APPENDIX A - HAZARD MITIGATION TEAM (SHMT) AND WORKING GROUP MEETING RECORDS

State Hazard Mitigation Team
GIS Technical Advisory Working Committee (GIS TAWC)

Meeting Record
Tuesday, August 3, 2010
9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees Phyllis Banducci, CAL FIRE
Jami Childress-Byers, Cal EMA
Dean Cromwell, CAL FIRE
Sennath Ekanayah, DWR
Kirby Everhart, Cal EMA
Johanna Fenton, Cal EMA
John Freckman, CSLC
David Harris, Resources Agency
Quinn Hart, UC Davis
Juliette Hayes, FEMA (via teleconference)
Kris Higgs, Cal EMA
Bryan Klung, Cal EMA
Michelle Martinez, Cal EMA
Miriam Morrill, USFWS
Jill Nelson, Cal Poly – SLO
Jim Nordstrom, Cal EMA
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Chuck Real, CGS
Matt Schmidtlein, Cal Poly – SLO
Carol Schuldt, Cal Poly – SLO
Paula Schulz, Cal Poly – SLO
John Tinsley, USGS
Ken Topping, Cal Poly – SLO
Diane Vaughan, Cal EMA
Ken Worman, Cal EMA

Thanks to Carol Schuldt for acting as Recorder. This set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key points.

Purpose Statement: To build a website (MyPlan) to assist local governments in undertaking more effective local hazard mitigation plans and hazard mitigation grant projects

Key Outcomes

Agreement on MyPlan Phase 1 data layers (see July 27 report Attachment A)

BASE LAYERS
- Combine county boundaries, city boundaries, major roads, and water features into a static base map layer
- Population, dams, state lands, federal lands and shaded relief to be on/off at user's choice
- Railroads and airports have a question mark re inclusion

HAZARD LAYERS
- As listed in Attachment A, but remove Draft LRA Fire Hazard data per Cal FIRE
- Add active faults layer
- Attempt to find WUI boundary layer
- Possibly add community wildfire protection plan layer

Agreement on MyPlan Phase 2 data layers
- Use active fault lines rather than pre-holocene as a base layer
- Add vegetation layer as base layer
- Add approved LRA Fire Hazard Severity Zone data to hazard layers

- Add EPA human-induced hazards layer

Agreement on open access to website, rather than restricted access, for Phase 1 product
Agreement that agencies that contribute the data will control access to it, and that the Website can use authentication, as necessary to restrict access
Agreement to use Web Mercator as the projection

Next Steps

CNRA to have hazards and base maps for a working online demo (beta version) for next meeting
Next meeting in late September 2010

State Hazard Mitigation Team
Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring
Strategic Work Group

Meeting Record
Tuesday, August 3, 2010
1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees

Mike Boswell, Cal Poly – SLO
Jami Childress-Byers, Cal EMA
John Freckman, CSLC
Marjorie Greene, EERI
Jim Guthrie, Cal Poly – SLO
David Harris, Resources Agency
Brian Laughlin, Cal Poly – SLO
Joel McRonald, DGS
Robert Mead, Cal EMA
Jill Nelson, Cal Poly – SLO
Bruce Patton, CDI
Paula Schulz, Cal Poly – SLO
Fred Turner, CSSC
William Siembieda, Cal Poly – SLO
Ken Topping, Cal Poly – SLO
Ken Worman, Cal EMA

Thanks to Paula Schulz for acting as Recorder. This set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key points.

Purpose Statement: To track mitigation progress and record successful outcomes toward increasing California's long-term resiliency

Key Outcomes

- Agreement on need to initiate progress measurements
- State agencies and local governments currently maintain data that should be accessed as a first step in building a mitigation baseline
- Data collection should begin with those indicators already in use (e.g., deaths, injuries, recent retrofits)
- Private sector initiatives need to be tracked as well

Next Steps

- Write letters to key agencies asking for their support in identifying mitigation progress currently being monitored and/or inventories or data maintained
- Encourage local governments to identify where risk is highest and begin collection efforts there
- Refine hierarchy of what is counted in terms of unreinforced masonry buildings
- Develop guidance on what data to collect; standardize language, definitions, and fields; provide training
- Explore potential for collaboration between SMART, EERI LFE, and EqRetrofit.org
- Develop baseline data sets for tracking pre-event mitigation and for post-event performance
- Plan for public/private sector information exchange on mitigation progress (i.e., conferences/forums)

State Hazard Mitigation Team
Cross-Sector Communications and Knowledge Sharing
Strategic Work Group

Meeting Record
Thursday, August 5, 2010
9:00 – 11:00 a.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees

Dave King, CSSC
Charlie Eadie, Cal Poly – SLO
Corinne Bartshire, Dewberry
Robert Anderson, CSSC
Brian Laughlin, Cal Poly – SLO
Kendall Reedy, Cal EMA
Michael Nowlan, FMA
Bruce Patton, Department of Insurance
Kevin Elcock, DWR
Ken Topping, Cal Poly – SLO
Ken Worman, Cal EMA
John Freckman, CSLC
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Terri Chapman, BICEPP
Brenda O'Connor, IBHS

Thanks to Corinne Bartshire for acting as Recorder. This set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key points.

Purpose Statement: To build collaboration between state and local governments, business associations and other private sector organizations to increase California's long-term resiliency

Key Outcomes

- Agreement on continuing outreach to local and private sector organizations through implementation of the SHMP.
- Agreement on preparation of standardized outreach SHMP messaging "kit" to support outreach efforts at professional association or organization meetings.
- Agreement on pursuing data collection to inform and support insurance incentives
- Agreement on Cal EMA/private partners jointly hosting annual mitigation progress forum

Next Steps

- Use Cal EMA's Facebook and Twitter accounts to disseminate messages regarding mitigation related events and progress
- Build on the contact database used for outreach during the 2010 SHMP update to develop a list of "mitigation partners" to be informed of mitigation activities and solicited for knowledge sharing via regular emails from Cal EMA
- Provide an opportunity on the Hazard Mitigation Web Portal for interested individuals to subscribe to the "mitigation partners" list
- Develop standardized messaging for the statewide hazard mitigation efforts including a memorable "grabber"
- Conduct a process to identify overlapping interests between public and private sector organizations with regard to hazard mitigation
- Develop an outreach "kit" to be used by all Cross-Sector Communications (CSC) Work Group members to convey statewide goals for hazard mitigation
- Compile a list of regular meetings (professional associations or local organizations) that CSC Work Group members attend
- Identify CSC Work Group members to present at some (or all) of the identified association meetings

- Coordinate with SMART program to collect loss data that can be used to inform development of insurance incentives
- Follow IBHS research on home construction practices to be conducted at new testing facility in South Carolina
- Discuss annual mitigation progress forum with other Strategic Work Groups to identify potential discussion topics, themes, attendees, etc.

Collected Key Ideas (provided by individual meeting participants):

- Mitigation is a tool that can be used to reduce insurance premiums
- Privately developed data can be used to change public policy
- Need collection of ideas used for collaboration
- Opportunity to promote larger goal of state resilience
- Information and context for stakeholder efforts; track mitigation progress (define both)
- Can be used as a resource for both ideas and action
- Mitigate! = cost benefit = save money + lives
- Vulnerability is high statewide
- Efforts are broad; many issues and hazards
- Much work has paid off – more can be done
- Be aware that FEMA disaster funds could be available
- Document would provide guidance in quantifying costs of doing hazard mitigation
- Where does work done in regard to this document reside?
- Suggest Cal EMA become a signatory on the NEMA white paper "Recommendations for an Effective National Mitigation Effort"
- Establish a Natural Hazard Mitigation Association Chapter or Chapters in California
- Insert information on the soon-to-be-completed IBHS laboratory into the SHMP and highlight its use in developing incentives for evolution of mitigation efforts as appropriate for the laboratory
- Suggest Cal EMA develop a "spider-bot" for the mitigation web portal to view capital improvement projects for publically traded companies
- Inquire about adopting a public or private school by communities and/or businesses for preparedness and/or mitigation of schools (possibly a joint effort with ASCE and EERI)
- If you are at risk of becoming a disaster victim, the SHMP contains information that will keep you safe and save you money
- The SHMP presents understanding of how state agencies interact to implement the mitigation strategy statewide
- The SHMP outlines state level legislation/policies that local government can leverage to implement mitigation actions
- To get business community on board with property mitigation, we need strong support of one of the statewide business groups (Chamber of Commerce, California Small Business Association, or California Manufacturers Association; approach these groups to include the survey in their newsletters or post on their websites ("buy in" of the business community)
- "The SHMP is a fantastic collection of detailed information about hazards facing California. I refer people to it when they are trying to learn about a specific hazard. However, due to its sheer size, as other participants noted, it puts people off."
- The SHMP should truly be a "living" document, one that is capable of incorporating additions and being available to SHMP readers. It can, and should be, a good resource for collecting mitigation information both to teach/inform other people. It should focus as a central point for the mitigation community in California, both public and private, to collaborate to advance mitigation in department. Therefore, it MUST be supplemented by regular meetings of interested stakeholders.

Mitigation Messaging Suggestions (provided by individual meeting participants):

- Mitigate or Die!
- Be resilient
- Risk reduction emphasis, connect with outreach on mitigation
- A plan today will help bring a better tomorrow
- Building community resilience
- Mitigation is good business
- Better to mitigate than litigate, even a little bit.
- SHMP - information that best serves you
- Striving for minimal damage
- Reduce Risk
- Talk about property protection, risk reduction, property damage reduction, etc.
- Talk about building structures that are strong, durable, resilient and disaster-resistant
- Example: “Going Green and Building Strong”

State Hazard Mitigation Team
Land Use Mitigation
Strategic Work Group

Meeting Record
Thursday, August 5, 2010
1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees

Charlie Eadie, Cal Poly – SLO
Corinne Bartshire, Dewberry
Robert Anderson, CSSC
Brian Laughlin, Cal Poly – SLO
Kendall Reedy, Cal EMA
Ken Topping, Cal Poly – SLO
Ken Worman, Cal EMA
John Freckman, CSLC
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Robert Mead, Cal EMA
Maria Lorenzo-Lee, DWR
Chuck Real, CGS
Ken Leep, Cal EMA
Bill Siembieda, Cal Poly – SLO

Thanks to Charles Eadie for acting as Recorder. This set of notes is not intended to include all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key points.

Purpose Statement: To strengthen land use mitigation methods to increase California's long-term resiliency

Key Outcomes

- Discussed progress of Strategic Growth Council (SGC-consortium of state agencies) and implementation of SB 375 re greenhouse gas reduction:
  - Money is available for sustainable projects and planning grants; SGC is reviewing
  - Approximately $60 million in funds available; perhaps 50% to be awarded this year
  - Agreed to promote future LHMP grant eligibility authorization by SGC

- Discussed Housing and Community Development/Housing and Urban Development (HCD/HUD) Disaster Recovery Initiative following 2008 California wildfires:
  - Due to advocacy by Cal EMA, available funding can be used for LHMPs; DRI funds can be used for local match
  - $39 million is available from HUD (federal), with another $15 million potentially available as a supplement (conditional: must use $39 million first)

- Research re LHMPs found that LHMPs are not well correlated with local government general plan safety elements

- New incentive for better correlation is now in place: If LHMP is adopted as part of a safety element; the local funding share of post-disaster Stafford Act public assistance grants is reduced from 6.25% to 0%
- Need to get the word out regarding this incentive and use of DRI funds as well
- New state guidance on general plans now requires better correlation

- Identified key problem facing local governments: they need assistance in applying for grants and in understanding the funding that is available

- Discussed Regional Blueprint process involving transportation planning by regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction. Presents an opportunity to address hazard mitigation planning on a regional scale; to date only the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has been doing this

- Agreed to promote land use mitigation through regional planning

- Discussed AB 162, which requires flood hazard considerations to be included in Land Use, Safety, Housing, and Conservation elements of local general plans. Department of Water Resources has prepared a new handbook to guide implementation of AB 162 (presentation by DWR representative)
    - New focus on 200 year flood hazards; maps by 2012
    - 25 modifications to Water and Government Codes
    - Annual review and compliance deadlines
    - San Joaquin Valley now subject to 200-year standard for mitigation by 2025, or else no development will be allowed
    - Levees will have to be brought up to 200-year standard in Central Valley
    - DWR is establishing risk zones

- Need to run DWR handbook by MPOs and COGs for possible regional application

Next Steps/Suggested New Initiatives

- Cal EMA should encourage land use map and growth trends assessment to be part of LHMP crosswalk (i.e., ask locals to put land use trends into LHMP analyses)
- Coordinate DWR initiatives with local regional governments (link with Blueprint process)
- Improve mapping coordination of GIS resources between state and local governments
- Better identify funding priorities and target the right agencies
- Invite cities and regional agency representatives to participate in future committee meetings
- Include local and regional organizations in online forums with ongoing facilitated discussion about land use and mitigation
- Connect with League of Cities and Council of County Governments (CSAC) regarding grants available for land use planning and mitigation
- Contact other agency personnel and make use of their already developed tools for technical assistance (for example, Nevada has developed a powerpoint and workshop on how to apply for hazard mitigation grants – contact Elizabeth Ashby (SHMO) and Kim Groenwald (NFIP coordinator))
- Connect zoning ordinances to LHMPs
- Educate planning commissioners re hazard mitigation and LHMPs
- State could consider establishing regional offices to assist local jurisdictions in identifying and applying for grants:
    1. staff these offices with grant-writing professionals
    2. establish outreach capabilities with these offices
- Consider ideas for promoting grant information:
    - Use social media alerts (facebook, twitter)
    - Use stakeholder email database (e.g., people could subscribe to grant/mitigation alerts through the web portal)
    - Use mitigation portal to host grant information with links to applications and guidance material
    - Advertise through CSAG, League of Cities, and professional organizations, such as the American Planning Association and Flood Managers Association
    - Use database of local LHMP contacts

GIS TAWC MEETING

Meeting Record
Thursday, December 5, 2010
1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees:

Phyllis Banduci	Cal Fire
Corinne Bartshire	Dewberry
Jami Byers	Cal EMA
Craig Conner	USACE
Johanna Fenton	Cal EMA
David Harris	Resources
Jordan Hastings	Chief Cartographer/NV Bureau of Mines and Geology
Kris Higgs	Cal EMA
Quinn Hart	UC Davis
Herby Lissade	Caltrans
Julie Norris	Ca EMA
John Pelonio	CA State Parks
Lorri Peltz-Lewis	USFS
Charles Real	CGS
Carol Schuldt	Cal Poly
Michael Thomas	DGS
Ken Topping	Cal Poly
Greg Vlasek	Cal EPA

INTRODUCTIONS

DISCUSSION:
Ken W asked Quinn about use statistics. He didn't have them with him, but can get basic numbers from Google Analytics.
Chuck reported that someone from the Applied Technology Council was asking him at a meeting about how they could access liquefaction/landslide information for a site by address, and he referred them to MyPlan. They were impressed. Chuck will be at a meeting with them soon and they indicated that they'd like to see it expand nationwide. More funding would make it greater (KW)
Question: were layers missing from phase 1 because of security concerns? Not really (KT)
REVIEW OF LAYERS THAT DIDN'T MAKE IT INTO PHASE 1:

DAM INUNDATION:
Some websites are already serving this data, so it's in the public domain (ABAG for instance). Cal EMA is sending out disks with the info on it on request. It's part of mandated information. Cal EMA legal council said that MyPlan would need new disclaimer for that layer. KW needs to find what he got from legal, and Quinn can add it to the layer description, and that should do it. Another option would be to set the disclaimer up as a 'click-through' to show legal disclaimer. Cal EMA will be data steward.

SEA LEVEL RISE:
This was deferred to phase 2 intentionally since it was climate related. Static data is available from the Pacific Institute: http://www.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/data/index.htm . It was developed for the 2009 Impacts of Sea Level Rise on the California Coast project, paid for by the CEC, among others.

GENERAL DISCUSSION:
KT commented that currently, various data is being developed by various agencies. Currently CA/WA/OR are working jointly on developing new climate change data. The Pacific Institute data will be replaced as newer, updated data becomes available.
Question – can MyPlan host layers developed by universities or institutes? KW – yes, conceivably, although the layers are currently all either from, or developed for, government agencies. Quinn pointed out that GIS TAWC vets all hazard layers and that they all have data stewards. There is also currently the ability to add data from any GIS server to your own map. GIS TAWC will pick and choose from proposed datasets and as things change, the layers available may change. For instance, a layer may go away if we lose a data steward or data corrupts or something.

David – the foundation of MyPlan is the stewardship of the layers. That's what makes it work, and makes it useful.

Greg asked how up-to-date the layers are, for instance updates on a compromised nuclear power plant? MyPlan not intended for short term phenomenon, more for long term mitigation planning, so layers are updated on a schedule set by the data stewards. It's not intended for emergency response. Kris commented that in many cases, emergency response data is not available to the general public, and is only released on a 'need to know' basis.

How does the public know whether the information is reliable and if it's controversial? For instance, sea level rise predictions? What if there are competing scenarios? KT – this group has a lot of expertise and can do a good job of vetting. If controversy arises, group will address the issue and decide what to do.
Johanna – most current datasets were created by state agencies. Pacific Agency did the sea level rise research for CEC with cooperation of CNRA. MyPlan is intended to supply data for locals who don't have easy GIS data available locally.

KW – as an example, if State Farm came to us with data, would we put it up? GIS TAWC would look at data for accuracy and suitability and probably reject it. Questions become more difficult if the data wasn't created by, or for, a state or federal agency.

Johanna – communities are ultimately responsible for evaluating suitability of MyPlan information for their locale.

Chuck – suggested we add the Coastal Zone boundary line. KW concurred. Quinn/KT – Coastal zone boundary may not need a steward, because the boundaries are static and fixed in law.

David – MyPlan 'proxy agent' is someone who keeps an eye on the progress of the data, even if they aren't at the agency that developed it (i.e. Cal EMA or Guido/CEC for Pacific Institute layers) They take responsibility for letting the group know when data is outdated or needs to be replaced.

Greg – is MyPlan an emergency planning site?

KW – No, it's meant for local agencies doing LHMPs or Safety/General plans who don't have access to GIS. It's for mitigation – not emergency planning or response, although it may be used by localities for whatever they wish, at their own discretion. He explained the relationship to MyHazards, as well. Some local agencies were using MyHazards to make maps for their plans and that's not a good idea because the datasets are not as accurate. MyPlan will also be used by other states, substituting their own data. Nevada has already begun. Other local planners are using it for other things besides mitigation – please let Julie know if we hear of instances of that.

KT described the difference between emergency planning and mitigation planning, and explaining why the Coastal Zone Boundary might be important for planning. An LHMP map might need that boundary on it. Someone commented that we need more cooperation between planners and responders. Gave an example of how the Coastal Zone boundary is important: Pacifica had to notify the Coastal Commission when they did emergency response within their boundary for landslides.
Johanna – explained that planners have to identify risk and address mitigation. The Coastal Zone boundary may affect what mitigation is available to them.

WILDFIRE THREAT LAYER DATED 2005:
KT asked if legend differences between this and LRA/SRA layers are important ? Phyllis said yes. The threat map shows the big picture, while LRA/SRA response area information is more local for those areas that have adopted them. They are just recommendations from Cal Fire to local communities. Cal Fire will need to decide on the symbology, since it could be confusing to have exactly the same color mean different things on two fire layers.

Phyllis – CA does have a published WUI layer that takes into account population, development, and fire threat. There is a new layer coming out that does a better job of identifying WUIs using LANDSCAN population data to identify them. [I didn't catch who's creating this layer - Maria? Western Foresters Association? West Side Risk

Assessment?] It may be a work in progress. It might we worth waiting and using the new one instead of the 2003 Cal Fire WUI layer which is outdated. Phyllis will follow up and either use new layer or update their old one.

Community Wildfire Protection Plan Boundaries – not yet available? Phyllis –explained that Cal Fire used a community layer in their planning and added attributes, so they ended up with only incorporated cities with plans. Those listed as Community at Risk are listed on the Fire Alliance website. KT – asked if this is worth including on MyPlan?

DAMS BASE LAYER
The National Inventory of Dams is available, however it has all sizes of dams from tiny, private to large federal. We could put the layer in, but limit it to dams that have inundation boundaries. Kris volunteered to be Proxy Data Steward.

STATE/FEDERAL LANDS
Quinn pointed out that California Protected Areas Database (CPAD) is already available. BLM is trying to integrate all data which CPAD is picking up. David talked about proposals to fund it. CA is ahead of the pack on this. CPAD includes all ownership data and may include manager info for lands as well. The layer is currently being cleaned up. Proposed Data Steward either Fish and Game or Green Info Network?? Someone needs to contact/develop a data steward and make sure that they are willing to have it on MyPlan.

DISCUSSION:
FEMA is currently doing an update to existing CA Coastal erosion risk mapping. Ask Chris Potter about it at CNRA. It might be a good idea to include it. It will be available in a couple of years from the Coastal Sediment Mgt. Workgroup (CSMW).

CAL-ADAPT WEBSITE DATA:
This website has available datasets for temperature/rainfall/snowpack/sea level change. Next meeting – invite someone who really knows Cal-Adapt to do a demo and discuss with us whether/how their data is compatible with MyPlan.

DISCUSSION:
Disaster history - Kris is updating the state disaster history database – but it needs to be available in a way that it is queryable by type and timeframe. Information is only available by county, not precise location.
Levee/sea walls – national layer just released. Lorri- will send Web links to Julie and Carol. [Not sure if this is available as a layer at this point]
Existing land use – is being worked on, trying to get a common definition of land use types, by Digital Land Records initiative – from GIOs office.
Critical infrastructure/ lifelines - includes things like pipelines, power lines, emergency responder sites, hospitals, etc. The problem is that each local entity is defining lifelines separately.

Scenarios for specific quakes on specific faults – Kris mentioned that Cal EMA has paid for HAZUS runs on potential earthquakes. The shakemaps exist – could they be included? They are more specific than general shake maps and allow cities to see how bad it would be if xyz fault generated a z.z magnitude quake. Could Cal EMA (Johanna) or Chuck be data steward for this? They are very specific and static. Corinne suggested this topic may need further discussion. Johanna felt that they should be on Cal EMA website, but not part of MyPlan.

Social vulnerability – schools, hospitals, nursing homes, retirement homes. Revisit later.
Wastewater treatment plants and powerplants - add if available? The dataset is available from EPA/Pacific Institute. We'd need a Data steward. Is it useful? May be too far over the line – too complicated. Leave off for now.

Question on whether we should be doing customer surveys to assess value of MyPlan, and talk to local planners, to see if it's working for them. KT mentioned that there are plans to create a workbook, Using MyPlan for your LHMP, to promote MyPlan.

Jami suggested having levels of MyPlan – simple to complex – so that it would be easier to use.
Current Phase – when someone discovers a glitch it would be useful to have a central point on main page for MyPlanHELP. The user could fill out a form and it would go to an alias and then redirect to Julie, Carol or whoever is designated to field questions. We are aware of firewall problems, virus programs can interfere, the Web browser version can affect display – all problems common to any website. Once we start to get a feel for common problems, we could add an FAQ. Quinn could define minimum capabilities and browsers requirements.

NEXT STEPS

The meeting record will be written and sent out via email. Quinn/David will start work on the easy stuff, and ask for volunteers to research the rest. GIS TAWC will meet again sometime this Spring, and we will try to get someone from Cal-Adapt to present to the group.

State Hazard Mitigation Team
Cross-Sector Communications and Knowledge Sharing
Strategic Work Group

Meeting Record
Monday, January 24, 2011
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Chris Anderson, HCD
Kevin Ward, UC Davis
Karin Beardsley, UC Davis
Jill Nelson, Cal Poly
Adrienne Greve, Cal Poly
Carol Schuldt, Cal Poly
Corinne Bartshire, Dewberry
Bruce Patton, CA Dept of Insurance
Jami Byers, Cal EMA
Fred Turner, CSSC
Ken Topping, Cal Poly
Ken Worman, Cal EMA
Mike Staley, CVCA
Michael Thomas, DGS
Ravi Varma, CA State Lands Commission (phone)
Allen Oto, DWR (phone)

Thanks to Corinne Bartshire for acting as Recorder. This set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key points.

