11			1		1	1		3
O-12						1		1
O-13								0
O-14			1		1	1		3
O-15					1	1		2
O-16			1		1			2
O-17	1	1		1				3
O-18		1		1		1		3
O-19	1	1			1			3
O-20	1		1		1			3
O-21		1	1			1		3
O-22		1					1	2
O-23							1	1
O-24							1	1
O-25				1				1
O-26		1			1	1		3
O-27		1						1
O-28		1				1		2
O-29				1				1
O-30						1		1
O-31					1			1
O-32	1		1		1			3
O-33		1	1	1		1		4
O-34							1	1
O-35							1	1
O-36	1			1				2
O-37	1		1	1	1			4
O-38	1		1	1	1			4

The refined summary of goals and objectives will be discussed at the November 2004 meeting.

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT

Julia Burrows distributed the latest draft of the Flood Risk Assessment to the Committee. This is draft #3 and reflects additional information provided by the Garth and the Floodplain Management staff and research by Tetra Tech.

There are additional details still being worked on. Julia asked the Committee if they supported posting the sections on the web for comment as they are completed. The Committee agreed by consensus to post the individual risk assessment sections as they are reviewed and approved by the Committee.

The Committee was asked to forward any comments on the third draft to staff.

SEISMIC RISK ASSESSMENT

Julia distributed the very draft seismic risk assessment to the Committee. She explained that Greenhorne and O'Mara, the consultant under contract by FEMA, is preparing this section. There are revisions that need to be made to reflect the City's General Plan (for instance the draft says there are no local faults in Roseville while the General Plan says there are three faults) and to update the data (data used dates to 1994).

Julia will continue working on the Seismic section and forward the next draft to the Committee for discussion at the December meeting.

Don Snow reviewed the seismic sections of the County and State plans. He said the sections needed improvement, for example the State plan listed the population of California as 200 million.

Don said that one issue of importance is utilities and transportation facilities as critical facilities in a disaster. Don Snow brought up the Kender Morgan natural gas pipeline that runs through the City parallel to the railroad tracks. He also mentioned that PG&E's preparedness literature is vague. The Plan should identify the utilities and identify the critical transportation facilities that would be vulnerable in the event of an earthquake.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Julia Burrows stated that staff will write the on-line survey results section with the comments received from the Committee. As discussed, sections will be posted on the web as they are completed and reviewed by the Committee. A suggestion was made that information could be included in the RCONA newsletters that go to every household.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY PLAN

George Booth stated that the Sacramento County plan will be released to the public on Thursday – November 18th. There will be a public meeting on December 6th. The Sac County plan is very similar to the Placer County plan because the same consulting firm is preparing both plans.

ACTIONS ITEMS

Grace Keller reviewed the extensive list of action items for the next meeting.

1. **Critical Facilities Definition** – to be amended and staff will provide inventory of critical facilities.
2. **Minutes** - October minutes to be amended with Jerry Erickson's comments.
3. **Table of Contents** - Wildfire and Human Health to be added to the Table of Contents
4. **Floodplain Policy** - Floodplains are to be protected; this needs to be a future policy with all the documents consistent
5. **Utility and Creek Access** – the plan should contain sewer and gas mitigation measures. Staff from Parks and Recreation and Streets to report back on gravel paths to access to paved to creeks. [Oakwood and Rocky Ridge – there are still deep ruts from the 1995 flood. Trucks buried to the axles. Log jam need paved access along creeks for mitigation during flood.
6. **Plan language for Secondary Impacts** - The consultants and staff will prepare a paragraph that states the City will pay attention to secondary effects. i.e. Contamination of water if failed infrastructure. A mitigation measure will also be included to report secondary impacts on a toll free line and website.
7. **Table of Goals and Objectives** – refined summary to be discussed.
8. **Seismic section** – new draft seismic section to be prepared.
9. **Public involvement summary** – to be prepared for the Plan by staff
10. **January Agenda** - Human Caused Hazards section will be agendaized for January.
11. **Flood Section to be published on-line.** Publish on-line flood section following final revisions.

The next meeting will be Tuesday, December 14, 2004 from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. in Civic Center Meeting Rooms 1 and 2.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was received.

ADJOURNMENT

The Steering Committee adjourned at 8:30 p.m.