Purpose Statement: To build collaboration between state and local governments, business associations and other private sector organizations to increase California's long-term resiliency

Key points from the discussion

- Reviewed the attached discussion outline
- Discussed mitigation vs response vs recovery
- Anticipate! Mitigate! What's your plan? (suggested slogan)
- Overall goal and vision:
    - Statewide umbrella organization
    - Value in pooling resources
    - Making people aware of this effort
    - How do people prioritize what is most important?
- Need agreement on which hazards different geographies are exposed to. State Lands Commission is working on oil facilities, people need to know which hazards are relevant.
- Distribution:
    - Upcoming press release
    - Upcoming executive summary
- There is something in the state hazard mitigation plan for everyone. Distribution needs to be vigorous and well conceived.
- Available Budget: minimal...
- Metrics to measure and set goals for cross-sector communication against?
- What are people using the plan for? (Bruce uses it as an educational tool)
- Suggestion to develop user guide for state hazard mitigation plan
- Suggestion to include discussion of why the plan is useful in the executive summary
- Suggestion to make each chapter a downloadable file on the web portal. The entire plan is too large to download.
- Cal EMA can integrate messaging about state hazard mitigation plan into Fire Alliance events.
- Suggestion to focus products from this group that can be published on the web portal.

- Who should be this group's key audience?
- Individual/private homeowners (NO)
- Elected Officials (YES)
- Emergency Managers (YES)
- City Planners (YES)

Suggestion to use the State Hazard Mitigation Plan to inform CEQA reviews and EIRs
Suggestion to spell out what CA is doing to be "enhanced". Explain that it comes with additional responsibilities. Elected officials should appreciate this.
Benefits of the plan: We need to outline these before we can identify stakeholders. (DWR plan is focused on flood risk for a community, mandated through state legislation, and has a guide on how to comply with the new state law)
The State Hazard Mitigation Plan is a resource for completing local hazard mitigation plans

Expectations/Synergies for this work group and member organizations

- Cal EMA and CSSC did a survey to find out what people know and don't know about disasters. We should do more surveys like this and use prior investments to understand our stakeholders.
- Consumer Services Agency is developing 18 annexes. We need a consistent messaging plan.
- Mitigation Recovery (HCD): in 2008 fires in San Diego, communication going up the chain lacked. They need to know what to anticipate for recovery. BAE and Southern California Earthquake use EF14.
- Note: there is no real statewide plan for recovery in CA
- Need pre-event recovery plans that integrate mitigation. (Ken Worman will stage this as a good idea for legislative action when economy is better.)
- Private Sector Partnership: Home Depot, Target, State Farm, etc. Use them for awareness campaigns.
- Increase awareness to everyone. Elected officials should be a focused audience.
- These ideas coordinate with the Strategic Growth Council. They can distribute the message (Karen Beardsley)

Next Steps

- Develop materials for members of the Cross-Sector Stakeholder Work Group to review/revise and comment on:
  3. Core PowerPoint presentation that may be modified for specific audiences
  4. Executive Summary of state hazard mitigation plan
  5. User guide for state hazard mitigation plan

- Identify stakeholder groups with the assistance of the following contact liaisons:
  6. Private Sector
  7. League of Cities
  8. CSAC
  9. Special District Association
  10. IBHS
  11. David Morgan

- Develop flyer(s) informing usefulness and availability of state hazard mitigation plan for specific audiences

State Hazard Mitigation Team
Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring
Strategic Work Group

Meeting Record
Tuesday, January 25, 2011
9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

AttendeesBruce Patton, CDI
Fred Turner, CSSC
Robert Anderson, CSSC
Michael Thomas, DGS
Kevin Ward, UC Davis
Ravi Varma, SLC (phone)
Ken Worman, Cal EMA
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Jami Childress-Byers, Cal EMA
Ken Topping, Cal Poly – SLO
Carol Schuldt, Cal Poly - SLO
Jill Nelson, Cal Poly - SLO
Charlie Eadie, Cal Poly
Paula Schulz - Cal Poly

Thanks to Paula Schulz for acting as Recorder. This set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key points.

Purpose Statement: To track mitigation progress and record successful outcomes toward increasing California's long-term resiliency

Key Outcomes

- Reviewed objectives to further define/refine future focus and tasks
- Identified various potential sources of mitigation baseline and progress documentation
- Determined there is potential to tie LHMPs more closely to mitigation progress indicators by adapting California requirements and recommending review crosswalk improvements to FEMA.
- When completed, the first phase of Cal VIVA will provide state infrastructure inventory and assessment as well as define mitigation priorities and targets for earthquake mitigation. Subsequent phases may address additional hazards.
- Unreinforced Masonry Building mitigation should shift from aggregate to parcel based reporting
- Sources of existing information should be mined and incorporated as appropriate into a framework for tracking mitigation progress
- Cal EMA needs to articulate what data it would like and get consensus from local government representatives in order to make data collection acceptable and cost effective

Next Steps

- Develop framework for defining/collecting mitigation inventories/progress

1. Use seven hazard categories included in My Plan
2. Include exposure, priority areas and items
3. Define what to measure: structures, land area, lifelines, cost/benefit re seismic, flood, fire, other (public/private).

Vulnerability	Structures	Land Area	Life Lines	Other
Seismic	(private/public) (state/local)			
Flood				
Fire				

- Establish list of data or types of mitigation progress to be collected
  - start with multi-hazard matrix developed by Fred Turner
  - have hazard specific experts refine matrix categories
  - seek input from local government representatives during process

- Review existing data sets/sources for appropriate data or methodologies for tracking (inventories/projects/progress)
  - NRPI (Natural Resource Projects Index, funded by State Water Board and housed at UC Davis)
  - California Geologic Survey 2006 Summary Report on State Hazard Mapping Act projects and mitigation
  - Board of Equalization maintains data on building demolition (could be a source for identifying structures mitigated)
  - Department of Insurance 1995 inventory of every residential structure in California
  - California Earthquake Authority will be providing wood frame residential retrofit grants of up to $1000
  - EERI non-ductile concrete inventory study will be released soon
  - Fill in gaps across the state using sampling and estimating techniques and creating proxy inventories

Inventory of buildings with Strong Motion Instruments to identify pre and post-event condition

- Identify desirable elements to be included in LHMP's to improve plan quality
  - Require Planning Department representation on Planning Team
  - Use existing rules/regulations to set criteria for including data that is useful
  - Use of My Plan or other GIS analysis tools
  - Provide incentives for including data (i.e., additional points on grant applications)
  - Incorporate mitigation tracking into building permit process using permit fee mechanism

- Request presentations/documentation from local governments who are implementing best practices
  - San Luis Obispo unreinforced masonry inventory website
  - Roseville flood mitigation program and Community Rating System
  - San Francisco Community Action Plan for Seismic Safety (CAPS)
  - City of Big Bear Lake fire mitigation programs
  - State of Delaware tracking system for flood mitigation projects
  - Request League of California Cities to identify cities with best practices

Solicit participation in Mitigation Progress Indicators and Tracking Indicators Strategic Planning Work Group that is representative of all primary hazards and interest groups

State Hazard Mitigation Team
Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring
Strategic Work Group

Meeting Record
Thursday, April 21, 2011
9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees : Bruce Patton, CDI
Chris Anderson, HCD
Dave Morgan, Delta Dental
Jim Chapman, USDA/NRCS
Ravi Varma, SLC (phone)
Claire Clark, City of San Luis Obispo
Stu Townsley, FMA/USACE
Iovanka Todt, FMA/USACE
Claire Marie Turner, USACE
Kevin Ward, U.C. Davis
Ken Worman, Cal EMA
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Jami Childress-Byers, Cal EMA
Kirby Everhart, Cal EMA
Johanna Fenton, Cal EMA
Kristina Moffitt, Cal EMA
Ken Topping, Cal Poly – SLO
Carol Schuldt, Cal Poly - SLO
Paula Schulz - Cal Poly

Thanks to Paula Schulz for acting as Recorder. This set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key point.

Purpose Statement: To track mitigation progress and record successful outcomes toward increasing California's long-term resiliency

Key Discussion Points:

- Claire Clark, the Economic Development Manager for the City of San Luis Obispo accepted the Work Group invitation to attend the meeting and present key elements of the city's successful Unreinforced Masonry Building Retrofit Program. Key points are outlined below. A copy of Clair's PowerPoint presentation is attached along with a copy of "What's Shaking", the City's newsletter publicizing and celebrating progress of the retrofit program.
- To comply with SB547, the City of San Luis Obispo identified 125 unreinforced masonry buildings to be mitigated by 2000. Between 1997 and 2004, 27 of those retrofits were completed. A large number of the remaining buildings were located in the in the downtown core area. The proximity of the 2004 Paso Robles Earthquake, and the damage and impact to the downtown business district in the City of Paso Robles stimulated renewed interest in the City of San Luis Obispo's URM retrofit program.
- The City Council collaborated with local businesses and building owners to establish revised retrofit requirements, timelines, incentives and penalties that would contribute to implementation.
- At this time only 19 buildings remain to be retrofit, the majority of which are located in the downtown core area and part of 3 large redevelopment projects currently in the planning stage.
- In addition to providing increased safety to the community, the retrofit program has increased the resiliency of the City's building stock to future earthquake events. The program has also contributed to a renewed economic viability by returning the historic quality of the downtown district, spurring ownership changes and redevelopment projects, and increasing the economic vibrancy of the core area.

Key Outcomes:

- There is a need to collect data and technical information about mitigation programs such as what was presented by Claire Clark
- There is also a need to tell the story to encourage other jurisdictions to take action
- It was agreed that economic research should be incorporated into our mitigation monitoring and evaluation.
- Economic impacts should be considered as part of benefit/cost calculations due to the potential long term impacts on a community from business interruption.
- It was suggested the longitudinal benefits including economic impact and community sustainability should be studied.
- There is potential for developing a decision support framework for mitigation that could be incorporated into future versions of MyPlan.
- At this meeting the Work Group also met its objective of increasing active participation by agencies or organizations addressing flood hazards. Representatives from the Army Corps of Engineers and Flood Managers Association attended and provided valuable insights into statewide flood mitigation activities.
- Stu Townsley from the USACE briefly presented the Silver Jackets concept and described some current efforts both nationally and in California. Their primary mission is to provide coordination between state and federal agencies in support for the full life cycle of floods.
- The USACE is currently participating in 60 or more flood risk mitigation activities in California within their three regional districts (Sacramento/San Francisco/Los Angeles).

Next Steps

- Schedule a presentation of the USACE "Silver Jackets" program for full SHMT Meeting
- Acquire list of +60 active USACE mitigation projects in California
- Follow up with Claire Clark (City of San Luis Obispo) to identify what information is available on line regarding the City's Unreinforced Masonry Building Program
- Use the SLO URM program as a case study and explore ways to document and distribute this and similar programs for other hazards as well
- Identify minimally intrusive questions to ask local government

Begin to fill in framework developed in January using My Plan categories and incorporate appropriate fields from the original Fred Turner Matrix

State Hazard Mitigation Team
GIS Technical Advisory Working Committee (GIS TAWC)

Meeting Record
Thursday, April 21, 2011
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 p.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees:

Chris Anderson	Housing and Comm. Dev.
Phyllis Banducci	Cal Fire
Corinne Bartshire	Dewberry/Cal Poly
David Sapsis	Cal Fire
Jami Childress-Byers	Cal EMA
Claire Clark	City of San Luis Obispo
Senarath Ekanayake	DWR
Kirby Everhart	Cal EMA
Johanna Fenton	Cal EMA
Quinn Hart	UCDavis
Jeremy Hill	DWR
Jordan Hastings	Nevada Bureau of Mines & Geology
Bryan Klung	Cal EMA
Kristina Moffitt	Cal EMA
Gary Johnson	Nevada Bureau of Mines & Geology
Julie Norris	Cal EMA
Bruce Patton	Dept. of Insurance
Chuck Real	CGS
Matt Schmidtlein	CSUS
Carol Schuldt	Cal Poly
Paula Schulz	Cal Poly
Tom Shane	USDA
Scott Splean	USDA
Iovanka Todt	FMA
Ken Topping	Cal Poly
Stu Townsley	USACE
Clare Marie Turner	USACE
Carl Wallace	City of Roseville
Ken Worman	Cal EMA

Thanks to Ken Topping, Johanna Fenton and Carol Schuldt for acting as recorders. This combined set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussion, but rather to serve as documentation of key points.

Key Discussion Items

- Ken Worman recapped what MyPlan is intended to do and its target audience. He asked Quinn to demo the latest updates using SLO and Roseville as examples, since they're here. He also requested comments from attendees on what the pressing concerns are with it, in its current configuration, and advice for helpful tools/processes/abilities. Final changes before going public will be prioritized – low hanging fruit first. Send comments to Julie – soon!! Cal EMA plans on making the website public in June – Phase One.
- Quinn commented that he needs to know what data products are the most useful.
- Chuck Real said that the data on MyPlan has been vetted, it's the right data to use, best available, not experimental.
- Ken Topping pointed out that today's discussion is to decide if it's usable as is.
- Carl/Roseville asked if it is intended for the public? KW says no – KT says yes. MyHazards is for public. More appropriate. Includes mitigation actions they should take. A couple of folks said they used MyHazards when buying real estate – even though not really suitable for that. But if you take it as a warning, then follow up with more research, it's OK. The public may find MyPlan more useful – but need to understand what it is.

<u>Quinn did a live demo of MyPlan:</u>
<u>What's new</u>

- City boundaries added
- Ability to print map finalized
- Added Service Layer download status indicators
- Changed default Basemap
- Simplified configuration on backend – easier to do mashups now

- Added Splash Screen
- Added "How to use" tutorial
- Updated documentation
- Google Earth coming soon
- Met with Data Stewards to revise symbology

What didn't get done:

- Legends – change w/ opacity (new problems)
- Downloads – Geodatabase available for partners, not publicly available
- Symbology will be available for GIS professionals
- Hit Counter – will use Google Analytics to track usage
- He is having some Internet Explorer woes, he's using Firefox to develop it

Comments on demo – His basemaps display properly, and they were changing what showed, as he zoomed in and out. After you change a basemap, you need to manually close the basemap window. Comment that there should probably be a Close Button or something. New information button shows at the bottom, with links to slideshow tutorials. Some layers now have stippling which is meant to indicate that there isn't data - not that there's no hazard. Comments that stippling makes it very hard to read underlying base map and is confusing.

- Carl/Roseville asked how a communities/counties would let Cal EMA and Quinn know when the local data (like a city boundary) changes? Ken T – yet to be determined.
- David/Cal Fire mentioned that for fire data, locals may adopt recommendations but not report it back up the line, so Cal Fire won't know
- Are city boundaries accurate? Probably not, since they're from 2008. Quinn will be looking for newer data.
- Carl/Roseville commented that cities need to report back when things changes. Can a user drop changes on top of the Web map? Quinn said that you can add your own layers using the ArcGIS Online – if you have a GIS server serving the data, however, chances are our target users won't have that capability.
- Ken T reminded everyone that this is for local folks without GIS. We want them to be able to make their maps for their LHMPs.
- Johanna agreed that the intended user doesn't have GIS layers for things like local facilities.
- Corinne mentioned that while MyPlan shows hazards nicely, it doesn't allow for vulnerability analysis. It would need base HAZUS data or similar, as well as points for emergency response, etc. What's the exposure? It would need locations for schools, hospitals, etc.
- Matt has some ideas for improvements. They would allow queries to find and then show all hospitals, etc. He'll discuss possibilities with Quinn after the meeting.
- Johanna would like to see the layer for population density – maybe at block level? That way you could see who is affected by hazards. That was part of the Phase one plan.
- Carl/Roseville commented that local zoning would be helpful. Also that most smaller communities rely on their county for data. Locals may have different definition of critical facilities, for instance.
- Carol pointed out that it's too soon to add facilities, because the map online is too small. Icons would overlap for larger counties/cities. Future plans call for allowing user to choose size of online map.
- Paula suggested that the county boundary layer is fine – but that most users probably won't want to see surrounding counties showing. The user needs to be able to clip the map to a city or county boundary, and we should add a layer of separate county boundaries that could be turned on or off one by one.
- Johanna agreed that we should have County Boundary option.
- Quinn will put city and county boundaries on the right side and allow them to be reordered and turned on and off.
- Paula asked Carl/Roseville about whether repetitive loss/flooding dots for properties would be useful. FEMA provides information to local communities. Discussion ensued.
- Matt asked about whether zoom levels have been set on hazards. Quinn said yes, if you zoom in too far on the large scale maps, beyond 1:24,000, it gets less accurate. Symbols/legends change.
- Johanna pointed out that scale issues seem to make it less useful at the county/community level. Scale dependent layers are confusing – things jump around and appear and disappear as you zoom in.

- Ken T volunteered that Cal Poly can help with user manual – but it needs to be a 3-way discussion. It should include instructions for all the capabilities – starting with simple, Web only possibilities, then on to using data in ArcGIS online/Google Earth, then to using the data in ArcMap.
- Matt asked if the data come as features or images? Quinn explained that it's primarily image services, but added some feature services for other data. Images don't have feature data. Features allow you to click on a feature and get data on that feature from attribute table.
- Claire/SLO gave us her take on MyPLan after pointing out that she doesn't use GIS, just the products. She looked at SLO on the MyPlan website, but didn't view any tutorials (probably typical for most users). She thought that it would also useful for fire departments, land use updates, etc. What GIS users want, should be secondary. Non-GIS folks should get first consideration.
- Discussion on how city boundary accuracy is very important and on how the crosshatching isn't helpful.
- Johanna wondered if the list of six hazards give a city the impression that those are the only hazards the state cares about? Even if you have local hazards not addressed on MyPlan? Group discussed the question and decided that the answer was, probably not. I would be helpful to see to see a Purpose Statement on the first Web page, explaining what it does and who it was developed for (Hazard mitigation planners).
- Ken W asked if it would be useful to have a link to the advanced version for GIS sophisticates? What if a city fires all of the GIS department staff? Suddenly the non-GIS guy has to make a map.
- General discussion about replacing 'eyeball' with check box to left of blue triangle and making opacity icon and information icon more intuitive.
- Carl/Roseville said that it really needs tooltips for each icon.
- Someone asked if the 58 hazards that communities ID'd statewide for the SHMP are available online. Can we get list of all the hazards? Yes – check on CalEMA website and the SHMP.
- Ken T summarized comments on his notepad (See transcription below) Quinn will add population density layer. He'll talk to Matt about the options for it.
- Flood mapping with 200-year zone from DWR will need to be added. DWR will be rolling out their own service in June with 100-, 200-, and 500-year layers. They'll work with Quinn and share resources. Probably need to separate the DWR layer from FEMA layer for now because the DWR layer isn't for insurance – but is required for a city general plan. Stu/USACE said to be careful to make sure that users understand the differences.
- Claire/USACE asked whether any coastal towns had responded to the beta site. Just Santa Barbara (see handout).
- Someone made a comment that the printed map needs to include a date printed, and dates of the hazard data, since it will change.
- Johanna mentioned that when she clicked on another tab at the top of the page, it knocked her out of the map with no way to get back without starting over. [Note: problem may be dependent on browser settings]
- Carol wondered about the mostly green Shaking Zones map, since it makes CA looks like a very safe place. What is the time frame for that data? She couldn't find that info in the ArcGIS Service Description, and the map looks a lot different than the map on the linking URL page.

Transcription of KT's notes on people's comments:

- FHSZ in LRA – stipple pattern is hiding what's underneath
- Boundary updates by cities needs to be implemented
- Population data should be included in Phase 1
- Vulnerable facilities planned for (Phase 2)
- Would be helpful to be able to gray out other jurisdictions with jurisdiction boundaries on top
- Fix legend (high priority)
- Repetitive loss structures planned for Phase 2
- User manual/tutorials differentiated by user type (high priority – as soon as site is done)
- Change "fortune cookie"/eye icon to check box
- Add tooltips for all icons
- DFIP and DWR layers need to be labeled as such
- Phase 1 check

Next Steps

- Make changes needed for Phase one
- Write user's manual, starting simple then going into detail
- Go live in June

State Hazard Mitigation Team
Cross-Sector Communications and Knowledge Sharing
Strategic Work Group

Meeting Record
Tuesday, May 10, 2011
9:00 – 11:00 p.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees

Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Ethan Mobley, Michael Baker Jr. Inc
Miriam Morrill, US Fish & Wildlife Service
Eric Jackson, HCD
Corinne Bartshire, Dewberry
John Rowden, CDFA
Jami Byers, Cal EMA
Ken Worman, Cal EMA
Ken Topping, Cal Poly
Sheri Blankenheim, Cal EMA
Dan Irvine, Cal Trans
Michael Thomas, DGS
Desiree Fox, Cal Trans
Iovanka Todt, FMA
Stu Townsley, USACE
John Debeaux, Sutter County (CESA)
Ravi Varma, State Lands Commission
Natalie Macris, Cal Poly

Thanks to Corinne Bartshire for acting as Recorder. This set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key points.

Purpose Statement: To build collaboration between state and local governments, business associations and other private sector organizations to increase California's long-term resiliency

Key points from the discussion

Reviewed existing outreach materials:

- Plan Announcement Email Blast
- Cal EMA video
- Draft Plan Executive Summary
- Consolidated State PowerPoint

Suggestions regarding revision of the Powerpoint included the following:

- Include information about grants and funding opportunities (Seismic Safety Commission and CEA)
- Include benefits of hazard mitigation planning – pick an aspect that is relevant to the community
- Include smaller, more do-able things for local jurisdictions
- Discuss the direct financial benefit as related to CRS or other opportunities
- Mitigation reduces response and recovery costs
- Provide assistance for local jurisdictions to identify actions they already are doing which contribute to mitigation
- Note that resiliency is an important concept to the private sector (COOP)
- "hazard mitigation" remains to be jargon –avoid the term
- Encourage mitigation practices as a "way of life" to be embraced by the private sector
- Let go of the need to explain the term "hazard mitigation". It is stove piped in a program, but the concept should be larger.
- Mitigation saves lives and investments
- Tailor the discussion to the audience
- Include examples of mitigation actions in the context of "what you do"
- Sell an action and its benefits & then link to state websites / resources with more information (ie. create defensible space – it will reduce your fire damage)
- Include pictures up front of mitigation success stories
- Grant eligibility is not enough of a carrot

- Obtain testimonies from local jurisdictions about how much money has been saved from mitigation planning.
- Advertise upcoming workshops (Cal EMA workshop on June 28th)
- Include a contact name for questions
- The message should be clear.
- Mitigation ambassadors should have a grab bag of tools
- Challenge: limited funding, programs aren't funding things that have been funded in the past, there is no guarantee for mitigation funding, lack of trust from local governments that the mitigation program is worth their time and energy
- Messaging should seize the moment: in the wake of a tsunami, talk about evacuation; after a freeze, talk to farmers about what they can do.
- Ken Topping reminded the group that the goal of this communication is to get some wheels under the plan ideas. The SHMP has implementation in it: MyPlan, SMART teams, Climate Adaptation Guide, and Cal VIVA.
- USACE and DWR created a climate change handbook intended to be a roadmap. Something similar for hazard mitigation planning might help locals think in terms of action.
- The current PPT is good for federal bureaucrats and Cal Volunteers.

Sectors to communicate the message to

- The group agreed the most powerful approach to spread this message would be to talk with political officials. (CSAC, League of Cities, California Special Districts, FMA, CESA)
- Julie Norris and John Rowden are already coordinating on a message to the agricultural community.
- The group may wish to reach out to businesses via professional associations that capture contingency planners for private sector corporations. Peter Ohtaki of CA Resiliency Alliance would be helpful in defining business sectors and their specific interests
- MPOs are another good sector to share the message with.
- Disaster Corps and CERT teams could be good messengers once the tools are polished.
- Building Industry Association
- Review DWR's Water Plan advisory list for stakeholder contacts

Next Steps

- Ken Worman asked all participants to submit mitigation success stories with pictures from their organizations or constituents.
- Revise PPT to:
  12. Introduce California's campaign to reduce disasters (limit future damage from natural hazards, increase resiliency, protect lives and investments in infrastructure)
  13. Share mitigation success stories
  14. Present testimonials about $$ saved
  15. Provide information on resources to support local mitigation planning efforts

- Circulate revised PPT to SHMT, CSAC, and League contacts for feedback
- Present at the following organizations to test the PPT
  - League of Cities
  - CSAC
  - FMA

- Stu noted that USACE is hosting a conference in Memphis in June where HUD, NRCS, FEMA, NOAA, and USGS will be present. Ken and Ken asked him to represent this message at that conference.
- DWR could present this message at the next Water Plan meeting.
- After testing the message with the local public sector, the committee will work together to revise the message for the business community (CA Resiliency Alliance &/or IBHS)
- Develop flyer(s) informing usefulness and availability of state hazard mitigation plan for specific audiences

State Hazard Mitigation Team
Land Use Mitigation
Strategic Work Group

Meeting Record
Tuesday, May 10, 2011
1:30 – 3:30
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees:

Tom Pace, City of Sacramento
Ken Topping, Cal Poly - SLO
Ken Worman, Cal EMA
Corinne Bartshire, Dewberry
Charlie Eadie, Cal Poly – SLO
Michael Thomas, DGS
Ana Serrano, Caltrans
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Stu Townsley, USACOE
Iovanka Todt, FMA
Brandt Stevens, CD Insurance
John Rowden, CDFA
Linda Wheaton, HCD
Chuck Real, CGS
Scott Morgan, OPR
Jami Childress-Byers, Cal EMA
Maria Lorenzo-Lee, DWR
Kacey Lizon, SACOG
Bob Anderson, SSC (by phone)
Allen Oto, DWR (by phone)

Thanks to Charles Eadie with assistance from Kim Eadie and Corinne Bartshire for acting as Recorders. This set of notes is not intended to include all discussions, but rather to serve as a documentation of key points.

Topic: Linking Hazard Mitigation to Sustainable Growth Planning under SB 375

Key Intended Outcomes:

- There are many parallel efforts in regional planning underway in California. This discussion endeavors to link sustainable growth planning under SB 375 to hazard mitigation, specifically AB 162 and SB 5, which require that floodplains be identified and addressed in local General Plans (see synopsis of each bill at end of notes)
- Participation of invited agencies is intended to improve understanding of various mandates and to encourage collaboration in planning.

Introductory Comments/Strategic Growth Council:

- 2010 included both Blueprint Planning and SB375
- Strategic Growth Council has funding for sustainable growth, and their main task is to develop grant programs
    - Urban greening
    - Sustainable growth (capped @ $1 million)
    - These provide opportunities to fund hazard mitigation planning & projects
    - Grant Information available at Sgc.ca.gov - there are open grants right now
    - Mitigation is not specifically on the current Council's radar.
    - This is an unprecedented source of funds for local planning

SACOG (Sacramento Area Council of Governments)

- SACOG is the MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) & COG (Council of Government) for Sacramento region
- SB 375 requires better coordination and integration of already existing planning efforts (i.e. land use and transportation planning)

- Creates a Sustainable Communities strategy as part of the Regional Transportation Plan
- Articulates land use patterns over the planning period
    - Mapping
    - Housing (Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) sync w/ regional transportation)
    - CEQA benefits (streamlining) under SB375
    - SB 375 is focused on reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from cars/trucks (passenger vehicles)
    - Targets set to achieve per capita reductions from 2005 to 2035
    - Each region sets targets: Intended to be both ambitious and achievable
- SACOG is the second MPO on track to adopt a regional transportation plan that implements SB 375
- The majority of the SACOG population is living in a floodplain
- How is the RHNA process/allocation coordinated with flood hazard management?
- RHNA requires recognition of flood hazards per AB 162
- SB 375 requires more synchronizing of RHNA with MPOs
- MPOs – Federal designation (generally large urban areas)
- RTPAs (Regional Transportation Planning Agencies) – State designation (generally rural areas)
- COGs – Joint powers

City of Sacramento

- Updated 2030 General Plan; worked closely with SACOG re: regional and local blueprint and sustainability planning
- Safety Element identifies hazards
- General Plan consistency with Regional Transportation Plan, Sustainable Community Strategy, IS NOT required
- Hazard Mitigation Plan is NOT required to be synchronized
- Required to address RHNA in Housing Element
- General Plan must be internally consistent
- Must have a Safety Element, but it's not the same thing as a LHMP (Local Hazard Mitigation Plan)
- City chose to adopt a Sustainability Master Plan
- Focus in sustainability plan on directing growth to infill areas with transportation infrastructure –generally more compact development

DWR (Department of Water Resources)

- Floodplain Handbook Page 28 summarizes available floodplain mapping
- 2015 & 2025 are milestones for urban level of flood protection
    - Could lose the right to certain development tools if not met
    - 3 regions; various maps involved
    - No new buildings if urban level flood protection measures are not met
    - DWR role is to be a mapping resource
- SB 5 set new standard for level of flood protection; now 200 year protection required for urban areas, not 100 year
- Concentrated on Central Valley.
- Completion of Sacramento Valley flood protection plan serves as framework for Sacramento and San Joaquin River levee improvements, to be adopted July 2012
- Cities must make GPs consistent after two years; one more year, then zoning comes into play
- Proposed development approvals, discretionary permits, subdivision maps must have a finding of urban local flood protection
- DWR is working on developing criteria for making the finding, meeting with stakeholders, striving to finalize by end of year

ACOE (Army Corps of Engineers)

- Sacramento area doing an outstanding job of dealing with the flood issues.
- FEMA map is the key standard for local governments; 200-year not necessarily the same as state.
- Valley communities are at high risk for flood.
- ACOE not confident of most levees in area, except in areas with recent patching work.
- FEMA mapping and actual risk are different
- Sacramento Valley is one of most complex hydrologic systems in world; Natomas opening into Yolo bypass has effects on the entire system, for example
- The Central Valley Flood Protection Plan will be first comprehensive look at the system, which will characterize flood risk

Other Comments/Issues

- AB162 is statewide; Land Use Element in general plans now has to be reviewed annually.
- 200 year finding is going to have major effect even down to ministerial permit issuance; what does it mean to be consistent with Central Valley FPP, for example?
- Another DWR effort: statewide flood management planning program to investigate flood risk statewide; working on it now, expecting draft recommendations out by end of this year (Recommendations Report), covers rest of state; final report due 2014.
- How is risk defined? Could be characterized in many ways: consequence times probability
- New federal redefinition: Executive Order 11988 discourages densification in flood-prone areas (see attached).
- Principles/guidelines document: recognizes that assessment of risk in past focused on damage, but not economic disruptions.
- All these factors are in flux, and it is a challenge to align vertical layers of government, plus interagency relationships.
- Protection of people is not the same as protection of property.
- In flood mapping process, risk is generally not the focus – more focus is placed on probability rather than consequences, therefore maps are generally probability maps, not risk maps.
- CalEMA has an opportunity to address both risk and actual loss.
- Today's meeting highlights the need for better connectivity among parties involved, and asks where the state will go over the next decade.
- Loss estimation is more widespread for earthquakes; more is needed for flood and other hazards.
- Lingering issue in flood risk involves how to deal with high velocity events.
- Disconnect exists between extrapolation data (i.e. 100 or 200 year flood mapping).
- Federal perspective considers probability times vulnerability times consequences: can only afford to do so much, so the long term goal is to make sure whatever mitigation you do is resilient enough to manage an event.
- Sustainable communities strategy will be adopted by SACOG next year…..just behind SANDAG (San Diego Area Governments).
- What might be possible for bringing direct perspective of land use affected by hazards into this process?
- Given that MPOs are on a planning cycle, there is potential to work on hazard mitigation repeatedly over multiple cycles/updates.
- Implicit in this conversation is an assumption of the collision course between densification and hazards, especially in the flood-prone Central Valley.
- Manage of risk can be done through design to varying extents.
- Strategic Growth Council is trying to get information out; but they don't want to load too much on transportation planning; the reality is that what works is to emphasize and make a priority of risk considerations in other planning efforts.
- Sustainability is the nexus. It connects all of it. Concept of resilience is a key part of sustainability.

<u>Next Steps:</u>

- Keep this relationship among agencies going;
- Look to tweak documents to recognize various connections;
- Support CalEMA's long term interest in having MPOs taking on hazard mitigation in regional planning and transportation planning efforts.

Synopsis of Key Legislation

Senate Bill 375 – Regional Targets

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375, Steinberg, Statutes of 2008) enhances California's ability to reach its AB 32 goals by promoting good planning with the goal of more sustainable communities.

SB 375 requires ARB to develop regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for passenger vehicles. ARB is to establish targets for 2020 and 2035 for each region covered by one of the State's 18 metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs).

Each of California's MPOs then prepare a "sustainable communities strategy (SCS)" that demonstrates how the region will meet its greenhouse gas reduction target through integrated land use, housing and transportation planning. Once adopted by the MPO, the SCS will be incorporated into that region's federally enforceable regional transportation plan (RTP). ARB is also required to review each final SCS to determine whether it would, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction target for its region. If the combination of measures in the SCS will not meet the region's target, the MPO must prepare a separate "alternative planning strategy (APS)" to meet the target. The APS is not a part of the RTP.

SB 375 also establishes incentives to encourage implementation of the SCS and APS. Developers can get relief from certain environmental review requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) if their new residential and mixed-use projects are consistent with a region's SCS (or APS) that meets the target (see Cal. Public Resources Code §§ 21155, 21155.1, 21155.2, 21159.28.).
SB 375 also Increases coordination between regional transportation and housing planning and requires consistency among the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and an RTP and SCS or APS. It changes the frequency of RHNA and housing element updates from five to eight years, and increases penalties for failure to meet update deadlines or rezone adequate housing sites.

Blueprint Planning

Caltrans Regional Blueprints program supports collaborative regional planning efforts through grants, support services and interagency coordination. Its purpose is to engage residents of a region in articulating a vision for the long term future of their region. The regional vision is developed from residents' values and priorities, and informed by advanced GIS modeling and visualization tools that demonstrate the impacts of growth and planning decisions. The process leads to the development of alternative growth scenarios for the region, and through a public process a preferred growth scenario is selected that can then guide regional and local land use and transportation decisions for a future that is sustainable, while meeting residents' needs and providing a high quality of life for all.

2007 California Flood Legislation

The devastation and loss of life resulting from Hurricane Katrina in 2005 further raised public awareness of the potential for catastrophic storm events throughout the nation. In the later part of 2007, the California Legislature passed and the Governor signed five interrelated bills (flood legislation) aimed at addressing the problems of flood protection and liability. These included Senate Bills (SB) 5 and 17, and Assembly Bills (AB) 5, 70 and 156. A sixth bill AB 162, require additional consideration of flood risk in local land use planning throughout California. Together, these bills outline a comprehensive approach to improving flood management at the State and local levels, with elements to address both the chance of flooding (e.g. improvements to reduce the probability that floods will occur) and the consequences when flooding does occur.

The Central Valley Flood Protection Act of 2008, enacted by SB5, seeks to address these problems by directing the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) to prepare and adopt a Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) by Mid-2012. The CVFPP is to establish a system-wide approach to improving flood management in the areas currently receiving some amount of flood protection from the existing facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control. In addition, the CVFPP is to include a recommended list of both structural and nonstructural means for improving performance and eliminating the deficiencies of flood management facilities, while also addressing ecosystem and other water-related issues. DWR shall develop a recommended schedule and funding plan to implement the recommendations of the CVFPP. The flood legislation establishes the 200-year flood event as a minimum level of flood protection to be provided in urban and urbanizing areas.

The flood legislation includes various requirements for local agencies with land use authority and/or flood management responsibilities in the State, as follows:

- Cities and counties in the Central Valley must incorporate the CVFPP's data, policies, and implementation measures into their general plans.
- Cities and counties in the Central Valley must amend their zoning ordinances to be consistent with the CVFPP.
- Central Valley counties must work with cities to develop an emergency response plan within 24 months of CVFPP adoption.
- Counties, cities, state, and local flood agencies must collaborate to provide relocation assistance or other cost-effective strategies for reducing flood risk to existing economically disadvantaged communities located in non-urbanized areas.
- Cities and counties must collaborate to develop funding mechanisms that finance local flood protection responsibilities by 2010.
- Cities and counties must add 200-year flood plan maps and maps of levee protection zones to the list of information regarding flood hazards to be identified in a revised safety element of a general plan.
- Refer the adopted or amended general plan to the Board when the proposed action is within the boundaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District.
- The Board and any relevant local agency must review the draft of an existing or amended safety element of each city and county located within the boundaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District.
- A council of governments must exclude land determined by FEMA or DWR as having inadequate flood protection from its land identified as suitable for urban development.
- Cities and counties in the Central Valley are prohibited from entering into development agreements, approving permits, entitlements, or subdivision maps for construction within a flood hazard zone unless it is protected by an urban level of flood protection or complies with FEMA standards.
- A city or county may be liable for its air and reasonable share of property damage caused by flood if the city or county has increased the State's exposure to liability by unreasonably approving new development protected by the State Plan of Flood Control.
- The allocation or expenditure of funds by the state for the upgrade of a project levee, that protects an area in which more than 1,000 people reside will be subject to a requirement that the local agency responsible for the operation and maintenance of the project levee and any city or county protected by the project levee, including a charter city or county, is to enter into an agreement to adopt a safety plan within two-years.

Executive Order 11988

Executive Order 11988 requires federal agencies to avoid to the extent possible the long and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of flood plains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative. In accomplishing this objective, "each agency shall provide leadership and shall take action to reduce the risk of flood loss, to minimize the impact of floods on human safety, health, and welfare, and to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by flood plains in carrying out its responsibilities" for the following actions:

- acquiring, managing, and disposing of federal lands and facilities;
- providing federally-undertaken, financed, or assisted construction and improvements;

- conducting federal activities and programs affecting land use, including but not limited to water and related land resources planning, regulation, and licensing activities.

The guidelines address an eight-step process that agencies should carry out as part of their decision-making on projects that have potential impacts to or within the floodplain. The eight steps, which are summarized below, reflect the decision-making process required in Section 2(a) of the Order.

16. Determine if a proposed action is in the base floodplain (that area which has a one percent or greater chance of flooding in any given year).
17. Conduct early public review, including public notice.
18. Identify and evaluate practicable alternatives to locating in the base floodplain, including alterative sites outside of the floodplain.
19. Identify impacts of the proposed action.
20. If impacts cannot be avoided, develop measures to minimize the impacts and restore and preserve the floodplain, as appropriate.
21. Reevaluate alternatives.
22. Present the findings and a public explanation.
23. Implement the action.

Among a number of things, the Interagency Task Force on Floodplain Management clarified the EO with respect to development in flood plains, emphasizing the requirement for agencies to select alternative sites for projects outside the flood plains, if practicable, and to develop measures to mitigate unavoidable impacts.

State Hazard Mitigation Team
Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring
Strategic Work Group

Meeting Record
Thursday, August 18, 2011
9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees :

Alec Stone, CDI
Chris Anderson, HCD
Janiele Maffel, CEA
Emily Nourse, CUEA
Ravi Varma, SLC (phone)
Desiree Fox, Caltrans
Anna Serrano, Catrans
Michael Pixton, Cal EMA
Carl Walker, City of Roseville
Rebecca Waggoner, Cal EMA
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
James Nortdstom, Cal EMA
Ken Topping, Cal Poly – SLO
Carol Schuldt, Cal Poly - SLO
Paula Schulz - Cal Poly
Corinne Bartshire – Dewberry

Thanks to Paula Schulz and Carol Schuldt for acting as Recorders. This set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key point.

Purpose Statement: To track mitigation progress and record successful outcomes toward increasing California's long-term resiliency

Key Discussion Points:

- Carl Walker, the Floodplain Manager for the City of Roseville accepted the Work Group invitation to attend the meeting and present key elements of the city's successful Floodplain Management Program. He also provided valuable insights into the city's mitigation planning process. Key points are outlined below. A copy of Carl's PowerPoint presentation is attached to provide additional details of the program.
- Roseville has a 30 year history of flooding and structural damage resulting from 6 major flood events. The population of the City increased from 45,000 to 120,593 in the past 22 years. However, standards put into place in the 1980's have mitigated the flood risk to new development.
- Floodplain mapping initiated by the city is based on projected build-out rather than existing development, which differs from FEMA's Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), and represents a forward thinking approach to floodplain management based on a "no adverse impact" policy.
- Currently 79% of the mapped floodplain is in open space or easement, which is an increase of 33% since program inception. Building codes and standards requiring 2 foot freeboard provide a strong disincentive to development in the floodplain.
- Over $20 million has been invested in floodplain management activities. Funding sources include FEMA, Army Corps of Engineers and gas taxes. By implementing both structural and non-structural mitigation, the flood risk to the city has decreased by 600%.
- Roseville has a well-integrated mitigation planning process whereby flood mitigation policies and programs are consistent across plans, including the General Plan, the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and the Community Rating System.
- The Community Rating System 10-step planning process was used to develop the 2011 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, and the resulting plan was integrated into the Safety Element of the General Plan.
- Program coordination and annual reporting requirements ensure interdepartmental plan maintenance and progress monitoring.

- By monitoring and documenting flood mitigation programs and progress, the City of Roseville has received credit for 16 of the 18 possible CRS activities, resulting in changing its CRS rating from Class 6 to Class 1 over a 15-year period, thus reducing flood insurance premiums for properties in the SFHA by 45%.
- Keys to success include:
    - Involve the public and landowners in the planning process
    - Document flood mitigation activities to maximize CRS credit
    - Assign responsibility for program coordination and monitoring
    - Commitment to a long-term program including planning, land use controls, structural improvements and warning systems.
    - Integrate mitigation planning requirements

Key Updates & Discussion:

- The Cal EMA mitigation web portal now includes a section for posting Mitigation Success Stories, organized by hazard. Included are photographs of completed mitigation projects, SMART Success Stories, and Success Stories presented to the Work Group.
- Cal EMA has developed a draft progress monitoring form to facilitate on-going documentation of mitigation programs and initiatives being undertaken by state agencies to be included in the 2013 SHMP Update.
- State Lands Commission (SLC) has volunteered to pilot test the progress monitoring form and provide updated information on the status of the Marine Oil
- Terminal Engineering and Maintenance Standards (MOTEMS) program and audits.
- The California Earthquake Authority (CEA) reports that $20 million is available for mitigation grants to both insured and uninsured homeowners to undertake earthquake retrofit projects. Program outreach efforts are directed toward city managers.
- HCD stated that they have experienced difficulty in getting applications for the 2008 DRI funds from local governments. It was suggested that Cal EMA could help with funding outreach efforts by included other agency funding initiatives on the mitigation web portal.
- Continuing to identify and develop the mitigation success story theme is a priority for the Work Group. Infrastructure retrofit was highlighted as a possible theme for future presentations. Topics could include the Caltrans retrofit programs, and San Francisco Bay Area projects, such as BART, EBMUD, and the SFPUC seismic retrofit programs.

Next Steps

- Continue with scheduling presentations to highlight mitigation success stories
- Target a fire mitigation success story for presentation at next work group meeting
- Consider identifying success stories for other hazards, such as landslide and levee failure
- Post the success story presentations on the Cal EMA Mitigation Web Portal
- Request selected Work Group members pilot test the newly developed progress monitoring form for 2013 SHMP updates
- Add external agency mitigation funding opportunities to Cal EMA mitigation web portal

State Hazard Mitigation Team
GIS Technical Advisory Working Committee (GIS TAWC)

Meeting Record
August 18, 2011
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
Cal EMA Headquarters
Mather, CA

Attendees:

Chris Anderson, HCD
Ricardo Ashby, NBM
Senarath Ekanayake, DWR
Kirby Everhart, Cal EMA
David Harris, Cal/NRA
Jordan Hastings, NBMG
Kris Higgs, Cal EMA
Jeremy Hill, DWR
Tony Lafferty, Esri
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Luke Opperman, Nev DWR
Lorri Peltz-Lewis, USFS
Michael Pixton, Cal/EPA
Chuck Real, CGS
Carol Schuldt, Cal Poly
Paul Schulz, Cal Poly
Tamara Scott Smith, Cal EMA
Alex Stone, CDI
Marcia Sully, Cal EMA
Ken Topping, Cal Poly
Rebecca Wagoner, Cal EMA
Rebecca Weber, Cal EMA

Welcome and Introductions (Julie/Ken T.)

Julie and Ken Topping gave a brief history of the development and intent of MyPlan, and included comments on FEMA's plan to share MyPlan 2 with other states.

'MyPlan Updates – good to go?' – (Quinn)

Quinn began by pointing out the changes since the last meeting in April:

- There is a new URL (myplan.calema.ca.gov) as of today.
- The toolbar has moved to the top, and now includes an icon for the QuickStart Guide.
- There are changes to several hazard layers: for instance, the FEMA and CA specific flood data has been put into two separate layers and there are more choices about what to show/hide. As an example, you can show only the 100-year flood data.
- The layer info button opens a window with a revised layout that has a short description and includes a link to the agency providing the data.
- Within an expanded layer, you can click on any text in blue to see more information about that data. As an example: clicking on "100-year with Storm Surge" in the FEMA/Flood layer opens a list of flood zone definitions.
- There is a new Population density layer based on 2010 Census data for Block Groups.
- There is a Boundaries layer where you can turn on/off county and/or city boundaries individually.
- Printing has been improved and the print preview window allows you to pan around and get exactly the area you need.
- There are two small icons at the top of the layer pane that allow you to expand or contract all layers at once.
- The application will be moving to a new server soon. [Quinn is this correct?]

Questions/Comments for Quinn:

-
- It appears some layers are not lining up properly with basemaps. Quinn will talk individually with those data providers to figure out why basemap and hazard layer aren't lining up.

- Is there a basemap that has no color at all? Having extra colors can be confusing for some layers. The terrain basemap is the plainest. It would be helpful to have only relief and streets. Maybe allow user to adjust transparency of basemap or turn it off complete – i.e. have a blank basemap.
- For phase 2, add Identify tool to see what things are. Also allow the user to change symbology for layers. Right now population and fire have the same red that means different things. Similar problem with population and shaking layers
- On flood layers, CA specific actually includes FEMA data, so description needs to be updated. It was intentional, and in future there may be a server for all federal layers and still allow each state to add its own modifications.
- Some anomalies with 500 year flood layer not including all of the 100 year data for some areas, in other places they do.
- Still need a Comments/Questions icon to collect feedback. Could possibly create a response form to get user to select a category for their feedback and allow it to be pre-categorized.
- Could add SUPPORT icon for those having website problems (or could just use Comments/Questions). There are 3rd-party services that will handle basic problems for a fee.
- MyPlan needs to generate use statistics: users, session time, exports, print calls or other similar data. David and Quinn said they'd investigate the possibilities, but it sounds like we shouldn't have a problem reporting out on use.
- Capacity testing hasn't been done yet. CNRA will have to test their server. ESRI might be able to help with that. Then they'll have to decide on what total concurrent user capacity should be.
- Need a temporary gatekeeper for comment/question form to review comments and forward them to the appropriate person. After discussion, Carol was asked to take this on.

Need a specific date for Official Rollout. Possible dates discussed for October or November. Soft rollout now – share URL with SHMT so we can clean up the last little things we don't know about. [A later email from Chuck/CGS said that they'd have their data issues cleared up by the end of the month. They will also supply changes to, and disclaimer language for, the initial welcome window.]

Next Steps

Nevada Update (Jordan Hastings) – Chief Cartographer for the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology

Nevada is planning to leverage California's work on MyPlan to expand it to Nevada. Some hazards are different, they have no coastline and not much water, but others are the same. Jordan used arcgis.com to show the kind of problem they're seeing with flood layers that cut off at unnatural boundaries. He also showed their fire history layer, and suggested that having a time slider would be interesting. They would really like to have a MyPlan website that has layers that cross state boundaries without interruption. They realize that hazard layers are done differently in each state. For instance, there is no local fire responsibility in NV. They would like to focus on the cartography itself, not just on the mapping.

They are proposing an all-day, MyPlan Wildfire Workshop at CalNEVA lodge in Lake Tahoe sometime this fall possibly Oct. 5, 2011. Because of the location right on the state line, everyone would be considered to be doing in-state travel. He'd like to bring Cal Fire, Cal EMA, Nevada Division of Emergency Management (DEM), Nevada Dept of Forestry and other appropriate people together to create a cross-state-line layer for wildfire. There is funding from Nevada for some of the costs for attendees.

Nevada would like to get on board with MyPlan soon and get this hashed out to harmonize data across state lines. [Since no one from FEMA, Cal EMA's fire expert, or Cal Fire was there, we need to make sure that Phyllis B at Cal Fire, someone from FEMA, and the appropriate Cal EMA person gets this information.] They are looking for common symbology. Data will be separately maintained, but symbology will match and it will mean the same thing when zoomed out to show areas of both states. More state material may show up as you zoom in. They're not proposing to change the data.

Nevada doesn't yet have a GIO, their data sources are varied, and there is only one server that can house all the GIS data in one place. How can MyPlan develop to serve national data easily? GIS TAWC needs to think about the possibilities. Maybe a distributed set of servers over the 50 states would be feasible? The Association of State Geologists might be able to provide server space.

Comments:

- There seemed to be a lot of enthusiasm for the CalNeva joint meeting within the group – but there was discussion about the best timing. October is worst month for fires in CA, so that month might be bad. The meeting would need to be before Thanksgiving and also work around another Cal EMA fire meeting down south.
- All travel needs to be pre-approved, so a form needs to be filled out to send up the line to be approved. Allow at least a couple of weeks for approval. Don't call it training.
- Sounds like a good idea.
- Quinn/David said that Amazon isn't approved for use as a remote server for mission critical data.
- FEMA Region 9 was very interested in promoting this expansion of MyPlan. Would they like to be at the Lake Tahoe meeting? They need to be aware of the issues of taking this across state lines.
- Full SHMT meeting will be on Oct. 11, 2011 – talking about getting ahead of the curve for reporting mitigation stuff, and promoting MyPlan so we might want to report out there on the progress at the CalNeva meeting.
- Quinn will provide info to Jordan on latest version of MyPlan

Discussion of MyPlan 2 – next phase (Ken T.)

Previous discussions of Phase 2 included:

- More layers : WUI, fire threat, climate change, sea level rise, social vulnerability, infrastructure, land use, levees/sea walls, etc.
- New tools: allow user to add dots to represent critical sites, allow user to choose different map sizes in order to see zoomed in data while printing a high quality zoomed out map, allow map to be emailed

Comments:
Coming on Sept 6-9 will be a class in Sacramento for using GIS and sharing data layers during emergency incidents. [I believe I heard someone say that it was EPA sponsored? Or possibly FEMA Region 9?] Because the topic includes HazMat incidents, the data is sensitive. The server would have to be limited access. [NOTE: Julie/Ken – I'm not sure I heard this part – it was on the other side of the room. Do you have anything to add?]

Future meetings - Talk more about MyPlan II in early Nov. and coordinate with the Tahoe meeting.

7. To Do's for MyPLan before official rollout include:
8. Introductory window/Disclaimer language
9. Address issues of incorrect alignment of hazard layers with basemaps
10. Comment/Questions icon for feedback
11. Capacity testing
12. Hit tracking for statistics
13. Pick date for official rollout
14. Basemap transparency and/or blank basemap options

State Hazard Mitigation Team
Cross-Sector Communications and Knowledge Sharing
Strategic Work Group

Meeting Record
Monday, September 19, 2011
9:00 – 11:00 a.m.
Rancho Cordova, CA

Attendees
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Corinne Bartshire, Dewberry
Bruce Patton, Dept of Insurance
Craig Conner, USACE
John Pelonio, State Parks
Claire Marie Turner, USACE
Ken Topping, Cal Poly
Karen Keene, CSAC
Dave Morgan, Delta Dental
Jami Childress-Byers, Cal EMA
Dorothy Holzem, League of Cities
Don Boland, CUEA
Juliano Calil, Nature Conservancy Intern
Maria Lorenzo, DWR
Ravi Varma, State Lands Commission

Thanks to Corinne Bartshire for acting as Recorder. This set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key points.

Purpose Statement: To build collaboration between state and local governments, business associations and other private sector organizations to increase California's long-term resiliency

Key points from the discussion

Summary from the other work groups:

- MyPlan will be officially released in October.
- The Land Use group has been discussing SB 375 (greenhouse gas reduction) as it relates to regional planning of land use and transportation to identify drivers for mitigation actions. The group will release a report of recommendations based on discussions with regional planning agencies and state agencies.
- The Progress Monitoring group is developing success stories to be posted on Cal EMA website along with an online tracking system for local jurisdictions to report mitigation progress. These will be announced at the October 25th SHMT meeting.
- Messaging Products
    - PPT (drafted)
    - Executive Summary (complete)
    - Western City Article (complete)
    - Flyers (to be determined)
- Private Sector Messaging
    - Dave Morgan can provide connection to associations.
    - Topics to highlight with the private sector:
    - Business recovery (what is already mitigated vs what needs further attention?)
    - How soon will power and water come back to keep my business going?
    - Public/Private coordination committee in BRMA
- Private Non Profits are eligible to participate in local mitigation plans and would be eligible for HMGP funds. (Jami Childress-Byers can provide more specifics on how PNPs are eligible for the various grant programs)
- CUEA's priority is to get back to profitability. They focus on "sustainable resiliency" for utility providers.
- Emergency Partnership Working Group. Speakers in Oakland about Public/Private Partnerships
- Unified command with Cal Fire regarding investor owned utilities.
- What message speaks to CSAC?

  - What happens if a community doesn't complete a LHMP?
  - What is the linkage to land use planning?
  - Need an elected official champion to get this topic on the CSAC Board agenda.
- What message speaks to the League of Cities?
  - Image of what is at risk to the City if they don't have an LHMP.
- People understand preparedness and will listen to preparedness messaging. Link this to mitigation.
- Look at the cost of postponement. Damage & recovery vs mitigation.
- What is the cost to develop a LHMP? (variable by population, available data, etc. Tools are available from Cal EMA to assist jurisdictions in completing LHMPs)
- If your local plan has lapsed...what is the message?

Next Steps

- Evaluate opportunities to promote the State's hazard mitigation planning efforts at various conferences and professional association meetings.
  - Public Works Directors (Ken Worman to present at the General Session on Thursday December 1, San Francisco)
  - County Planning Directors (early 2012, talk with Karen Keene)
  - County & City Spring Meeting (mid-march 2012) (CSAC and League may share key note sessions)
  - BRMA monthly meetings in Bay Area
  - ASAP/ACP monthly meetings in Sacramento
  - Los Angeles BICEPP & ACP
- Identify publications appropriate to publish an article promoting the State's hazard mitigation planning efforts.
  - ePub (Karen Keene)
  - Karen Keene will talk with CSAC communications staff.
  - Connect with Dave Morgan about developing an article for BRMA
  - CSDA publication?
  - School Districts publications?
  - Institute for Local Government (Dorothy Holzem can provide contact)
- Post the article written for the League of Cities on the Cal EMA Hazard mitigation web portal.
- Post the SHMP executive summary on the Cal EMA website.
- Suggestion: Prepare a statewide email blast summarizing the accomplishments of all work groups (progress for SHMP implementation) during the year 2011, outline the implementation goals for 2012, and ask interested parties to participate in the upcoming year.

- CUEA will link the SHMP to their website and provide it as a tool to engineers and constituents.

Cal EMA continues to conduct workshops promoting the planning initiatives and grant programs around the state.

State Hazard Mitigation Team

Meeting Record
Tuesday, October 25, 2011
1:30 – 4:00 p.m.
Mather, CA

Attendees

Ken Worman, Cal EMA
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
David Harris, XXX
Quinn Hart, UC Davis
Carol Schuldt, Cal Poly
Karen McCready, Cal EMA
Kurt Malchow, XXX
Corinne Bartshire, Dewberry
Bruce Anderson
Maria Lorenzo
Jami Chldress-Byers, Cal EMA
Chuck Real,
Charles Eadie, Cal Poly
Paula Schulz, Cal Poly
Jill Nelson, Cal Poly
Cindy Pilg, Cal Poly (via teleconference)

Cindy Pilg acted as Recorder. This set of notes is not intended to be comprehensive of all discussions, but rather to serve as documentation of key points.

Introduction

- Summaries and results from specialty/working groups will be presented at this meeting since last meeting (December 2010)
- Ken Worman announced retirement in December 2011; letter of appreciation presented from Cal Poly to Ken Worman

Key Discussion Points

- *New Progress Reporting System Update:*
    - Reporting mechanism for keeping the plan current (key means of helping register, communicate and archive progress made on programs within the plan via online progress reporting form link on Cal EMA web portal)
    - SHMT members requested to submit suggestions for developing the progress report form (screenshot distributed)
- *MyPlan (Phase 1)*
    - New Internet map service website providing access to GIS hazards mapping, jointly sponsored by Cal EMA and the California Natural Resources Agency (ESRI-based services)
    - Platform to bring information and mitigation planners together support partnership and collaboration (dynamic vehicle to integrate shared vision)
    - Quick Start User Guide available on MyPlan
    - MyPlan – demonstration
    - Connects to system's default layers or organizational layers; will connect to KML layers (in later phase); shake maps added
    - FEMA/California flood layers added; multiple layer components (adding and subtracting layers)
    - Printing/export capability; address/landmark searching
    - Ability to add local data
    - Creating a private package in an effort for local planning agencies to get through the planning process; expandable to other states (Nevada presently using)
    - Encourage SHMT members to submit suggestions in planning for Phase 2
    - Cal EMA using MyPlan to verify hazards in grant application review (JULIE: Please verify this; couldn't hear via teleconference)

- *Climate Adaptation Policy Guide (APG)*

- Guidance for local planner to adapt to climate impacts; provides access to planning information and tools for communities
- Streamlines federal/state/local planning; builds on what local agencies already do
- Implements the SHMP charge to provide planning guidance for natural hazards exacerbated by climate change.
- Joint effort between Cal EMA and Natural Resources Agency
- Advisory committee provides input that characterizes most important climate statewide impacts as well as framework for document
- Policy Issues Report (PIR) – framework for organization of document; breaks state into regions and generally characterizes and develops approaches to climate impacts
- Integrates with the Cal-Adapt website and vulnerability study; provides approaches to local government. All three work together to help local agencies.
- Next Steps:
  Survey with regional/local agencies regarding addressing/planning climate adaptation
  January 2012 – first draft. Governors Extreme Events conference to better prepare the state (draft will be presented at that time)
- Review phases, stakeholder, public advisory board ; completed in June 2012

- *California Vital Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessment (Cal VIVA) – vital infrastructure of state of California and how well it is prepared in event of earthquake*
  - Advisory group – purpose is to take lessons and make state stronger
  - Response and recovery necessary to keep state going; prioritization technique to look at buildings overall and develop mechanism with funding stream for 24,000 state-owned buildings by end of June.
  - Create framework for database, prioritization, assessment, methodology and testing.
  - 3 triggers:

24. Where is building located (high seismicity)? Statewide Property Inventory (SPI) tells us where statewide buildings are located, however it is incomplete
25. What is building structure overall (age of construction, type, changes in code – on original documents)?
26. Necessity of building to house people working for state after earthquake (functionality of building) – how to pull state together. Focus is on state-owned and -operated buildings in an emergency and operation effort (EOC, utilities , vital records)
    - 4 agencies representative (Caltrans, DWR, CHP and CALFIRE). Alternate EOC not operational after earthquake. High performance structures through EOC and lower performance through alternates. Overall pretty good structurally.
    - Next step: Inspect 15-20 buildings; 9 completed.
    - CHP has aggressive program in overview sense with a seismic evaluation that we can tie into; Cal Fire has not yet made connection.
    - ASCE 31 and HAZUS used as methodology.

Work Group Summaries

Cross-Sector Communications and Knowledge Sharing

- What does plan mean? What does it do for the state? How do different sectors integrate?
- Goal is to expand collaboration and increase awareness and communication; elected officials need to champion
- Work Group strategies:
  - Created a Powerpoint template (does not work for each group); different driver for mitigation actions
  - Developed UTube video discussing mitigation
  - Distributed email blast to stakeholders
  - Published Executive Summary - why they care about hazard mitigation and what they should get out of the state plan
  - Authored Western City article – hazard mitigation is important and there are tools at state level (Cal EMA web portal)

  - CSAC presentation to public works directors (K. Worman - presenter)
- Encourage SHMT members to submit suggestions for distribution addresses
- Messaging suggestions:
- Mitigation reduces response and recovery time
- Mitigation saves lives and investment
- Mitigation success relies on a local champion to make it happen
- People don't relate to the word mitigation

Land Use Mitigation

- SB 375, AB 32 and SB 732 – state regional focus on greenhouse gas reduction
- AB 162, SB 5 – Central Valley flood protection board
- From state to local – sustainability (local) and flood (regional governments); trickle down to local governments (get 2 dogs barking at each other and not just down to locals)
- Strategic Growth Council – providing new incentives
- Findings: Mitigation projects being prioritized on local level; hazard mitigation as grant-eligible for sustainability

Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring

- Goal – to record and report successes of state
- Focus areas: develop local mitigation data and incorporate into the plan
- Learn new things from presentations – City of SLO and City of Roseville; continuing series with Santa Barbara County ; potential local mitigation success story (posted on Cal EMA website)
- LHMPs reference the 2010 SHMP
- Quantify risk reduction
- Integration between different mitigation planning processes
- Highlight and support relationship between local mitigation plans and safety element
- Continue on success story track; identify where they exist (outreach); and share results beyond SHMT (i.e., utility projects in Bay Area)

SMART - Loss Avoidance Monitoring System

- Purpose - to document loss avoidance/cost effectiveness of mitigation projects
- CSU faculty/staff become team members for project assessments
- Cal Poly developed outline of SMART Process and coordinated created procedures
- Cal Poly completed 3 trainings; 42 SMART team members – expertise to look at physical project and research and complete assessment to determine if projects are cost effective
- Preliminary damage assessment – December 2010 Storm (SB, Orange, Riverside, San Diego – hardest hit); 3 projects for assessment for SMART team; findings to be published on Cal EMA website.

Next Meeting

- GIS and Progress Monitoring – December 5, 2011

State Hazard Mitigation Team
GIS Technical Advisory Working Committee (GIS TAWC)

Meeting Record
December 5, 2011
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
Cal EMA Headquarters
Mather, CA

Attendees:

Phyllis Banduci	Cal Fire
Corinne Bartshire	Dewberry
Jami Byers	Cal EMA
Craig Conner	USACE
Johanna Fenton	Cal EMA
David Harris	Resources
Jordan Hastings	Chief Cartographer/NV Bureau of Mines and Geology
Kris Higgs	Cal EMA
Quinn Hart	UC Davis
Herby Lissade	Caltrans
Julie Norris	Ca EMA
John Pelonio	CA State Parks
Lorri Peltz-Lewis	USFS
Charles Real	CGS
Carol Schuldt	Cal Poly
Michael Thomas	DGS
Ken Topping	Cal Poly
Greg Vlasek	Cal EPA

INTRODUCTIONS

DISCUSSION:
Ken W asked Quinn about use statistics. He didn't have them with him, but can get basic numbers from Google Analytics.
Chuck reported that someone from the Applied Technology Council was asking him at a meeting about how they could access liquefaction/landslide information for a site by address, and he referred them to MyPlan. They were impressed. Chuck will be at a meeting with them soon and they indicated that they'd like to see it expand nationwide. More funding would make it greater (KW)
Question: were layers missing from phase 1 because of security concerns? Not really (KT)

REVIEW OF LAYERS THAT DIDN'T MAKE IT INTO PHASE 1:
DAM INUNDATION:
Some websites are already serving this data, so it's in the public domain (ABAG for instance). Cal EMA is sending out disks with the info on it on request. It's part of mandated information. Cal EMA legal council said that MyPlan would need new disclaimer for that layer. KW needs to find what he got from legal, and Quinn can add it to the layer description, and that should do it. Another option would be to set the disclaimer up as a 'click-through' to show legal disclaimer. Cal EMA will be data steward.
SEA LEVEL RISE:
This was deferred to phase 2 intentionally since it was climate related. Static data is available from the Pacific Institute: http://www.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/data/index.htm . It was developed for the 2009 Impacts of Sea Level Rise on the California Coast project, paid for by the CEC, among others.
GENERAL DISCUSSION:
KT commented that currently, various data is being developed by various agencies. Currently CA/WA/OR are working jointly on developing new climate change data. The Pacific Institute data will be replaced as newer, updated data becomes available.
Question – can MyPlan host layers developed by universities or institutes? KW – yes, conceivably, although the layers are currently all either from, or developed for, government agencies. Quinn pointed out that GIS TAWC vets all hazard layers and that they all have data stewards. There is also currently the ability to add data from any GIS server to your own map. GIS TAWC will pick and choose from proposed datasets and as things change, the layers available may change. For instance, a layer may go away if we lose a data steward or data corrupts or something. David – the foundation of MyPlan is the stewardship of the layers. That's what makes it work, and makes it useful.

Greg asked how up-to-date the layers are, for instance updates on a compromised nuclear power plant? MyPlan not intended for short term phenomenon, more for long term mitigation planning, so layers are updated on a schedule set by the data stewards. It's not intended for emergency response. Kris commented that in many cases, emergency response data is not available to the general public, and is only released on a 'need to know' basis.

How does the public know whether the information is reliable and if it's controversial? For instance, sea level rise predictions? What if there are competing scenarios? KT – this group has a lot of expertise and can do a good job of vetting. If controversy arises, group will address the issue and decide what to do.
Johanna – most current datasets were created by state agencies. Pacific Agency did the sea level rise research for CEC with cooperation of CNRA. MyPlan is intended to supply data for locals who don't have easy GIS data available locally.

KW – as an example, if State Farm came to us with data, would we put it up? GIS TAWC would look at data for accuracy and suitability and probably reject it. Questions become more difficult if the data wasn't created by, or for, a state or federal agency.

Johanna – communities are ultimately responsible for evaluating suitability of MyPlan information for their locale.

Chuck – suggested we add the Coastal Zone boundary line. KW concurred. Quinn/KT – Coastal zone boundary may not need a steward, because the boundaries are static and fixed in law.

David – MyPlan 'proxy agent' is someone who keeps an eye on the progress of the data, even if they aren't at the agency that developed it (i.e. Cal EMA or Guido/CEC for Pacific Institute layers) They take responsibility for letting the group know when data is outdated or needs to be replaced.

Greg – is MyPlan an emergency planning site?

KW – No, it's meant for local agencies doing LHMPs or Safety/General plans who don't have access to GIS. It's for mitigation – not emergency planning or response, although it may be used by localities for whatever they wish, at their own discretion. He explained the relationship to MyHazards, as well. Some local agencies were using MyHazards to make maps for their plans and that's not a good idea because the datasets are not as accurate. MyPlan will also be used by other states, substituting their own data. Nevada has already begun. Other local planners are using it for other things besides mitigation – please let Julie know if we hear of instances of that.

KT described the difference between emergency planning and mitigation planning, and explaining why the Coastal Zone Boundary might be important for planning. An LHMP map might need that boundary on it. Someone commented that we need more cooperation between planners and responders. Gave an example of how the Coastal Zone boundary is important: Pacifica had to notify the Coastal Commission when they did emergency response within their boundary for landslides.

Johanna – explained that planners have to identify risk and address mitigation. The Coastal Zone boundary may affect what mitigation is available to them.

WILDFIRE THREAT LAYER DATED 2005:
KT asked if legend differences between this and LRA/SRA layers are important ? Phyllis said yes. The threat map shows the big picture, while LRA/SRA response area information is more local for those areas that have adopted them. They are just recommendations from Cal Fire to local communities. Cal Fire will need to decide on the symbology, since it could be confusing to have exactly the same color mean different things on two fire layers. Phyllis – CA does have a published WUI layer that takes into account population, development, and fire threat. There is a new layer coming out that does a better job of identifying WUIs using LANDSCAN population data to identify them. [I didn't catch who's creating this layer - Maria? Western Foresters Association? West Side Risk Assessment?] It may be a work in progress. It might we worth waiting and using the new one instead of the 2003 Cal Fire WUI layer which is outdated. Phyllis will follow up and either use new layer or update their old one.

Community Wildfire Protection Plan Boundaries – not yet available? Phyllis –explained that Cal Fire used a community layer in their planning and added attributes, so they ended up with only incorporated cities with plans. Those listed as Community at Risk are listed on the Fire Alliance website. KT – asked if this is worth including on MyPlan?

DAMS BASE LAYER
The National Inventory of Dams is available, however it has all sizes of dams from tiny, private to large federal. We could put the layer in, but limit it to dams that have inundation boundaries. Kris volunteered to be Proxy Data Steward.

STATE/FEDERAL LANDS
Quinn pointed out that California Protected Areas Database (CPAD) is already available. BLM is trying to integrate all data which CPAD is picking up. David talked about proposals to fund it. CA is ahead of the pack on this. CPAD includes all ownership data and may include manager info for lands as well. The layer is currently being cleaned up. Proposed Data Steward either Fish and Game or Green Info Network?? Someone needs to contact/develop a data steward and make sure that they are willing to have it on MyPlan.

DISCUSSION:
FEMA is currently doing an update to existing CA Coastal erosion risk mapping. Ask Chris Potter about it at CNRA. It might be a good idea to include it. It will be available in a couple of years from the Coastal Sediment Mgt. Workgroup (CSMW).

CAL-ADAPT WEBSITE DATA:
This website has available datasets for temperature/rainfall/snowpack/sea level change. Next meeting – invite someone who really knows Cal-Adapt to do a demo and discuss with us whether/how their data is compatible with MyPlan.

DISCUSSION:
Disaster history - Kris is updating the state disaster history database – but it needs to be available in a way that it is queryable by type and timeframe. Information is only available by county, not precise location.
Levee/sea walls – national layer just released. Lorri- will send Web links to Julie and Carol. [Not sure if this is available as a layer at this point]

Existing land use – is being worked on, trying to get a common definition of land use types, by Digital Land Records initiative – from GIOs office.

Critical infrastructure/ lifelines - includes things like pipelines, power lines, emergency responder sites, hospitals, etc. The problem is that each local entity is defining lifelines separately.

Scenarios for specific quakes on specific faults – Kris mentioned that Cal EMA has paid for HAZUS runs on potential earthquakes. The shakemaps exist – could they be included? They are more specific than general shake maps and allow cities to see how bad it would be if xyz fault generated a z.z magnitude quake. Could Cal EMA (Johanna) or Chuck be data steward for this? They are very specific and static. Corinne suggested this topic may need further discussion. Johanna felt that they should be on Cal EMA website, but not part of MyPlan.

Social vulnerability – schools, hospitals, nursing homes, retirement homes. Revisit later.

Wastewater treatment plants and powerplants - add if available? The dataset is available from EPA/Pacific Institute. We'd need a Data steward. Is it useful? May be too far over the line – too complicated. Leave off for now.

Question on whether we should be doing customer surveys to assess value of MyPlan, and talk to local planners, to see if it's working for them. KT mentioned that there are plans to create a workbook, Using MyPlan for your LHMP, to promote MyPlan.

Jami suggested having levels of MyPlan – simple to complex – so that it would be easier to use.

Current Phase – when someone discovers a glitch it would be useful to have a central point on main page for MyPlanHELP. The user could fill out a form and it would go to an alias and then redirect to Julie, Carol or whoever is designated to field questions. We are aware of firewall problems, virus programs can interfere, the Web browser version can affect display – all problems common to any website. Once we start to get a feel for common problems, we could add an FAQ. Quinn could define minimum capabilities and browsers requirements.

NEXT STEPS

The meeting record will be written and sent out via email. Quinn/David will start work on the easy stuff, and ask for volunteers to research the rest. GIS TAWC will meet again sometime this Spring, and we will try to get someone from Cal-Adapt to present to the group.

State Hazard Mitigation Team (SHMT)
Kickoff Meeting

Meeting Record
January 31, 2013
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
Cal EMA Headquarters
Mather, CA

Attendees
Bob Anderson, Cal Quake
Chris Anderson, HCD
Phyllis Banducci, Cal Fire
Brian Banning, Cal EMA
Wendy Boemecke, Cal EMA
Don Boland, Cal EMA
Jami-Childress-Byers, Cal EMA
David Conn, Cal Poly
Sam Cowan, Cal EMA
Christina Curry, Cal EMA
Shane Detweiler, USGS
Tom Ducker, Cal EMA
Kirby Everhart, Cal EMA
Rob Feuerstein, ESRI
Desiree Fox, CalTrans
David Harris, Resources
Kris Higgs, Cal EMA
Ron Hooks, Cal EMA
Victoria LaMars-Haas, Cal EMA
Jose Lara, Cal EMA
Janiele Maffeil, Cal Quake
Kurt Malchow, Resources Agency
Michelle Martinez, Cal EMA
Tracy McBroom, CDSS
Karen McCready, Cal EMA
Kathy McKeever, Cal EMA
Scott Morgan, OPR
Julie Norris,Cal EMA
Phil Oglesby, Cal EMA
Nate Ortiz, Cal EMA
John Pelonio, State Parks
Eleyne Phillips, USGS
Ricardo Pineda, DWR
Hal Readdick, Cal EMA
Greg Sandin, DGS
Paula Schulz, Cal Poly
Sandeep Singh, CDCR
Judy Soutiere, USACE
Amy Stewart, Cal EMA
C.M. Stoff, CDCR
Alec Stone, CDI
Nancy Sutton, Cal EMA
Michael Thomas, DGS
Iovanka Todt, Flood Management Agency
Ken Topping, Cal Poly
Fred Turner, CSSC
Karen Valencia, Cal EMA
Terrie Watson, HCD
Ken Worman, CCC

Phone Attendees Marian Ashe
Terri Chapman, Enterprise Business Continuity
Bob Charbonneau, University of CA
Johanna Fenton, Cal EMA
Sara Flores, Ocean Prot. Counsel
Cyndi Hillary, RCRC
Erika Hughes, CA State Humane
Herby Lissade, CalTrans
Maria Lorenzo, DWR
Ravi Varma, State Lands Commission

Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting is to kick off the State Hazard Mitigation Planning Plan (SHMP) preparation for 2013. The State Hazard Mitigation Team (SHMT) will work with Cal EMA and Cal Poly to develop the 2013 State of California Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Welcome and Opening Comments (Christina Curry)

Why Prepare a State Hazard Mitigation Plan (SHMP)?

- The SHMP is California's primary hazard mitigation guidance document and defines a long-term strategy for reducing disaster losses.
- The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000) requires all states and local agencies to prepare, adopt and update a hazard mitigation plan to be eligible to receive non-emergency Stafford Act funding including HMGP, PDM, PA, FMAG, FMA and SRL grant programs.
- Maintaining Enhanced Plan Status also allows for a higher percentage of post-disaster grant funds to be awarded to the state.

Overview of 2013 SHMP Project (Julie Norris)

- Each agency was asked to review the 2010 SHMP to determine what information should be updated and to identify new programs or legislated. SHMT members were asked to pay particular attention to Appendices L & U.
- SHMT members were asked to use the Progress Update Form to submit their updates
- Members are also asked to revisit the SHMP Goals & Objectives to fine tune in light of current programs and priorities.
- SHMT members were requested to actively participate in plan development and review and to keep to the completion schedule as it has been established.

Current/New/Expanded Content (Ken Topping)

- Cal Poly/Cal EMA contract was approved January 2013 for the 2013 SHMP. It is an accelerated timeframe to comply with September 2013 deadline.
- SHMP focus continues to be hazard mitigation of primary hazards affecting the state, both natural and man-made.
- Hazard mitigation, as defined by FEMA, is "sustained action to reduce or eliminate long-term risks to human life and property from natural and human-caused hazards". Preparedness actions are important as elements of a comprehensive disaster management program, but are not the focus of the SHMP.
- Existing chapters of the SHMP will be updated. Areas of expansion include climate change and the Cal Viva project.

Climate Change (Kurt Malchow)

The Climate Adaptation Planning Guide (APG) has been completed. The APG is a compendium of four companion documents provides guidance to support regional and local communities in proactively addressing the unavoidable consequences of climate change. The guides can be found on the Cal EMA website as well as the Resources Climate Change Portal at:
http://resources.ca.gov/climate_adaptation/local_government/adaptation_policy_guide.html

- Planning for Adaptive Communities – presents basis for climate change adaption planning and introduces a step-by-step process for local and regional climate vulnerability assessment and adaptation strategy development.
- Defining Local and Regional Impacts – provides a more in-depth understanding of how climate change can affect a community. Includes seven "impact sectors" to support local climate vulnerability assessments.
- Understanding Regional Characteristics – identifies climate impact regions, including environmental, socioeconomic characteristics.
- Identifying Adaptation Strategies – explores potential adaptation strategies communities can use to meet local adaptation needs.

California Vital Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessment (Ken Topping)

- Multi-year effort to identify, assess, and prioritize seismic upgrades for the states critical infrastructure funded through the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP)
- Cal Viva I – developed methodology for assessing seismic vulnerability and recommending retrofits for key state-owned buildings
- Cal Viva II – developed a seismic vulnerability evaluation strategy for use by State departments
- Cal Viva III – testing and finalizing departmental plan strategy for implementation and progress monitoring (2013 focus)

State Agency Updates (Ken Topping and all - facilitated round robin)

- Cal EMA: Established mitigation grant priorities to be consistent with SHMP goals and objectives; revamped mitigation grant application process to be less burdensome and opened it to continuous application period; using MyPlan as the single hazard screening criteria when reviewing NOI submissions.

- CEA (California Earthquake Authority): Developed incentive program for seismic retrofit of single family dwellings (sfd); developing guidelines for retrofit of sfd; funding research on how structural elements of sfd perform in earthquakes.

- CSSC (Seismic Safety Commission): Pursuing applied research program since 2006, including hospital retrofit standards, award winning preparedness website; nuclear power plant evaluations, and tsunami vulnerability study for southern California ports.

- DWR (Department of Water Resources): Completed the Central Valley Flood Plan for 1607 miles of levee; working on Flood Futures Report addressing the vulnerability of land and facilities protected by levees.

- Cal Fire: Updating the California Fire Assessment.

- OPR (Office of Planning and Research): Completed the California Adaptation Planning Guide and published five supporting documents; revising the Fire Mitigation Planning Guide to assist local jurisdictions to comply with AB 1241; updating General Plan Guidelines that will incorporate hazard mitigation issues.

- CUEA (California Utilities Emergency Association): Completion of new power line into California from Arizona to provide power redundancy and avoid widespread power outages; seismic retrofits for cell towers underway; PG&E has seismic retrofit program for critical infrastructure.

Overview of MyPlan and GIS TAWC Next Steps (David Harris)

- MyPlan was developed to allow for geospatial analysis
- Combined effort of CNRA and Cal OES and multiagency work group (GIS TAWC)
- Final product was piloted by local jurisdictions and refinements made
- Operates on the html5 platform which is current industry standard
- Uses a portfolio management approach to sharing data through agency stewardship
- Currently adding new data types including vulnerable population data
- Will be “digging deeper” in next applications to support local fire plans
- Next phase will allow locals to input their own data
- The GIS TAWC will be reconvening in the next couple of months

2013 SHMP Schedule of Completion (David Conn)

- April 1, 2013 – Member Agency Progress Updates due for activities from January 2010 through December 2012
- May 30, 2013 – Complete Internal Draft for Cal EMA Review
- June 14 – Circulate Administrative Draft to SHMT for Review
- July 15 Publish Public Review Draft of 2013 SHMP
- September 20 – Cal EMA Secretary adopts 2013 SHMP

Next Steps

- Next meeting will be scheduled for the first week in April following agency update April 1 deadline. **Update: The next meeting will be held on April 4th from 1:30-3:30 p.m. at Cal EMA.*
- All SHMT members should complete and submit the Progress Report Form to Julie Norris by April 1st, 2013. The form will be online before that date.
- All SHMT member agencies are to continue identification/verification of appropriate points of contact and submit to Julie Norris.

State Hazard Mitigation Team (SHMT)
Team Meeting

Meeting Record
April 4, 2013
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
Cal EMA Headquarters
Mather, CA

Attendees (See Cal OES sign in sheets for on-site attendees)

Phone Attendees: (Partial list)
Xxxxxxxxx, State Lands Commission
Fred Turner, Seismic Safety Commission
Chuck Real, California Geological Survey
Kurt Malchow, Resources Agency_
Alex Xxxxx, Xxxxxxxxxx
Kathy Durbin, Public Health

Meeting Purpose

To revisit State Hazard Mitigation Plan Goals and Objectives for consistency and relevancy to current state programs and practices.

SHMP Goals and Objectives (Ken Topping)

Few significant changes have been made to the SHMP Goals and Objectives since they were originally drafted in 2007. Given the importance of those statements in setting the agenda for the state's mitigation activities, and recognizing new and emerging initiatives, it is appropriate to revisit the goals and objectives as part of the 2013 Update process.

Major discussion points and suggestions are outlined below for each of the four goals. Comments relative to specific objectives are also included.

Goal 1: Significantly reduce life loss and injuries

- A word search of the goals and objectives did not find a mention of agriculture which seems strange based on the importance of agriculture in this state. It is a broad issue that also impacts agribusiness located outside this state. Agribusiness in California generates more $$ than most state budgets for the year.
- Need to have response and recovery woven into the mitigation plan to reflect the comprehensive nature of solutions.
- Look at repurposing of facilities, including brownfields
- Focus is on public sector, and needs to incorporate private business. Need to acknowledge the role of business and private sector in the state. The SHMP should reflect all of the activities that go on in the state, and not just meet the FEMA requirements for the Plan.
- Incorporate the concept of resiliency and adaptation into mitigation.
- State Lands Commission is working with private business: Also need to include the organizational resilience as well as facilities they are working on.

Goal 2: Minimize damage to structures and property, as well as disruption of essential services and human activities

- Suggestion that the goal could be split into two to allow for more focus on essential services and human activities as relates to resiliency.
- Concern raised that if split it into two, then you take the focus off damage to structures and property as the main focus of mitigation.
- There is potential that the mitigation plan may get too broad if split it out.
- In the past we have looked at physical changes equating to mitigation and risk reduction.
- We need to keep a focus on performance based standards as part of goal 2.
- Perhaps we need a new Goal to reflect our new interest in resiliency and the need to look holistically at preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery as contributing to resiliency.
- Suggest adding a goal: Enhancing economic resiliency

Goal 3: Protect the environment

- Include an objective addressing the integration of climate change and sea level rise
- Might need a prologue to the plan that highlights the need to incorporate climate change as part of the mitigation strategy
- Climate change is not in and of itself a hazard, but impacts other hazards, with the exception of earthquake
- Climate change is a cross cutting aspect
- There should be more language relating to the impacts on infrastructure of sea level rise
- Where do we put mitigation of greenhouse gases
- Do we need to differentiate between natural and man-made environment?
- Cal Fire makes the distinction, but uses the same language.
- Issues of extreme heat as a result of climate change and adapting our built environment
- Is Objective 6 necessary or is there a way to revise to reflect current relationship of CEQA to LHMP's, since Plans are considered programmatic and not subject to CEQA review.
- For CWPP, as long as you are not addressing impacts then CEQA does not apply.
- Local governments must be cognitive as they develop their plans and be aware of what impacts of mitigation strategies or projects might be.
- As long as you are not addressing impacts then CEQA does not apply according to CWPP.

Goal 4: Promote hazard mitigation as an integrated public policy.

- The Brown administration is interested in revisiting CEQA requirements – ask them to revist CEQA law to expedite mitigation stick and brick projects – expedite mitigation projects such as levee strengthening or strengthening railway bridges. Add an objective to approach the Brown administration to consider this.
- SB 375 targeting sustainable communities provides CEQA relief to local communities. Perhaps could build a parallel format.
- Relocation of facilities due to sea level rise are an example of expediting CEQA to reduce life loss and increase economic resiliency.
- Objective 4: Need to continue to educate the general public about hazards, where they are, and what they can do about it.
- Objective 6: change working to "disaster resilient communities" rather than disaster-resistant sustainable communities.
- Potentially tighten up or shorten some of these objectives.

New Goal: Promote hazard mitigation as a standard business practice.

- Need some objectives to include under this goal.
- Will require continued outreach to private sector groups.
- CalViva is geared toward assessing state owned buildings for seismic vulnerability – those buildings needed for response and recovery. We may want to add an objective to reflect the underpinnings of Cal Viva: to strengthen state facilities that are essential to response and recovery.

Summary of Key Issues:

- Broader incorporation of private sector
- Include agriculture sustainability
- Enhance climate change impacts
- Create stronger linkages between plans
- Integrate resilience and adaptation concepts
- Revisit the SHMP title to incorporate resiliency concepts

Next Steps

- Agencies which have not yet submitted updates are asked to respond quickly
- Send suggestions for goals and objectives revisions to Julie Norris, David Conn and Ken Topping prior to next SHMT meeting
- Cal EMA to distribute 2011 Strategic Work Group Reports to SHMT members
- Next meeting will be scheduled for mid to late May

State Hazard Mitigation Team (SHMT)
GIS Technical Advisory Working Group (GIS TAWC)

Meeting Record
May 2, 2013
9:30 – 12 noon
Cal EMA Headquarters
Mather, CA

Attendees

Phyllis Banducci, Cal FIRE
David Conn, Cal Poly
Rob Feuerstein, ESRI
Joseph Gonzales, CDSS
Kris Higgs, Cal EMA
Karen Jackson, Cal EMA
Gary Johnson, Bureau of Mines & Geology
Dave King, CSSC
Scott Marotte, Cal EMA
Michelle Martinez, Cal EMA
Tentu McGuire, CGS
Ethan Mobley, Michael Baker JL, Inc
James Nordstrom, Cal EMA
Julie Norris, Cal EMA
Nate Ortiz, Cal EMA
Carol Schuldt, Cal Poly
Amy Stewart, Cal EMA
Pat Stiefer, FEMA Region 9
Ken Topping, Cal Poly
Phillip Wang, FEMA
Carol Walker, Cal EMA

Welcome and Self-Introductions (Julie Norris)

Brief Background on GIS TAWC (Ken Topping)

- GIS TAWC is one of the 2010 SHMT working groups, and the most successful.
- MyPlan was developed by the group, and it includes almost all hazards required by law.
- CNRA was instrumental in getting the website up and running.
- Today restarts the group for the 2013 SHMP and MyPlan2.
- David Conn is the new Cal Poly project lead, with Ken Topping as advisor.

2013 SHMP Map Update Review (Kris Higgs/Cal EMA and Carol Schuldt/Cal Poly)

- All agencies with maps in the 2010 SHMP are asked to review the maps they contributed to verify if they need to be updated and to make sure they are still relevant
- All agencies are asked to look at Cal EMA and Cal Poly provided maps made with your agency's data layers to verify they are still current. If you have more recent information, please let Cal EMA/Cal Poly know
- Kris Higgs is developing a map template for agencies to use to make their maps so that the 2013 SHMP maps have a consistent look/feel. She will be getting that out to those affected. Meg Henry at Cal Poly is the one doing the formatting for the whole document and will also have some input.
- Some questions about continuing to use screenshots of Web maps from various agencies, since they tend to look less than optimal after being shrunk to 6" x 9".
- Julie Norris will be the data consolidator and will forward information to the appropriate individuals. She can also field questions.
- The first internal Cal EMA review is scheduled for May 30th. May edits will probably continue after that date.

MyPlan Live Demo (David Harris/CNRA)

- David talked about the agencies supplying data
- MyPLan links out to those agencies to grab data

- All layers overlay properly, using geospatial Web services
- Users can add their own extra layers if they have the Web address for their services
- MyPlan is intended for hazard mitigation planning, but the basic framework is adaptable for other uses and is becoming popular
- New versions are being developed for Cal Fire (with around 25 fire-related layers) and others
- New developments include: a simplified interface; a version that works for tablets/phones in the field (see ceres.ca.gov/mobile/myplan.html); better identity support; the ability to create a link to share a map the user has created; a new Query feature that will allow a user to select desired features within a layer for display; the ability to use GPS zoom; a possible switch from the ESRI Addressing engine to a new CA supplied address layer; a new layer layout; a future change to services.gis.ca.gov
- Data curation is very important, which means having good data stewards for each agency/layer is essential.

MyPlan Phase 2 Content Development (David Harris/CNRA)

- They would like to make MyPlan more conversational (i.e. TurboTax for hazard mitigation)
- Make it 2-way, so that users can share their needs/suggestions more easily
- Provide more workflow guidance to the user: more hand-holding, provide the steps needed to use it for LHMP development, perhaps an online Wizard
- Use a risk portfolio management approach: allows the state to know what assets are important to locals and what the local hazards are
- Provide support for common operating data standards: support emergency responders, etc.
- Change how the attribute lists are managed: more context [ask David for more detail]
- Extend map viewer to provide custom functionality
- Allow users to write their own plugins and mods
- Customize the results page
- Thematic data curation is central, the agencies need to be involved
- Provide new outreach to local clients
- David will provide statistics on usage

Input from Attendees

- CGS commented that they are working on getting data on state facilities/state property inventory with CTA. Is MyPlan the appropriate tool for supplying this data? David: You can link from MyPlan out to the website to get the data and include it. Problem is CTA is free now – but could start charging. Should they just skip CTA and go with David's group? Answer: Maybe - data can be in various places, and still be accessed. They want to use it right after an emergency so people could use the Web to see what's going on
- Johanna Fenton/Cal EMA - have we had input from communities about what they'd like to see? David doesn't know of any
- CalFire may have put out too much data -they may be harvesting data from other agencies
- Julie/Cal EMA – they geocode funded projects and can use that layer after a disaster to see if there was a project there (SMART) and to see if it was effective; they plan on going to look at January floods to see if there were local projects that avoided losses because of a mitigation project
- Ken commented that SMART is still in its infancy, but getting going. There is currently no repository for their reports; Johanna commented that SMART only covers federally funded projects – we need to know about others as well.
- Julie said that CalEMA is asking locals to use MyPlan maps to verify that their funding request is for a documented hazard for them.
- Someone commented that having a wizard would be great for helping decide what maps to make and how to make them.
- David – collecting info from locals may change how grants are funded.

- Ken – DGS/EF7 [Did I hear that right?] to ID vulnerable state props. He also spoke briefly about what Cal VIVA is about: it aids state agencies in identifying critical facilities that need assessment on EQ vulnerable buildings and helps with plans for mitigation. State reporting plan is next step for agencies to report results on evaluations. HMGP grants might be appropriate to fund the properties assessment. It is still being developed, and the final repository for Cal VIVA assessments has not been determined. Perhaps DGS? Important to make sure that data is structured appropriately for users' needs. There is a control question as well. MyPlan also needs links to CalAdapt
- David made a comment about common operating systems.

Next Steps/Final Comments

- Julie – an online report form will soon be available on the Cal EMA website so that agencies/localities can document retrofits/success stories/etc. for inclusion in future SHMPs and for reporting to the governor's office.
- David – SHMP should bring people's attention to MyPlan; if anyone has any ideas let us know
- MyPlan 2 Handout
  - what new hazards/base layers are useful?
  - Other comments;
    27. JF – volcanoes layer should be available within next year. David commented that it would be logical to also include an elevation layer to go with it.
    28. DWR – new flood layer coming soon. Send to Julie with service info, if available
    29. David – technology platform is incredible, this group has a lot of leverage to make a big difference "TAWC isn't cheap – it's incredibly valuable'
  - Julie – more comments on the 'comment form' for locales to use to highlight accomplishments. It's really important to show what state is doing. GIS TAWC doesn't stop when SHMP is published, it's ongoing, so keep the ideas coming.
  - Johanna said that she directed folks to MyPlan when appropriate
  - Ken - David can you provide stats on numbers of hits and where? DH – yes
  - Johanna - suggested that GIS TAWC members provide internal training on MyPLan to introduce it in your own agency. Spread the word within your agencies and at meetings and conferences.
  - David - standards compliant - data sharing with other agencies and private entities is important
  - Ken - coastal hazards issues (storms, sea level, coastal flooding) data is changing rapidly. California's Climate Adaptation Planning Guide is a spinoff from the SHMP, also addresses heat, etc. Several agencies cooperated to write the APG and to help local entities to plan for the changes. It ties nicely into MyPlan. We need more climate oriented data linked into MyPlan – CalAdapt, for instance. DH – CalAdapt is being refreshed, and data will be available for inclusion in MyPlan.
- Kris (comment from Dave) – can't put in text box on map output. It would be nice to be able to bring in your own agency logo as well.
- Ken - by end of May Cal Poly will send SHMP 2013 draft, with whatever maps we have, to Cal EMA. After next TAWC we can have a meeting with those doing the SHMP mapping to discuss any needed changes. GIS TAWC will meet again the second week in June in conjunction with the next SHMT meeting. Stay tuned for date.
- Ken - this should be user driven – think about the local community planner who's reading this – what is meaningful for them – what's missing or could come out?

State Hazard Mitigation Team (SHMT)
GIS Technical Advisory Working Group (GIS TAWC)

Meeting Record
June 12, 2013
9:30 – 11:30 am
Cal EMA Headquarters
Mather, CA

TOPIC: "Development of MyPlan 2"

Attendees:
Phyllis Banducci / CAL FIRE
David Conn / Cal Poly
Sam Cowen / Cal EMA
Senarath Ekanayake / DWR
Johanna Fenton / Cal EMA
Desiree Fox / CALTRANS
David Harris / Natural Resources
Meg Henry / Cal Poly
Kris Higgs / Cal EMA
Ron Hooks / Cal EMA
Sandra Khan / DGS
Dave King / CSSC
Michelle Martinez / Cal EMA
Justin Merz / CERES
David Michel / CEC
Julie Norris / Cal EMA
Phil Oglesby / Cal EMA
Lorri Peltz-Lewis / USFS
Andy Petrow / ICF
Chuck Real / CGS
Susanne Rohner / CALTRANS
Greg Sandin / DGS
Matt Schmidtlein / CSUS
Carol Schuldt / Cal Poly
Paula Schulz / Cal Poly
Cathryn Stoffan / CDCR
McGuire Terilee / CADOC/CGS
Michael Thomas / DGS
Ken Topping / Cal Poly

9:30 Welcome & Self-Introductions – Joanne Brandani

9:40 2013 SHMP Map Status Report –Carol Schuldt, Kris Higgs, David Conn, Ken Topping
Carol displayed all maps provided by Cal Poly and Cal EMA.

Comments:
- ARkStorm map is a screenshot. Matt offered to help us obtain the actual shapefile for the modeled flooding in order to create a more readable map. Kris mentioned that Cal EMA is doing a flooding scenario for the Bay Area that's similar.
- Ken Topping explained that we are not worrying about visual consistency on layouts because of time constraints.
- Reminder to change all references from Cal EMA to Cal-OES, and could change to a bigger font on 'created by'.
- Cal-OES will double-check their maps to make sure all elements are there.
- Matt asked for clarification on whether the Population/Social Vulnerability layer has been updated with newest Census data. A new model will need to be developed for the 2016 SHMP to use the new data available from the US Census .
- The wildfire perimeter map needs to be updated, if the data are available.
- Matt pointed out that since this SHMP is covering so many more hazards, the legend on the map that says "All risks" should specify Wildfire/Flood/EQ.
- Chuck is providing data from his office on news reports of landslides.

10:30 MyPlan 2 Content Development – David Harris, Julie Norris, and all
David discussed Myplan and pointed out that it has been hugely successful and that Phase 2 can be even better. CERES staff are supplying technical support and working with a lot of agencies on a lot of projects. He explained

the intent of MyHazards, which is intended for the general public and is soon to be refreshed based on MyPlan, versus MyPlan which is intended for local mitigation planners. MyPlan makes GIS hazard analysis as easy as possible for non-GIS, non-mitigation users. He ran through a quick review of current features, including base maps, layers, ability to change layer opacity, and print/export options. All metadata are vetted by contributing agencies and have contact information. It is also possible to add local data if they are available as a web service. In the next phase, the intent is to add more layers and feature services.

Comments:

- Scott/FEMA (on phone) commented that there will soon be changes to how they supply flood data, including WMS and REST and a Web feature service. Go to msc.fema.gov to look for the announcement to get more information. Also at top under tools – look for link once it is available.
- David said that we may change how we grab their data once their new change is implemented. FEMA direct access makes sure that all data are as current as possible. ESRI's version of flood data from FEMA is currently out-of-date.
- Ken said that new CA flood mapping will show up on MyPlan when done and that there are new requirements for flood maps for new development in city/counties.
- Johanna asked if there is a way to be notified when new data are available, and David said that it is not currently set up for that, but it's a good idea. She also asked if they are archiving old data and he said that he'd like to be able to do that and include a 'time slider' on MyPlan so that users can see how things have changed. However that is more complicated and harder to do. Prior versions are available through the CERES library. They are planning on doing a developer's manual, including information on best practices and the best ways to use it.
- Kris asked if it is possible to put tabs at the top to sort layers by subject? David replied that it might interfere with the data layering. Matt suggested that they might be able to at least color the layer names to group them visually.
- David is a programmer working for CERES – he said that there are some problems with IE8, some backward compatibility problem and slow performance; IE10 is somewhat better. Chrome is much better, but may be a problem with agencies that only allow IE. If a local community has a GIS Web service, they can add those layers as well. ESRI Web service is the default.
- Ken pointed out that we are trying to include all hazards that must be disclosed by law. Climate change impact is on the horizon for mandatory disclosure. Will 200-year flood mapping all be added by July deadline?
- Julie commented that Cal Adapt data would be appropriate once they can provide them as a service.
- Chuck pointed out that MyPlan isn't intended as a site to provide disclosure maps – so there are limits to how close you can zoom. What about alluvial flood plain mapping that Alluvial Fan Task Force is doing? Discussion ensued.
- David agreed that appropriate use is important. It would be possible for someone to make assumptions about what they are seeing on MyPlan. Stewardship by agencies is important.
- Matt mentioned that it's confusing when there are layers in the table of contents that don't show up on the map, so why not only have layers only show up when you're zoomed in to where info is available.
- David said that a common operating data source would make things more organized. It would allow displays to be customized according to what the user is trying to do. The MyPlan skeleton is available to anyone to use in their state/agency. During the next phase, they want to shift from broadcasting info to making it more conversational, for instance, getting feedback from local agencies and allowing them to upload data on things like vital infrastructure with the choice to make it available to everyone, or just available to them.
- Phyllis suggested that data be divided by county. Layers would only show up if there are data in the county.
- Johanna pointed out that local agencies allowed to upload data wouldn't be verified like state agency data. David responded that local agencies would have to take responsibility for accuracy; maybe some things shouldn't be available to everyone – just selected users.
- Matt suggested that we make it a high priority for local agencies to be able to add their data to maps as they make them; a lower priority is crowd sourcing for general distribution, since liability may be an issue.

- Ken had a question about who is providing updates as city boundaries change, since they need to be current. Also, special district boundaries might be a good thing to provide as well. Special Districts Association may be able to provide boundary data. They are a big potential user. What about school district boundaries?
- David commented that in emergency response, knowing the names for things is important. We probably need a list of alternate names. They plan on contacting local organizations/groups to consult on usability. Ken mentioned several groups that should be included.
- Ken also pointed out that Cal VIVA is trying to get agencies/localities to identify their buildings that need EQ upgrades. He asked if DGS has been contacted about using SPI to track needed EQ work? Is DGS planning on flagging all state-owned buildings that need upgrades? DGS/SPI person said yes – it will be available as a spreadsheet.
- David/Ken discussed implementing a user survey. It hasn't been attempted yet, but should be done as soon as possible.
- Matt asked if we are interested in allowing users to compare hazards to things in other layers? For instance, number of state buildings in flood zones. Discussion ensued.
- Carol asked if we could get use statistics? David said that they are available, but not too useful since they only track hits on the initial page, not refreshes.
- David suggested that it would be nice to have a user blog and/or an onscreen survey to gather input from users.
- Julie commented that further information on where local funded grant projects are would be useful, perhaps with a clickable popup label that has details.
- David mentioned that the project is already way past the original budget for MyPlan.
- Ken pointed out that MyPlan is a remarkable achievement; David and GIS TAWC have done a lot of hard work and are to be commended. It's one of best outreach tools Cal-EMA has in its toolbag. David agreed and pointed out that they have very capable staff.
- Kris asked if we should add political districts? Chuck pointed out that local politicians may object.
- Phyllis asked if we are in Phase two? Julie said yes, but some features are still on the wish list [see handout] and we need to decide what is going to be tackled next.
- Ken wondered if Corrections would like to see their assets in a layer?
- Phyllis talked about the new MyPlan for Fire. It has many wildfire related layers. The user target is FireSafe Councils and similar agencies. It is still in testing with a possible rollout this Fall. It may have more functionality than MyPlan, but that it's simpler because all layers are from Cal Fire. Also, working with two decision makers makes decisions better, faster, and simpler. It includes things like current fire activity, plus planning, with a total of about 18 layers. It includes point data for some data that might be better as polygons/boundaries, but they're not available yet; you need to go look at documents to find out where actual boundaries are.
- David pointed out that MyPlan base software is being used for other planning topics as well. They are trying to embed as much intelligence into it as possible. They'd like to determine the best practice to develop tools to make it 'as easy as Turbo Tax'. Maybe so it even remembers what you did last time in bookmarks or something similar.
- Ken said that Cal Poly will prepare a User Guide soon, although it will likely be outdated as soon as it appears.

Julie reminded everyone to get 2013 SHMP updates to Meg/Lupe by June 17, or sooner, for June 21 publication for SHMT.

The next meeting of GIS TQWC will be at end of summer before final SHMP, probably in early August.

State Hazard Mitigation Team (SHMT)
Team Meeting

Meeting Record
June 12, 2013
1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
Cal EMA Headquarters
Mather, CA

TOPIC: "The 2013 SHMP: What's New and Different"

Attendees:
Phyllis Banducci / CAL FIRE
David Conn / Cal Poly
Sam Cowen / Cal EMA
Senarath Ekanayake / DWR
Johanna Fenton / Cal EMA
Desiree Fox / CALTRANS
Meg Henry / Cal Poly
Kris Higgs / Cal EMA
Ron Hooks / Cal EMA
Sandra Khan / DGS
Michelle Martinez / Cal EMA
David Michel / CEC
Julie Norris / Cal EMA
Phil Oglesby / Cal EMA
Lorri Peltz-Lewis / USFS
Andy Petrow / ICF
Chuck Real / CGS
Susanne Rohner / CALTRANS
Greg Sandin / DGS
Carol Schuldt / Cal Poly
Paula Schulz / Cal Poly
Cathryn Stoffan / CDCR
McGuire Terilee / CADOC/CGS
Michael Thomas / DGS
Ken Topping / Cal Poly

1:30 *Welcome & Self-Introductions* – Joanne Brandani/Julie Norris

1:45 *2013 SHMP Update Schedule and Status Report* – David Conn, Ken Topping

2:00 Review of Significant Progress Updates and Info Remaining Needs
Revised Goals and objectives based on April 4 discussion
Strategic working group recommendations
Earthquake, flood and wildfire mitigation updates
Climate adaptation, lifelines and other hazards updates
Mitigation grant program updates

3:15 Next Steps

3:30 Adjourn

APPENDIX B – 2013 STATE HAZARD MITIGATION TEAM ROSTER OF AGENCIES AND STAKEHOLDER ORGANIZATIONS

American Planning Association California Chapter

American Red Cross (Sacramento Chapter)

Association of Contingency Planners

Association of Environmental Professionals

Business and Industry Council for Emergency Planning & Preparedness (BICEPP)

Business Executives For National Security (BENS)

Business Recovery Managers Association

California Coastal Commission

California Coastal Conservancy

California Conservation Corps

California Department of Conservation

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

California Department of Education

California Department of Food and Agriculture

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), Office of the Fire Marshal

California Department of General Services

California Department of Housing and Community Development

California Department of Insurance

California Department of Public Health

California Department of Social Services

California Department of Technology Services

California Department of Transportation

California Department of Water Resources

California Earthquake Authority

California Emergency Services Association (CESA) – Sutter County

California Energy Commission

California Environmental Protection Agency (CAL/EPA)

- Integrated Waste Management Board
- Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
- State Water Resources Control Board

California Fire Safe Council

California Geological Survey

California Highway Patrol

California Natural Resources Agency

California Public Utilities Commission

California Seismic Safety Commission

California State Archives

California State Association of Counties (CSAC)

California State Lands Commission

California State Parks

California State University System (CSU)

California Utilities Emergency Association (CUEA)

CaliforniaVolunteers

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

Community Outreach Promoting Emergency (COPE)

Preparedness

Delta Protection Commission

Dewberry

Division of the State Architect

Earthquake Engineering Research Institute (EERI)

Esri

FEMA Region IX

Floodplain Management Association

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

Institute for Building and Home Safety (IBHS)

League of California Cities

Local Government Commission

Michael Baker Corporation

MMI Engineering

Native American Heritage Commission

Natural Resources Conservation Services

Nature Conservancy

Ocean Protection Council/Coastal and Ocean Climate Action Team

Office of Historic Preservation (see DPR)

Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (part of Health and Human Services Department)

Planning and Conservation League

Public Agency Risk Managers Associates

Reclamation Board

Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Sacramento Municipality Utility District (SMUD)

San Francisco Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)

San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services

Sierra Club

Sierra Nevada Conservancy

State Humane Association of California

State of Nevada

Strategic Growth Council

United States Army Corps of Engineers

United States Bureau of Indian Affairs

United States Bureau of Land Management

United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

United States Forest Service

United States Fish and Wildlife Service

United States Geological Survey

University of California Davis

University of California (Office of the Secretary of the Regents)

University of Southern California (USC)

Volunteer Centers of California

Wildlife Conservation Board

APPENDIX C – ASSEMBLY BILL 2140

BILL NUMBER: AB 2140CHAPTERED
BILL TEXT

CHAPTER 739

FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE SEPTEMBER 29, 2006
APPROVED BY GOVERNOR SEPTEMBER 29, 2006
PASSED THE ASSEMBLY AUGUST 21, 2006
PASSED THE SENATE AUGUST 17, 2006
AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 14, 2006
AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 28, 2006
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 9, 2006

INTRODUCED BY Assembly Member Hancock

FEBRUARY 21, 2006

An act to add Sections 8685.9 and 65302.6 to the Government Code, relating to local planning.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2140, Hancock General plans: safety element.

(1) The California Disaster Assistance Act limits the state share for any eligible project to no more than 75 percent of total state eligible costs, except that the state share shall be up to 100 percent of total state eligible costs connected with certain events.

This bill would prohibit the state share for any eligible project from exceeding 75 percent of total state eligible costs unless the local agency is located within a city, county, or city and county that has adopted a local hazard mitigation plan in accordance with the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 as part of the safety element of its general plan, in which case the Legislature may provide for a state share of local costs that exceeds 75 percent of total state eligible costs.

(2) The Planning and Zoning Law requires that a city, county, or city and county general plan contain specified elements, including a safety element for the protection of the community from any unreasonable risks associated with the effects of seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, tsunami, seiche, and dam failure; slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, and other seismic, geologic, and fire hazards.

This bill would authorize a city, county, or a city and county to adopt with its safety element a federally specified local hazard mitigation plan that includes specified elements, and require the Office of Emergency Services to give preference to local jurisdictions that have not adopted a local hazard mitigation plan with respect to specified federal programs for assistance in developing and adopting a plan.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 8685.9 is added to the Government Code, to read:

8685.9. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including Section 8686, for any eligible project, the state share shall not exceed 75 percent of total state eligible costs unless the local agency is located within a city, county, or city and county that has adopted a local hazard mitigation plan in accordance with the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-390) as part of the safety element of its general plan adopted pursuant to subdivision (g) of Section 65302. In that situation, the Legislature may provide for a state share of local costs that exceeds 75 percent of total state eligible costs.

SECTION 2. Section 65302.6 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65302.6. (a) A city, county, or a city and county may adopt with its safety element pursuant to subdivision (g) of Section 65302 a local hazard mitigation plan (HMP) specified in the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (P. L. 106-390). The hazard mitigation plan shall include all of the following elements called for in the federal act requirements:

(1) An initial earthquake performance evaluation of public facilities that provide essential services, shelter, and critical governmental functions.
(2) An inventory of private facilities that are potentially hazardous, including, but not limited to, multiunit, soft story, concrete tilt-up, and concrete frame buildings.
(3) A plan to reduce the potential risk from private and governmental facilities in the event of a disaster.

(b) Local jurisdictions that have not adopted a local hazard mitigation plan shall be given preference by the Office of Emergency Services in recommending actions to be funded from the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program, the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, and the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program to assist the local jurisdiction in developing and adopting a local hazard mitigation plan, subject to available funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Source: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/index.html (Bill Information)

APPENDIX D – ASSEMBLY BILL 162

BILL NUMBER: AB 162 CHAPTERED
BILL TEXT

CHAPTER 369

FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE OCTOBER 10, 2007
APPROVED BY GOVERNOR OCTOBER 10, 2007
PASSED THE SENATE SEPTEMBER 7, 2007/PASSED THE ASSEMBLY SEPTEMBER 11, 2007
AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 31, 2007/AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 17, 2007

INTRODUCED BY Assembly Member Wolk

JANUARY 22, 2007

An act to amend Sections 65302, 65303.4, 65352, 65584.04, and 65584.06 of, and to add Sections 65300.2 and 65302.7 to, the Government Code, relating to local planning.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 162, Wolk. Land use: water supply.

(1) The Planning and Zoning Law requires a city or county general plan to include specified mandatory elements, including a land use element that designates the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of the land for various purposes and a conservation element that considers, among other things, the effect of development within the jurisdiction, as described in the land use element, on natural resources located on public lands, including military installations, and provides that the conservation element may also cover, among other things, flood control.

This bill would require the land use element to identify and annually review those areas covered by the general plan that are subject to flooding as identified by flood plain mapping prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Department of Water Resources. The bill also would require, upon the next revision of the housing element, on or after January 1, 2009, the conservation element of the general plan to identify rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, riparian habitat, and land that may accommodate floodwater for purposes of groundwater recharge and stormwater management. By imposing new duties on local public officials, the bill would create a state-mandated local program.

(2) The Planning and Zoning Law also requires that a city or county general plan contain a safety element for the protection of the community from any unreasonable risks associated with the effects of seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, tsunami, seiche, and dam failure; slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, and other seismic, geologic, and fire hazards.
This bill would also require, upon the next revision of the housing element, on or after January 1, 2009, the safety element to identify, among other things, information regarding flood hazards and to establish a set of comprehensive goals, policies, and objectives, based on specified information for the protection of the community from, among other things, the unreasonable risks of flooding.

The bill would also require the planning agency, upon each revision of the housing element to review, and if necessary, to identify new information that was not available during the previous revision of the safety

element and would provide criteria by which cities and counties that have flood plain management ordinances may comply with these provisions.

(3) The Planning and Zoning Law also requires, prior to the periodic review of its general plan and prior to preparing or revising its safety element, each city and county to consult with the Division of Mines and Geology of the Department of Conservation and with the Office of Emergency Services, as specified, and requires that at specified times prior to adoption or amendment of the safety element, each city and county submit one copy of a draft or amendment of the safety element to specified state agencies and local governments for review pursuant to specified procedures.

Existing law establishes the 7-member Reclamation Board in the Department of Water Resources and requires the board members to be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor. Senate Bill 17 of the 2006-07 Regular Session, if enacted, would rename the Reclamation Board as the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, and would revise the membership of the board.

This bill would also require each city and county located within the boundaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District to submit the draft element or draft amendment to the safety element of its general plan to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board and every local agency that provides flood protection to territory in the city or county at least 90 days prior to the adoption of, or amendment to, the safety element. The bill would also require the board and a local agency to review the draft or an existing safety element and report its written recommendations to the planning agency within 60 days of its receipt of the draft or existing safety element, as specified.

(4) The Planning and Zoning Law requires, prior to action by a legislative body to adopt or substantially amend a general plan, that the planning agency refer the proposed action to specified state, local, and federal agencies.

This bill would also require that the proposed action be referred to the board when the proposed action is within the boundaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District.

(5) The Planning and Zoning Law requires at least 2 years prior to a scheduled revision of a local government's housing element that each council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, or the Department of Housing and Community Development, where there is no council of governments, develop a proposed methodology for distributing the existing and projected regional housing needs to cities, counties, and cities and counties within the region or within the subregion, where applicable, pursuant to specified provisions.
That law requires that the methodology be consistent with specified objectives that include, among other things, a determination of the availability of land suitable for urban development or for conversion to residential use, the availability of underutilized land, and opportunities for infill development and increased residential densities.

This bill would provide that the determination of available land suitable for urban development may exclude lands where the flood management infrastructure designed to protect the jurisdiction is not adequate to avoid the risk of flooding such that the development of housing would be impractical due to cost or other considerations.

(6) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 65300.2 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65300.2. (a) For the purposes of this article, a "200-year flood plain" is an area that has a 1 in 200 chance of flooding in any given year, based on hydrological modeling and other engineering criteria accepted by the Department of Water Resources.

(b) For the purposes of this article, a "levee protection zone" is an area that is protected, as determined by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board or the Department of Water Resources, by a levee that is part of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control, as defined under Section 5096.805 of the Public Resources Code.

SECTION 1.5. Section 65302 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65302. The general plan shall consist of a statement of development policies and shall include a diagram or diagrams and text setting forth objectives, principles, standards, and plan proposals.

The plan shall include the following elements:

(a)A land use element that designates the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of the land for housing, business, industry, open space, including agriculture, natural resources, recreation, and enjoyment of scenic beauty, education, public buildings and grounds, solid and liquid waste disposal facilities, and other categories of public and private uses of land. The location and designation of the extent of the uses of the land for public and private uses shall consider the identification of land and natural resources pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (d). The land use element shall include a statement of the standards of population density and building intensity recommended for the various districts and other territory covered by the plan. The land use element shall identify and annually review those areas covered by the plan that are subject to flooding identified by flood plain mapping prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the Department of Water Resources. The land use element shall also do both of the following:(1) Designate in a land use category that provides for timber production those parcels of real property zoned for timberland production pursuant to the California Timberland Productivity Act of 1982, Chapter 6.7 (commencing with

Section 51100) of Part 1 of Division 1 of Title 5.

(2) Consider the impact of new growth on military readiness activities carried out on military bases, installations, and operating and training areas, when proposing zoning ordinances or designating land uses covered by the general plan for land, or other territory adjacent to military facilities, or underlying designated military aviation routes and airspace.

(A) In determining the impact of new growth on military readiness activities, information provided by military facilities shall be considered. Cities and counties shall address military impacts based on information from the military and other sources.

(B) The following definitions govern this paragraph:

(i) "Military readiness activities" mean all of the following:

(I) Training, support, and operations that prepare the men and women of the military for combat.

(II) Operation, maintenance, and security of any military installation.

(III) Testing of military equipment, vehicles, weapons, and sensors for proper operation or suitability for combat use.

(ii) "Military installation" means a base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility for any ship, or other activity under the jurisdiction of the United States

Department of Defense as defined in paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of Section 2687 of Title 10 of the United States Code.

(b) A circulation element consisting of the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, any military airports and ports, and other local public utilities and facilities, all correlated with the land use
element of the plan.

(c) A housing element as provided in Article 10.6 (commencing with Section 65580).

(d) (1) A conservation element for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources including water and its hydraulic force, forests, soils, rivers and other waters, harbors, fisheries, wildlife, minerals, and other natural resources. The conservation element shall consider the effect of development within the jurisdiction, as described in the land use element, on natural resources located on public lands, including military installations. That portion of the conservation element including waters shall be developed in coordination with any countywide water agency and with all district and city agencies, including flood management, water conservation, or groundwater agencies that have developed, served, controlled, managed, or conserved water of any type for any purpose in the county or city for which the plan is prepared. Coordination shall include the discussion and evaluation of any water supply and demand information described in Section 65352.5, if that information has been submitted by the water agency to the city or county.

(2) The conservation element may also cover all of the following:

(A) The reclamation of land and waters.

(B) Prevention and control of the pollution of streams and other waters.

(C) Regulation of the use of land in stream channels and other areas required for the accomplishment of the conservation plan.

(D) Prevention, control, and correction of the erosion of soils, beaches, and shores.

(E) Protection of watersheds.

(F) The location, quantity and quality of the rock, sand and gravel resources.

(3) Upon the next revision of the housing element on or after January 1, 2009, the conservation element shall identify rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, riparian habitats, and land that may accommodate floodwater for purposes of groundwater recharge and storm water management.

(e) An open-space element as provided in Article 10.5 (commencing with Section 65560).

(f) (1) A noise element which shall identify and appraise noise problems in the community. The noise element shall recognize the guidelines established by the Office of Noise Control in the State Department of Health Care Services and shall analyze and quantify, to the extent practicable, as determined by the legislative body, current and projected noise levels for all of the following sources:

(A) Highways and freeways.

(B) Primary arterials and major local streets.

(C) Passenger and freight on-line railroad operations and ground rapid transit systems.

(D) Commercial, general aviation, heliport, helistop, and military airport operations, aircraft overflights, jet engine test stands, and all other ground facilities and maintenance functions related to airport operation.

(E) Local industrial plants, including, but not limited to, railroad classification yards.

(F) Other ground stationary noise sources, including, but not limited to, military installations, identified by local agencies as contributing to the community noise environment.

(2) Noise contours shall be shown for all of these sources and stated in terms of community noise equivalent level (CNEL) or day-night average level (Ldn). The noise contours shall be prepared on the basis of noise monitoring or following generally accepted noise modeling techniques for the various sources identified in paragraphs (1) to (6), inclusive.

(3) The noise contours shall be used as a guide for establishing a pattern of land uses in the land use element that minimizes the exposure of community residents to excessive noise.

(4) The noise element shall include implementation measures and possible solutions that address existing and foreseeable noise problems, if any. The adopted noise element shall serve as a guideline for compliance with the state's noise insulation standards.

(g) (1) A safety element for the protection of the community from any unreasonable risks associated with the effects of seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, tsunami, seiche, and dam failure; slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides; subsidence, liquefaction, and other seismic hazards identified pursuant to Chapter 7.8 (commencing with Section 2690) of Division 2 of the Public Resources Code, and other geologic hazards known to the legislative body; flooding; and wild land and urban fires. The safety element shall include mapping of known seismic and other geologic hazards. It shall also address evacuation routes, military installations, peakload water supply requirements, and minimum road widths and clearances around structures, as those items relate to identified fire and geologic hazards.

(2) The safety element, upon the next revision of the housing element on or after January 1, 2009, shall also do the following:

(A) Identify information regarding flood hazards, including, but not limited to, the following:

(i) Flood hazard zones. As used in this subdivision, "flood hazard zone" means an area subject to flooding that is delineated as either a special hazard area or an area of moderate or minimal hazard on an official flood insurance rate map issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The identification of a flood hazard zone does not imply that areas outside the flood hazard zones or uses permitted within flood hazard zones will be free from flooding or flood damage.

(ii) National Flood Insurance Program maps published by FEMA.

(iii) Information about flood hazards that is available from the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

(iv) Designated floodway maps that are available from the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.

(v) Dam failure inundation maps prepared pursuant to Section 8589.5 that are available from the Office of Emergency Services.

(vi) Awareness Floodplain Mapping Program maps and 200-year flood plain maps that are or may be available from, or accepted by, the Department of Water Resources.

(vii) Maps of levee protection zones.

(viii) Areas subject to inundation in the event of the failure of project or non-project levees or floodwalls.

(ix) Historical data on flooding, including locally prepared maps of areas that are subject to flooding, areas that are vulnerable to flooding after wildfires, and sites that have been repeatedly damaged by flooding.

(x) Existing and planned development in flood hazard zones, including structures, roads, utilities, and essential public facilities.

(xi) Local, state, and federal agencies with responsibility for flood protection, including special districts and local offices of emergency services.

(B) Establish a set of comprehensive goals, policies, and objectives based on the information identified pursuant to subparagraph (A), for the protection of the community from the unreasonable risks of flooding, including, but not limited to:

(i) Avoiding or minimizing the risks of flooding to new development.

(ii) Evaluating whether new development should be located in flood hazard zones, and identifying construction methods or other methods to minimize damage if new development is located in flood hazard zones.

(iii) Maintaining the structural and operational integrity of essential public facilities during flooding.

(iv) Locating, when feasible, new essential public facilities outside of flood hazard zones, including hospitals and health care facilities, emergency shelters, fire stations, emergency command centers, and emergency communications facilities or identifying construction methods or other methods to minimize damage if these facilities are located in flood hazard zones.

(v) Establishing cooperative working relationships among public agencies with responsibility for flood protection.

(C) Establish a set of feasible implementation measures designed to carry out the goals, policies, and objectives established pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(3) After the initial revision of the safety element pursuant to paragraph (2), upon each revision of the housing element, the planning agency shall review and, if necessary, revise the safety element to identify new information that was not available during the previous revision of the safety element.

(4) Cities and counties that have flood plain management ordinances that have been approved by FEMA that substantially comply with this section, or have substantially equivalent provisions to this subdivision in their general plans, may use that information in the safety element to comply with this subdivision, and shall summarize and incorporate by reference into the safety element the other general plan provisions or the flood plain ordinance, specifically showing how each requirement of this subdivision has been met.

(5) Prior to the periodic review of its general plan and prior to preparing or revising its safety element, each city and county shall consult the California Geological Survey of the Department of Conservation, the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, if the city or county is located within the boundaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District, as set forth in Section 8501 of the Water Code, and the Office of Emergency Services for the purpose of including information known by and available to the department, the office, and the board required by this subdivision.

(6) To the extent that a county's safety element is sufficiently detailed and contains appropriate policies and programs for adoption by a city, a city may adopt that portion of the county's safety element that pertains to the city's planning area in satisfaction of the requirement imposed by this subdivision.

SECTION 2. Section 65302.7 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65302.7. (a) For the purposes of complying with Section 65302.5, each county or city located within the boundaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District, as set forth in Section 8501 of the Water Code, shall submit the draft element of, or draft amendment to, the safety element to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board and to every local agency that provides flood protection to territory in the city or county at least 90 days prior to the adoption of, or amendment to, the safety element of its general plan.

(b) The Central Valley Flood Protection Board and each local agency described in paragraph (1) shall review the draft or an existing safety element and report their respective written recommendations to the planning agency within 60 days of the receipt of the draft or existing safety element. The Central Valley Flood Protection Board and each local agency shall review the draft or existing safety element and may offer written recommendations for changes to the draft or existing safety element regarding both of the following:

(1) Uses of land and policies in areas subjected to flooding that will protect life, property, and natural resources from unreasonable risks associated with flooding.

(2) Methods and strategies for flood risk reduction and protection within areas subjected to flooding.

(c) Prior to the adoption of its draft element or draft amendments to the safety element, the board of supervisors of the county or the city council of a city shall consider the recommendations

made by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board and any local agency that provides flood protection to territory in the city or county. If the board of supervisors or the city council determines not to accept all or some of the recommendations, if any, made by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board or the local agency, the board of supervisors or the city council shall make findings that state its reasons for not accepting a recommendation and shall communicate those findings in writing to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board or to the local agency.

(d) If the Central Valley Flood Protection Board's or the local agency's recommendations are not available within the time limits required by this section, the board of supervisors or the city council may act without those recommendations. The board of supervisors or city council shall consider the recommendations at the next time it considers amendments to its safety element.

SECTION 3. Section 65303.4 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65303.4. The Department of Water Resources or the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, as appropriate, and the Department of Fish and Game may develop site design and planning policies to assist local agencies which request help in implementing the general plan guidelines for meeting flood control objectives and other land management needs.

SECTION 4. Section 65352 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65352. (a) Prior to action by a legislative body to adopt or substantially amend a general plan, the planning agency shall refer the proposed action to all of the following entities:

(1) A city or county, within or abutting the area covered by the proposal, and any special district that may be significantly affected by the proposed action, as determined by the planning agency.

(2) An elementary, high school, or unified school district within the area covered by the proposed action.

(3) The local agency formation commission.

(4) An areawide planning agency whose operations may be significantly affected by the proposed action, as determined by the planning agency.

(5) A federal agency if its operations or lands within its jurisdiction may be significantly affected by the proposed action, as determined by the planning agency.

(6) (A) The branches of the United States Armed Forces that have provided the Office of Planning and Research with a California mailing address pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 65944 when the proposed action is within 1,000 feet of a military installation, or lies within special use airspace, or beneath a low-level flight path, as defined in Section 21098 of the Public Resources Code, provided that the United States Department of Defense provides electronic maps of low-level flight paths, special use airspace, and military installations at a scale and in an electronic format that is acceptable to the Office of Planning and Research.

(B) Within 30 days of a determination by the Office of Planning and Research that the information provided by the Department of Defense is sufficient and in an acceptable scale and format, the office shall notify cities, counties, and cities and counties of the availability of the information on the Internet. Cities, counties, and cities and counties shall comply with subparagraph (A) within 30 days of receiving this notice from the office.

(7) A public water system, as defined in Section 116275 of the Health and Safety Code, with 3,000 or more service connections, that serves water to customers within the area covered by the proposal.

The public water system shall have at least 45 days to comment on the proposed plan, in accordance with subdivision (b), and to provide the planning agency with the information set forth in Section 65352.5.

(8) The Bay Area Air Quality Management District for a proposed action within the boundaries of the district.

(9) On and after March 1, 2005, a California Native American tribe, that is on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission, with traditional lands located within the city or county's jurisdiction.

(10) The Central Valley Flood Protection Board for a proposed action within the boundaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District, as set forth in Section 8501 of the Water Code.

(b)Each entity receiving a proposed general plan or amendment of a general plan pursuant to this section shall have 45 days from the date the referring agency mails it or delivers it in which to comment unless a longer period is specified by the planning agency.

(c) (1) This section is directory, not mandatory, and the failure to refer a proposed action to the other entities specified in this section does not affect the validity of the action, if adopted.

(2) To the extent that the requirements of this section conflict with the requirements of Chapter 4.4 (commencing with Section 65919), the requirements of Chapter 4.4 shall prevail.

SECTION 5. Section 65584.04 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65584.04. (a) At least two years prior to a scheduled revision required by Section 65588, each council of governments, or delegate subregion as applicable, shall develop a proposed methodology for distributing the existing and projected regional housing need to cities, counties, and cities and counties within the region or within the subregion, where applicable pursuant to this section. The methodology shall be consistent with the objectives listed in subdivision (d) of Section 65584.

(b) (1) No more than six months prior to the development of a proposed methodology for distributing the existing and projected housing need, each council of governments shall survey each of its member jurisdictions to request, at a minimum, information regarding the factors listed in subdivision (d) that will allow the development of a methodology based upon the factors established in subdivision (d).

(2) The council of governments shall seek to obtain the information in a manner and format that is comparable throughout the region and utilize readily available data to the extent possible.

(3) The information provided by a local government pursuant to this section shall be used, to the extent possible, by the council of governments, or delegate subregion as applicable, as source information for the methodology developed pursuant to this section.

The survey shall state that none of the information received may be used as a basis for reducing the total housing need established for the region pursuant to Section 65584.01.

(4) If the council of governments fails to conduct a survey pursuant to this subdivision, a city, county, or city and county may submit information related to the items listed in subdivision (d) prior to the public comment period provided for in subdivision (c).

(c) Public participation and access shall be required in the development of the methodology and in the process of drafting and adoption of the allocation of the regional housing needs. Participation by organizations other than local jurisdictions and councils of governments shall be solicited in a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community. The proposed methodology, along with any relevant underlying data and assumptions, and an explanation of how information about local government conditions gathered pursuant to subdivision (b) has been used to develop the proposed methodology, and how each of the factors listed in subdivision (d) is incorporated into the methodology, shall be distributed to all cities, counties, any subregions, and members of the public who have made a written request for the proposed methodology. The council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall conduct at least one public hearing to receive oral and written comments on the proposed methodology.

(d) To the extent that sufficient data is available from local governments pursuant to subdivision (b) or other sources, each council of governments, or delegate subregion as applicable, shall include the following factors to develop the methodology that allocates regional housing needs:

(1) Each member jurisdiction's existing and projected jobs and housing relationship.

(2) The opportunities and constraints to development of additional housing in each member jurisdiction, including all of the following:

(A) Lack of capacity for sewer or water service due to federal or state laws, regulations or regulatory actions, or supply and distribution decisions made by a sewer or water service provider other than the local jurisdiction that preclude the jurisdiction from providing necessary infrastructure for additional development during the planning period.

(B) The availability of land suitable for urban development or for conversion to residential use, the availability of underutilized land, and opportunities for infill development and increased residential densities. The council of governments may not limit its consideration of suitable housing sites or land suitable for urban development to existing zoning ordinances and land use restrictions of a locality, but shall consider the potential for increased residential development under alternative zoning ordinances and land use restrictions. The determination of available land suitable for urban development may exclude lands where the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the Department of Water Resources has determined that the flood management infrastructure designed to protect that land is not adequate to avoid the risk of flooding.

(C) Lands preserved or protected from urban development under existing federal or state programs, or both, designed to protect open space, farmland, environmental habitats, and natural resources on a long-term basis.

(D) County policies to preserve prime agricultural land, as defined pursuant to Section 56064, within an unincorporated area.

(3) The distribution of household growth assumed for purposes of a comparable period of regional transportation plans and opportunities to maximize the use of public transportation and existing transportation infrastructure.

(4) The market demand for housing.

(5) Agreements between a county and cities in a county to direct growth toward incorporated areas of the county.

(6) The loss of units contained in assisted housing developments, as defined in paragraph (8) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, that changed to non-low-income use through mortgage prepayment, subsidy contract expirations, or termination of use restrictions.

(7) High-housing cost burdens.

(8) The housing needs of farmworkers.

(9) The housing needs generated by the presence of a private university or a campus of the California State University or the University of California within any member jurisdiction.

(10) Any other factors adopted by the council of governments.

(e) The council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall explain in writing how each of the factors described in subdivision (d) was incorporated into the methodology and how the methodology is consistent with subdivision (d) of Section 65584. The methodology may include numerical weighting.

(f) Any ordinance, policy, voter-approved measure, or standard of a city or county that directly or indirectly limits the number of residential building permits issued by a city or county shall not be a justification for a determination or a reduction in the share of a city or county of the regional housing need.

(g) In addition to the factors identified pursuant to subdivision (d), the council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall identify any existing local, regional, or state incentives, such as a priority for funding or other incentives available to those local governments that are willing to accept a higher share than proposed in the draft allocation to those local governments by the council of governments or delegate subregion pursuant to Section 65584.05.

(h) Following the conclusion of the 60-day public comment period described in subdivision (c) on the proposed allocation methodology, and after making any revisions deemed appropriate by the council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, as a result of comments received during the public comment period, each council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall adopt a final regional, or subregional, housing need allocation methodology and provide notice of the adoption of the methodology to the jurisdictions within the region, or delegate subregion as applicable, and to the department.

SECTION 6. Section 65584.06 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65584.06. (a) For cities and counties without a council of governments, the department shall determine and distribute the existing and projected housing need, in accordance with Section 65584 and this section. If the department determines that a county or counties, supported by a resolution adopted by the board or boards of supervisors, and a majority of cities within the county or counties representing a majority of the population of the county or counties, possess the capability and resources and has agreed to accept the responsibility, with respect to its jurisdiction, for the distribution of the regional housing need, the department shall
delegate this responsibility to the cities and county or counties.

(b) The distribution of regional housing need shall, based upon available data and in consultation with the cities and counties, take into consideration market demand for housing, the distribution of household growth within the county assumed in the regional transportation plan where applicable, employment opportunities and commuting patterns, the availability of suitable sites and public facilities, agreements between a county and cities in a county to direct growth toward incorporated areas of the county, or other considerations as may be requested by the affected cities or counties and agreed to by the department. As part of the allocation of the regional housing need, the department shall provide each city and county with data describing the assumptions and methodology used in calculating its share of the regional housing need. Consideration of suitable housing sites or land suitable for urban development is not limited to existing zoning ordinances and land use restrictions of a locality, but shall include consideration of the potential for increased residential development under alternative zoning ordinances and land use restrictions. The determination of available land suitable for urban development may exclude lands where the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the Department of Water Resources has determined that the flood management infrastructure designed to protect that land is not adequate to avoid the risk of flooding.

(c) Within 90 days following the department's determination of a draft distribution of the regional housing need to the cities and the county, a city or county may propose to revise the determination of its share of the regional housing need in accordance with criteria set forth in the draft distribution. The proposed revised share shall be based upon comparable data available for all affected jurisdictions, and accepted planning methodology, and shall be supported by adequate documentation.

(d) (1) Within 60 days after the end of the 90-day time period for the revision by the cities or county, the department shall accept the proposed revision, modify its earlier determination, or indicate why the proposed revision is inconsistent with the regional housing need.

(2) If the department does not accept the proposed revision, then, within 30 days, the city or county may request a public hearing to review the determination.

(3) The city or county shall be notified within 30 days by certified mail, return receipt requested, of at least one public hearing regarding the determination.

(4) The date of the hearing shall be at least 10 but not more than 15 days from the date of the notification.

(5) Before making its final determination, the department shall consider all comments received and shall include a written response to each request for revision received from a city or county.

(e) If the department accepts the proposed revision or modifies its earlier determination, the city or county shall use that share. If the department grants a revised allocation pursuant to subdivision

(d), the department shall ensure that the total regional housing need is maintained. The department's final determination shall be in writing and shall include information explaining how its action is consistent with this section. If the department indicates that the proposed revision is inconsistent with the regional housing need, the city or county shall use the share that was originally determined by the department. The department, within its final determination, may adjust the allocation of a city or county that was not the subject of a request for revision of the draft distribution.

(f) The department shall issue a final regional housing need allocation for all cities and counties within 45 days of the completion of the local review period.

SECTION 7. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code.

Source: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/index.html - (Bill Information)

APPENDIX E – ASSEMBLY BILL 70

BILL NUMBER: AB 70 CHAPTERED
BILL TEXT

CHAPTER 367

FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE OCTOBER 10, 2007
APPROVED BY GOVERNOR OCTOBER 10, 2007
PASSED THE SENATE SEPTEMBER 11, 2007
PASSED THE ASSEMBLY SEPTEMBER 12, 2007
AMENDED IN SENATE SEPTEMBER 7, 2007
AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 17, 2007
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JUNE 4, 2007
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 11, 2007
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY FEBRUARY 21, 2007

INTRODUCED BY Assembly Member Jones

DECEMBER 4, 2006

An act to add Section 8307 to the Water Code, relating to flood liability.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 70, Jones. Flood liability.

Existing law, under various circumstances, subjects a public entity or an employee of a public entity to liability for property damage or personal injury caused by or from floods or floodwaters. This bill would provide that a city or county may be required to contribute its fair and reasonable share of the property damage caused by a flood to the extent that it has increased the state's exposure to liability for property damage by unreasonably approving, as defined, new development in a previously undeveloped area, as defined, that is protected by a state flood control project, unless the city or county meets specified requirements.

The bill would become operative only if SB 5 is enacted and becomes effective on or before January 1, 2008.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 8307 is added to the Water Code, to read:

8307. (a) A city or county may be required to contribute its fair and reasonable share of the property damage caused by a flood to the extent that the city or county has increased the state's exposure to liability for property damage by unreasonably approving new development in a previously undeveloped area that is protected by a state flood control project. However, a city or county shall not be required to contribute if, after the amendments required by Sections 65302.9 and 65860.1 of the Government Code have become effective, the city or county complies with Sections 65865.5, 65962, and 66474.5 of the Government Code as applicable with respect to that development. This section shall not be construed to extend or toll the statute of limitations for challenging the approval of any new development.

(b) A city or county is not required to contribute unless an action has been filed against the state asserting liability for property damage caused by a flood and the provisions of subdivision (a) providing for

contribution have been satisfied. A city or county is not required to contribute if the state settles the claims against it without providing the city or county with an opportunity to participate in settlement negotiations.

(c) For the purposes of this section:

(1) "State flood control project" means any flood control works within the Sacramento River Flood Control Project described in Section 8350, and of flood control projects in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River watersheds authorized pursuant to Article 2 (commencing with Section 12648) of Chapter 2 of Part 6 of Division 6.

(2) "Undeveloped area" means an area devoted to "agricultural use," as defined in Section 51201 of the Government Code, or "open space land," as defined in Section 65560 of the Government Code, that, as of January 1, 2008, is not already designated for development in a general or specific plan or by a local zoning ordinance.

(3) "Unreasonably approving" means approving a new development project without appropriately considering significant risks of flooding made known to the approving agency as of the time of approval and without taking reasonable and feasible action to mitigate the potential property damage to the new development resulting from a flood.

(4) "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.

(d) This section shall not apply to any land or projects for which an application for development has been submitted to the city or county prior to January 1, 2008.

SECTION. 2. Section 1 of this act shall become operative only if Senate Bill 5 of the 2007-08 Regular Session of the Legislature is enacted and becomes effective on or before January 1, 2008.

Source: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/index.html - (Bill Information)

APPENDIX F – SENATE BILL 5

BILL NUMBER: AB 5CHAPTERED
BILL TEXT

CHAPTER 366

FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE OCTOBER 10, 2007
APPROVED BY GOVERNOR OCTOBER 10, 2007
PASSED THE SENATE SEPTEMBER 11, 2007
PASSED THE ASSEMBLY SEPTEMBER 12, 2007
AMENDED IN SENATE SEPTEMBER 7, 2007
AMENDED IN SENATE SEPTEMBER 4, 2007
AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 21, 2007
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JUNE 6, 2007
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 2, 2007
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 17, 2007

INTRODUCED BY Assembly Member Wolk
(Principal coauthor: Assembly Member Jones)
(Principal coauthors: Senators Florez, Machado, and Steinberg)

DECEMBER 4, 2006

An act to amend Section 11564 of, and to repeal Section 13332.11.1 of the Government Code, to repeal Section 5096.830 of the Public Resources Code, and to amend Sections 8521, 8550, 8551, 8552, 8554, 8575, 8590, 12878, 12878.1, 12878.21, and 12878.23 of, to amend the heading of Part 4 (commencing with Section 8520) of Division 5 of, to add Sections 8306, 8522.3, 8522.5, 8523, 8577, 8578, 8610.5, 8612, 8613, 9625, and 12585.12 to, to add Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 9110) to Part 4 of Division 5 of, to add Part 8 (commencing with Section 9650) to Division 5 of, to repeal Article 8 (commencing with Section 8725) of Chapter 3 of Part 4 of Division 5 of, and to repeal and add Article 2 (commencing with Section 8580) Chapter 2 of Part 4 of Division 5 of, the Water Code, relating to flood management, and making an appropriation therefor.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 5, Wolk. Flood management.

(1) Existing law establishes the 7-member Reclamation Board in the Department of Water Resources. Existing law requires the board members to be appointed and to serve at the pleasure of the Governor. Existing law prescribes compensation for each board member for time
spent attending meetings of the board in the amount of $100, except as specified. Existing law requires the board to elect one of its members as president. Existing law requires the board to appoint a secretary, who may be a board member, and authorizes the board to appoint a general manager, a chief engineer, and an assistant secretary. Existing law authorizes the board to employ certain other employees.

This bill would rename the Reclamation Board the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. The bill would require the board to act independently of the department. The bill would state the intent of the Legislature to transfer the duties and corresponding funding allocated to the Reclamation Board as it exists on December 31, 2007, together with all necessary positions, to the board as it is reconstituted on and after

January 1, 2008. The bill would prohibit the department from overturning any action or decision by the board.

The bill would increase the membership of the board from 7 to 9 members. The bill would require 7 members to be appointed by the Governor, subject to Senate confirmation, 4 of whom would be required to meet specified eligibility requirements and 3 of whom would be designated as public members. The bill would require one board member to be the Chair of the Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water and one board member to be the Chair of the Assembly Committee on Water, Parks and Wildlife, and would designate those 2 members as nonvoting ex officio members. The bill, with a certain exception, would require the board members to serve 4-year terms. The bill would require the board members to receive a salary identical to that received by members of the State Air Resources Board and would incorporate additional changes made by AB 933, which has been chaptered. The bill would require the Governor to select one of the board members as president. The bill would repeal provisions relating to the appointment or employment of specified personnel and, instead, authorize the board to appoint an executive officer and chief engineer and to employ legal counsel and other necessary staff.

(2) Existing law provides that a member of the board having an interest in lands within the drainage district is not disqualified from voting to execute any part of the plans of flood control or from carrying out the objectives of the board.

This bill would instead require that a member of the board comply with specified conflict of interest requirements when voting to carry out any part of a plan of flood control and when carrying out the objectives of certain provisions of law relating to the board. The bill would subject the board members to specified requirements relating to conflict of interest and ex parte communications.

(3) Existing law authorizes the board to engage in various flood control activities along the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River, their tributaries, and related areas.

This bill would prohibit a board member from advocating to a federal agency on behalf of a project that has been or is reasonably anticipated to be submitted to the board for review unless the board authorizes that action in accordance with specified requirements. The bill would require the board to adopt regulations relating to evidentiary hearings and to hold evidentiary hearings to determine any matter that requires the issuance of a permit. The bill would require the board to take action only after allowing public comment and to consider, as applicable, specified matters for the purpose of taking that action in any evidentiary hearing. The bill would authorize the board to collaborate with state and federal agencies, if appropriate, regarding certain multi-objective flood management strategies.

(4) The Department of Water Resources performs various flood control activities throughout the state. Existing law also authorizes the Reclamation Board to engage in various flood control activities along the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River, their tributaries, and related areas. Existing law requires the board to establish and enforce standards for the maintenance and operation of, and to undertake other responsibilities with regard to, flood control works under its jurisdiction. This bill would authorize the department to provide meals and other necessary support to any person engaged in emergency flood fight activities, as defined, on behalf of, or in cooperation with, the department. The bill would require the department, on or before December 31, 2008, to prepare, and the board to adopt, a schedule for mapping areas at risk of flooding in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River drainage. The bill would authorize the board or the department to establish a program of mitigation banking for the activities of the board or the department and for the benefit of local districts in the discharge of specified flood control responsibilities.

The bill would require the department to prepare, and the board to adopt, a flood control system status report, to be updated periodically, for the State Plan of Flood Control, as defined, and to undertake a

related inspection of project levees, as defined. The bill would require the department, on or before September 1, 2010, and on or before September 1 of each year thereafter, to provide written notice to each landowner whose property is determined to be within a levee flood protection zone. The bill would require the department to prepare and maintain maps for levee flood protection zones. The bill would authorize the department to revise the maps to include updated information.

The bill would require, on or before September 30 of each year, a local agency responsible for the operation and maintenance of a project levee to prepare and submit to the department a specified report of information for inclusion in periodic flood management reports prepared by the department. By establishing these requirements on a local agency, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. The bill would require the department, on or before December 31, 2008, to prepare and transmit to the board a report on project levees that are operated and maintained by each local agency using certain information. The bill would specify that a local agency responsible for the operation and maintenance of a project levee may propose to the board an upgrade of the project levee.

(5) Existing law authorizes, on a project-by-project basis, and in accordance with designated plans, state participation in federal flood control projects and specifies the degree of cooperation to be assumed by the state and local agencies in connection with those projects. Existing law, except as otherwise provided, requires the board to give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that local cooperation as required by federal law will be furnished by the state in connection with described flood control projects.

This bill would authorize the department and the board to participate with the federal government or local agencies in the design of environmental enhancements associated with a federal flood control project, and to participate in the construction of environmental enhancements associated with a federal flood control project for which the state has authorized state participation.

(6) Existing law establishes procedures for the assumption of flood control maintenance and operation duties by the department in connection with the formation of a maintenance area on behalf of a federal flood control project unit if the department finds that a unit of a project is not being operate or maintained in accordance with standards established by federal regulations or the governing body of a local agency obligated to operate and maintain that unit by resolution declares that it no longer desires to operate and maintain the unit. Under existing law, the department and the board are not required to form a maintenance area if neither agency has given the nonfederal assurances to the United States required for the project, except as otherwise provided for a project for which an application for the formation of the maintenance area has been submitted on or before July 1, 2003. Existing law prescribes requirements relating to the imposition of assessments on behalf of a maintenance area. Existing law requires the funds generated by the imposition of the assessments to be deposited in the Water Resources Revolving Fund and continuously appropriates those funds to pay the operation and maintenance costs of maintenance areas. Existing law provides for the dissolution of a maintenance area.

This bill would provide for the formation of a maintenance area if the department determines that a project unit is not being operated or maintained in accordance with federal regulations or the modification of a project unit that has been permitted by the board and that provides flood protection is not being operated or maintained in accordance with the requirements established by the board or the department, or if the local agency obligated to operate and maintain the project unit declares that it no longer desires to do so. The bill would provide that, if a maintenance area is formed for a portion of a project unit, any remaining portion of the project unit not included in the maintenance area remains the responsibility of the local agency obligated to operate and maintain that unit. The bill would authorize the board and the department to consolidate maintenance areas that share a common boundary.

The bill would delete the provisions relating to the formation of a maintenance area for a project for which an application for the formation of a maintenance area has been submitted on or before July 1, 2003. The

bill would provide that the department is not required to perform certain work in connection with the formation of a maintenance area requested by a local agency until the local agency requesting the formation of the maintenance area pays to the department an amount of money that reflects certain costs incurred by the department.

The bill would change requirements relating to the imposition of assessments by revising the definition of the term "maintenance" to include work described as maintenance by the board or the department. By expanding the definition of that term to include additional work, the costs of which would be paid on behalf of maintenance areas from the continuous appropriation of funds from the Water Resources Revolving Fund, the bill would make an appropriation.

(7) Under existing law, the department expends or allocates funds on behalf of various flood control projects within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and related areas. This bill, commencing July 1, 2008, would subject the allocation or expenditure of funds by the state for the upgrade of a project levee, if that upgrade is authorized on or after July 1, 2008, that protects an urban area in which more than 1,000 people reside to a requirement that the local agency responsible for the operation and maintenance of the project levee and any city or county protected by the project levee enter into an agreement to adopt a safety plan that includes specified components, within 2 years. If a city or county is responsible for the operation or maintenance of the project levee, the bill would require the governing body to approve a resolution committing to the preparation of a safety plan within 2 years. The bill would define the "upgrade of a project levee" to mean specified improvements, excluding any action undertaken on an emergency basis.
(8) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that with regard to certain mandates no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason. With regard to any other mandates, this bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs so mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to the statutory provisions noted above.

(9) This bill would repeal certain provisions added by AB 156 if AB 156 and this bill are enacted and become operative and other conditions are met.

(10) This bill would repeal a provision added by SB 17 if SB 17 and this bill are enacted and become operative and other conditions are met. Appropriation: yes.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Legislature hereby finds and declares all of the following:

(a) The central valley of this state is experiencing unprecedented development, resulting in the conversion of historically agricultural lands and communities to densely populated residential and urban centers.

(b) The Legislature recognizes that by their nature, levees, which are earthen embankments typically founded on fluvial deposits, cannot offer complete protection from flooding, but can decrease its frequency.

(c) The Legislature recognizes that the level of flood protection afforded rural and agricultural lands by the original flood control system is not considered adequate to protect those lands when developed for urban uses, and that a dichotomous system of flood protection for urban and rural lands has developed through many years of practice.

(d) The Legislature further recognizes that levees built to reclaim and protect agricultural land may be inadequate to protect urban development unless those levees are significantly improved.

(e) Local agencies are primarily responsible for making land use decisions in the state, and the Legislature intends that they retain that lead role.

(f) Local agencies rely upon federal flood plain information when approving developments, but the information available is often out of date and the flood risk may be greater than that indicated using available federal information.

(g) Flood plain management tools such as flood plain mapping, the National Flood Insurance Program, and the designated floodway program, represent important supplemental activities to educate the public about, and protect the public from, flood hazards.

(h) It is necessary for the state to immediately undertake the task of mapping flood plains and submitting up-to-date information to the federal government so that the federal National Flood Insurance Program maps reflect current and accurate conditions. In this way, the public can be provided with reliable information regarding flooding potential, and local agencies can make informed land use and flood management decisions so that the risk to life and property can be effectively reduced.

SECTION 2. Section 11564 of the Government Code is amended to read:

11564. (a) Effective January 1, 1988, an annual salary of twenty-five thousand one hundred eighteen dollars ($25,118) shall be paid to each member of the State Air Resources Board and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, if each member devotes a minimum of 60 hours per month to state board work. The salary shall be reduced proportionately if less than 60 hours per month is devoted to state board work.

(b) The annual compensation provided by this section shall be increased in any fiscal year in which a general salary increase is provided for state employees. The amount of the increase provided by this section shall be comparable to, but shall not exceed, the percentage of the general salary increases provided for state employees during that fiscal year.

(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), any salary increase is subject to Section 11565.5.

SECTION 3. Section 13332.11.1 of the Government Code, as added by Assembly Bill 156 of the 2007-08 Regular Session of the Legislature, is repealed.

SECTION 4. Section 5096.830 of the Public Resources Code, as added by Assembly Bill 156 of the 2007-08 Regular Session of the Legislature, is repealed.

SECTION 5. Section 8306 is added to the Water Code, to read:

8306. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the department may provide meals and other necessary support to any person, including, but not limited to, an employee of the department, who is engaged in emergency flood fight activities on behalf of, or in cooperation with, the department.

(b) For the purposes of this section, "emergency flood fight activities" mean actions taken under emergency conditions to maintain flood control features, the failure of which threaten to destroy life, property, or resources.

SECTION 6. The heading of Part 4 (commencing with Section 8520) of Division 5 of the Water Code is amended to read:

PART 4. THE CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION BOARD

SECTION 7. Section 8521 of the Water Code is amended to read:

8521 "Board" means the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. Any reference to the Reclamation Board in this or any other code means the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.

SECTION 8. Section 8522.3 is added to the Water Code, to read:

8522.3. "Facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control" means the levees, weirs, channels, and other features of the State Plan of Flood Control.

SECTION 9. Section 8522.5 is added to the Water Code, to read:

8522.5. "Project levee" means any levee that is a part of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control.

SECTION 10. Section 8523 is added to the Water Code, to read:

8523. "State Plan of Flood Control" means the state and federal flood control works, lands, programs, plans, policies, conditions, and mode of maintenance and operations of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project described in Section 8350, and of flood control projects in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River watersheds authorized pursuant to Article 2 (commencing with Section 12648) of Chapter 2 of Part 6 of Division 6 for which the board or the department has provided the assurances of nonfederal cooperation to the United States, and those facilities identified in Section 8361.

SECTION 11. Section 8550 of the Water Code is amended to read:

8550. (a) The board is continued in existence and shall continue to exercise and have all of its powers, duties, purposes, responsibilities, and jurisdiction.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the board shall act independently of the department. The department shall not overturn any action or decision by the board.

(c) It is the intent of the Legislature to transfer the duties and corresponding funding allocated to the Reclamation Board as it exists on December 31, 2007, together with all necessary positions, to the board as it is reconstituted on and after January 1, 2008.

SECTION 12. Section 8551 of the Water Code is amended to read:

8551. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (g), the board consists of nine members who shall be appointed in accordance with this section.

(b) (1) Seven members of the board shall be appointed by the Governor, subject to Senate confirmation.

(2) Of the members appointed pursuant to paragraph (1), the following requirements apply:

(A) One person shall be an engineer.

(B) One person shall have training, experience, and expertise in geology or hydrology.

(C) One person shall be a flood control expert with not less than five years' experience.

(D) One person shall be an attorney with water experience.

(E) Three persons shall be public members.

(c) One member of the board shall be the Chair of the Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water, to the extent that service with the board does not conflict with his or her legislative duties.

(d) One member of the board shall be the Chair of the Assembly Committee on Water, Parks and Wildlife, to the extent that service with the board does not conflict with his or her legislative duties.

(e) The members appointed pursuant to subdivisions (c) and (d) shall be nonvoting ex officio members.

(f) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the board members appointed pursuant to subdivision (b) shall serve four-year terms.

(2) The board members initially appointed pursuant to this section shall determine, by lot, that five members shall serve four-year terms and four members shall serve two-year terms.

(g) Each board member holding office on December 31, 2007, shall continue to serve until his or her successor is appointed and has been qualified to hold office. The order of replacement shall be determined by lot.

SECTION 13. Section 8552 of the Water Code is amended to read:

8552. Each member of the board appointed pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 8551 shall receive compensation as follows:

(a) Each member shall receive the necessary expenses incurred by the member in the performance of official duties.

(b) Any member traveling outside the state pursuant to authorization of the board, and the approval of the Governor and Director of Finance as provided by Section 11032 of the Government Code, while so engaged shall receive per diem and his or her necessary expenses.

(c) Each member shall receive the salary provided for in Section 11564 of the Government Code.

SECTION 14. Section 8554 of the Water Code is amended to read:

8554. The Governor shall select one of the members of the board as president.

SECTION 15. Section 8575 of the Water Code is amended to read:

8575. A member of the board shall comply with the conflict of interest requirements of Section 87100 of the Government Code when voting to carry out any part of a plan of flood control and when carrying out the objects of this part.

SECTION 16. Section 8577 is added to the Water Code, to read:

8577. (a) A board member shall not participate in any board action or attempt to influence any decision or recommendation by any employee of, or consultant to, the board that involves himself or herself or that involves any entity with which the member is connected as a director, officer, consultant, or full- or part-time employee, or in which the member has a direct personal financial interest within the meaning of Section 87100 of the Government Code.

(b) A board member shall not participate in any proceeding before any agency as a consultant or in any other capacity on behalf of any person that actively participates in matters before the board.

(c) For a period of 12 months after leaving office, a former board member shall not act as agent or attorney for, or otherwise represent, any other person before the board by making any formal or informal appearance or by making any oral or written communication to the board.

(d) A board member shall not advocate to the United States Army Corps of Engineers or other federal agency on behalf of any project that has been or is reasonably anticipated to be submitted to the board for review, unless the board authorizes that action in accordance with Section 8560.

SECTION 17. Section 8578 is added to the Water Code, to read:

8578. (a) For the purposes of this section, "ex parte communication" means any oral or written communication concerning matters, other than purely procedural matters, under the board's jurisdiction that are subject to a vote.

(b)

(1) No board member nor any person or organization with an interest in board decisions, nor any person representing a person or organization with an interest in board decisions, excluding a staff member of the board acting in his or her official capacity, who intends to influence the decision of a board member on a matter before the board, shall conduct an ex parte communication.

(2) If an ex parte communication occurs, the board member shall notify the interested party that a full disclosure of the ex parte communication shall be entered in the board's record.

(3) Communications cease to be ex parte communications when the board member or the person who engaged in the communication with the board member fully discloses the communication and requests in writing that it be placed in the board's official record of the proceeding.

(c) Notwithstanding Section 11425.10 of the Government Code, the ex parte communications provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (Article 7 (commencing with Section 11430.10) of Chapter 4.5 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code) do not apply to proceedings of the board to which this section applies.

SECTION 18. Article 2 (commencing with Section 8580) of Chapter 2 of Part 4 of Division 5 of the Water Code is repealed.

SECTION 19. Article 2 (commencing with Section 8580) is added to Chapter 2 of Part 4 of Division 5 of the Water Code, to read:

Article 2. Employees

8580. (a) The board may appoint an executive officer.
(b) The board may appoint a chief engineer.
(c) The board may employ legal counsel and other necessary staff.

SECTION 20. Section 8590 of the Water Code is amended to read:

8590. To carry out the primary state interest described in Section 8532, the board may do any of the following:

(a) Acquire either within or outside the boundaries of the drainage district, by purchase, condemnation or by other lawful means in the name of the drainage district, all lands, rights-of-way, easements, property or material necessary or requisite for the purpose of bypasses, weirs, cuts, canals, sumps, levees, overflow channels and basins, reservoirs and other flood control works, and other necessary purposes, including drainage purposes.

(b) Construct, clear, and maintain bypasses, levees, canals, sumps, overflow channels and basins, reservoirs and other flood control works.

(c) Construct, maintain, and operate ditches, canals, pumping plants, and other drainage works.

(d) Make contracts in the name of the drainage district to indemnify or compensate any owner of land or other property for any injury or damage caused by the exercise of the powers conferred by this division, or arising out of the use, taking, or damage of any property for any of the purposes of this division.

(e) Collaborate with state and federal agencies, if appropriate, regarding multi-objective flood management strategies that incorporate agricultural conservation, ecosystem protection and restoration, or recreational components.

SECTION 21. Section 8610.5 is added to the Water Code, to read:

8610.5. (a) (1) The board shall adopt regulations relating to evidentiary hearings pursuant to Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 11400) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

(2) The board shall hold an evidentiary hearing for any matter that requires the issuance of a permit.

(3) The board is not required to hold an evidentiary hearing before making a decision relating to general flood protection policy or planning.

(b) The board may take an action pursuant to Section 8560 only after allowing for public comment.

(c) The board shall, in any evidentiary hearing, consider all of the following, as applicable, for the purpose of taking any action pursuant to Section 8560:

(1) Evidence that the board admits into its record from any party, state or local public agency, or nongovernmental organization with expertise in flood or flood plain management.

(2) The best available science that relates to the scientific issues presented by the executive officer, legal counsel, the department, or other parties that raise credible scientific issues.

(3) Effects of the proposed decision on the entire State Plan of Flood Control.

(4) Effects of reasonably projected future events, including but not limited to, changes in hydrology, climate, and development within the applicable watershed.

SECTION 22. Section 8612 is added to the Water Code, to read:

8612. (a) On or before December 31, 2008, the department shall prepare, and the board shall adopt, a schedule for mapping areas at risk of flooding in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River drainage.

(b) The department shall update the schedule annually and shall present the updated schedule to the board for adoption on or before December 31 of each year. The update shall include the status of mapping in progress and an estimated time of completion. The schedule shall be based on the present and expected future risk of flooding and associated consequences.

SECTION 23. Section 8613 is added to the Water Code, to read:

8613. (a) The board or the department may establish a program of mitigation banking for the activities of the board or the department under this part and for the benefit of local districts in the discharge of their flood control responsibilities under this part and the State Water Resources Law of 1945 (Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 12570) and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 12639) of Part 6 of Division 6).

(b) For the purposes of carrying out subdivision (a), the board or the department, in consultation with all appropriate state, local, and federal agencies with jurisdiction over environmental protection that are authorized to regulate and impose requirements upon the flood control work performed under this part or the State Water Resources Law of 1945 (Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 12570) and Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 12639) of Part 6 of Division 6), may establish a system of mitigation banking by which mitigation credits may be acquired in advance for flood control work to be performed by the board, the department, or a local agency authorized to operate and maintain facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control.

SECTION 24. Article 8 (commencing with Section 8725) of Chapter 3 of Part 4 of Division 5 of the Water Code, as added by Senate Bill 17 of the 2007-08 Regular Session of the Legislature, is repealed.

SECTION 25. Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 9110) is added to Part 4 of Division 5 of the Water Code, to read:

CHAPTER 9. REPORTS

Article 1. Definitions

9110. Unless the context requires otherwise, the definitions set forth in this article govern the construction of this chapter.

(a) "Fiscal year" has the same meaning as that set forth in Section 13290 of the Government Code.

(b) "Levee flood protection zone" means the area, as determined by the board or the department that is protected by a project levee.

(c) "Local agency" means a local agency responsible for the maintenance of a project levee.

(d) "Maintenance" has the same meaning as that set forth in subdivision (f) of Section 12878.

(e) "Project levee" means any levee that is part of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control.

(f) "State Plan of Flood Control" has the same meaning as that set forth in Section 5096.805 of the Public Resources Code.

Article 2. State Reports

9120. (a) The department shall prepare and the board shall adopt a flood control system status report for the State Plan of Flood Control. This status report shall be updated periodically, as determined by the board. For the purposes of preparing the report, the department shall inspect the project levees and review available information to ascertain whether there are evident deficiencies.

(b) The status report shall include identification and description of each facility, an estimate of the risk of levee failure, a discussion of the inspection and review undertaken pursuant to subdivision (a), and appropriate recommendations regarding the levees and future work activities.

(c) On or before December 31, 2008, the board shall advise the Legislature, in writing, as to the board's schedule of implementation of this section.

9121. (a) On or before September 1, 2010, and on or before September 1 of each year thereafter, the department shall provide written notice to each landowner whose property is determined to be entirely or partially within a levee flood protection zone.

(b) The notice shall include statements regarding all of the following:

(1) The property is located behind a levee.

(2) Levees reduce, but do not eliminate, the risk of flooding and are subject to catastrophic failure.

(3) If available, the level of flood risk as described in the flood control system status report described in Section 9120 and a levee flood protection zone map prepared in accordance with Section 9130.

(4) The state recommends that property owners in a levee flood protection zone obtain flood insurance, such as insurance provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency through the National Flood Insurance Program.

(5) Information about purchasing federal flood insurance.

(6) The Internet address of the Web site that contains the information required by the flood management report described in Section 9141.

(7) Any other information determined by the department to be relevant.

(c) A county, with assistance from the department, shall annually provide to the department, by electronic means, lists of names and addresses of property owners in a levee flood protection zone located in that county.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, the department may enter into contracts with private companies to provide the notices required by this section.

9122. The board shall determine the areas benefited by facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control based on information developed by the department.

Article 3. Levee Flood Protection Zone Maps

9130. (a) The department shall prepare and maintain maps for levee flood protection zones. The department shall prepare the maps by December 31, 2008, and shall include in the maps a designation of those lands where flood levels would be more than three feet deep if a project levee were to fail, using the best available information. The maps shall include other flood depth contours if that information is available.

(b) The department shall distribute the levee flood protection zone maps to appropriate governmental agencies, as determined by the department.

(c) The department shall make the maps readily available to the public. The department may charge a fee for the cost of reproducing the maps. To the extent feasible, maps shall be made available on the Internet Web site of the department.

(d) The department may periodically revise the maps to include updated information when that information becomes available.

Article 4. Local Reports

9140. (a) On or before September 30 of each year, a local agency responsible for the operation and maintenance of a project levee shall prepare and submit to the department, in a format specified by the department, a report of information for inclusion in periodic
flood management reports prepared by the department relating to the project levee. The information submitted to the department shall include all of the following:

(1) Information known to the local agency that is relevant to the condition or performance of the project levee.

(2) Information identifying known conditions that might impair or compromise the level of flood protection provided by the project levee.

(3) A summary of the maintenance performed by the local agency during the previous fiscal year.

(4) A statement of work and estimated cost for operation and maintenance of the project levee for the current fiscal year, as approved by the local agency.

(5) Any other readily available information contained in the records of the local agency relevant to the condition or performance of the project levee, as determined by the board or the department.

(b) A local agency described in subdivision (a) that operates and maintains a non-project levee that also benefits land within the boundaries of the area benefited by the project levee shall include information pursuant to subdivision (a) with regard to the non-project
levee.

(c) A local agency that incurs costs for the maintenance or improvement of a project or non-project levee under the delta levee maintenance subventions program established pursuant to Part 9 (commencing with Section 12980) of Division 6 may submit information submitted to satisfy the requirements of that program to meet the requirements of paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), but may do so only for that reach of the levee included in that program.

(d) (1) A local agency responsible for the operation and maintenance of a levee not otherwise subject to this section may voluntarily prepare and submit to the department or the board a flood management report for posting on the Internet Web site of the department or the board.

(2) A flood management report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be made available on the Internet Web site of the board if the local agency is partially or wholly within the geographical boundaries of the board's jurisdiction. Otherwise, the report shall be made available on the Internet Web site of the department.

9141. (a) The department shall prepare and transmit to the board a report on the project levees operated and maintained by each local agency, using information provided by the local agency pursuant to Section 9140 and information from relevant portions of any of the following documents, as determined by the department:

(1) Annual inspection reports on local agency maintenance prepared by the department or the board.

(2) The State Plan of Flood Control.

(3) The flood control system status report described in Section 9120.

(4) The schedule for mapping described in Section 8612.

(5) Any correspondence, document, or information deemed relevant by the department.

(b) The department shall make the flood management report for each local agency available on the Internet Web site of the board and shall provide the report to all of the following entities:

(1) The local agency.

(2) Any city or county within the local agency's jurisdiction.

(3) Any public library located within the local agency's jurisdiction.

(c) The report shall be completed on or before December 31, 2008, and shall be updated annually.

9142. A local agency responsible for the operation and maintenance of a project levee may propose to the board an upgrade of the project levee if the local agency determines that the upgrade is appropriate. The local agency may implement that upgrade if approved by the board.

SECTION 26. Section 9625 is added to the Water Code, to read:

9625. (a) By January 1, 2010, the department shall develop cost-sharing formulas, as needed, for funds made available by the Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006 (Chapter 1.699 (commencing with Section 5096.800) of Division 5 of the Public Resources Code) and the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Division 43 (commencing with Section 75001) of the Public Resources Code) for repairs or improvements of facilities included in the plan to determine the local share of the cost of design and construction.

(b) For qualifying projects pursuant to subdivision (a), the state' s share of the nonfederal share shall be set at a minimum level of 50 percent.

(c) In developing cost-share formulas, the department shall consider the ability of local governments to pay their share of the capital costs of the project.

(d) Prior to finalizing cost-share formulas, the department shall conduct public meetings to consider public comments. The department shall post the draft cost-share formula on its Internet Web site at least 30 days before the public meetings. To the extent feasible, the department shall provide outreach to disadvantaged communities to promote access and participation in the meetings.

SECTION 27. Part 8 (commencing with Section 9650) is added to Division 5 of the Water Code, to read:

PART 8. PROJECT LEVEE UPGRADES

9650. (a) (1) Commencing July 1, 2008, the allocation or expenditure of funds by the state for the upgrade of a project levee, if that upgrade is authorized on or after July 1, 2008, that protects an area in which more than 1,000 people reside shall be subject to a requirement that the local agency responsible for the operation and maintenance of the project levee and any city or county protected by the project levee, including a charter city or charter county, enter into an agreement to adopt a safety plan within two years. If a city or county is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the project levee, the governing body shall approve a resolution committing to the preparation of a safety plan within two years.

(2) The local entity responsible for the operation and maintenance of the project levee shall submit a copy of the safety plan to the department and the Reclamation Board.

(b) The safety plan, at a minimum, shall include all of the following elements:

(1) A flood preparedness plan that includes storage of materials that can be used to reinforce or protect a levee when a risk of failure exists.

(2) A levee patrol plan for high water situations.

(3) A flood-fight plan for the period before state or federal agencies assume control over the flood fight.

(4) An evacuation plan that includes a system for adequately warning the general public in the event of a levee failure, and a plan for the evacuation of every affected school, residential care facility for the elderly, and long-term health care facility.

(5) A floodwater removal plan.

(6) A requirement, to the extent reasonable, that either of the following applies to a new building in which the inhabitants are expected to be essential service providers:

(A) The building is located outside an area that may be flooded.

(B) The building is designed to be operable shortly after the floodwater is removed.

(c) The safety plan shall be integrated into any other local agency emergency plan and shall be coordinated with the state emergency plan.

(d) This section does not require the adoption of an element of the safety plan that was adopted previously and remains in effect.

9651. Unless the context requires otherwise, the definitions set forth in this section govern the construction of this part.

(a) "Emergency plan" and "state emergency plan" have the meanings set forth in subdivisions (a) and (b), respectively, of Section 8560 of the Government Code.

(b) "Essential service providers" includes, but is not limited to, hospitals, fire stations, police stations, and jails.

(c) "Long-term health care facility" has the same meaning as defined in Section 1418 of the Health and Safety Code.

(d) "Project levee" means any levee that is part of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control.

(e) "Residential care facility for the elderly" has the same meaning as defined in Section 1569.2 of the Health and Safety Code.

(f) "School" means a public or private preschool, elementary school, or secondary school or institution.

(g) "State Plan of Flood Control" means the state and federal flood control works, lands, programs, plans, policies, conditions, and mode of maintenance and operations of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project described in Section 8350, and of flood control projects in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River watersheds authorized pursuant to Article 2 (commencing with Section 12648) of Chapter 2 of Part 6 of Division 6 for which the board or the department has provided the assurances of nonfederal cooperation to the United States, and those facilities identified in Section 8361.

(h) (1) "Upgrade of a project levee" means installing a levee underseepage control system, increasing the height or bulk of a levee, installing a slurry wall or sheet pile into the levee, rebuilding a levee because of internal geotechnical flaws, or adding a stability berm.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), an upgrade of a project levee does not include any action undertaken on an emergency basis.

SECTION 28. Section 12585.12 is added to the Water Code, to read:

12585.12. The department and the board may participate with the federal government or local agencies in the design of environmental enhancements associated with a federal flood control project, and may participate in the construction of environmental enhancements associated with a federal flood control project for which the state has authorized state participation.

SECTION 29. Section 12878 of the Water Code is amended to read:

12878. Unless the context otherwise requires, the following definitions apply throughout this chapter:

(a) "Department" means Department of Water Resources.

(b) "Director" means the Director of Water Resources.

(c) "Board" means the State Reclamation Board.

(d) Wherever the words "board or department" or "board or director" are used together in this chapter they shall mean board as to any project in the Sacramento or San Joaquin Valleys or on or near the Sacramento River or the San Joaquin River or any of their tributaries, and department or director as to any project in any other part of the state outside of the jurisdiction of the board.

(e) "Project" means any project that has been authorized pursuant to Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 12639) or Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 12850) and concerning which assurances have been given to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of Agriculture that the state or a political subdivision thereof will operate and maintain the project works in accordance with regulations prescribed by the federal government or any project upon which assurances have been given to the Secretary of the Army and upon which the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, has performed work pursuant to Section 208 of Public Law 780, 83rd Congress, 2nd Session, approved September 3, 1954.

(f) "Maintenance" means work described as maintenance by the federal regulations issued by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Agriculture, the department, or the board for any project.

(g) "Maintenance area" means described or delineated lands that are found by the board or department to be benefited by the maintenance and operation of a particular unit of a project.

(h) "Unit" means any portion of the works of a project designated as a unit by the board or department, other than the works prescribed in Section 8361, or works operated and maintained by the United States.

(i) "Land" includes improvements.

(j) "Local agency" means and includes all districts or other public agencies responsible for the operation of works of any project under Section 8370, Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 12639) or Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 12850) or any other law of this state.

(k) "Cost of operation and maintenance" means, for the purposes of maintenance areas established after July 31, 2004, as the result of relinquishment by a local agency pursuant to Section 12878.1 only, the cost of all maintenance, as defined in subdivision (f), and shall also include, but is not limited to, all of the following costs:

(1) All costs incurred by the department or the board in the formation of the maintenance area under this chapter.

(2) Any costs, if deemed appropriate by the department, to secure insurance covering liability to others for damages arising from the maintenance activities of the department or from flooding in the maintenance area.

(3) Any costs of defending any action brought against the state, the department, or the board, or any employees of these entities, for damages arising from the maintenance activities of the department or from flooding in the maintenance area.

(4) Any costs incurred in the payment of any judgment or settlement of an action against the state, the department, or the board, or any employees of these entities, for damages arising from the formation of the maintenance area or from any maintenance activities of the department or flooding in the maintenance area.

SECTION 30. Section 12878.1 of the Water Code is amended to read:

12878.1.(a) If the department determines that a unit of a project is not being operated or maintained in accordance with the standards established by federal regulations , if the department determines that the modification of a unit of a project that has been permitted by the board and that provides flood protection is not being operated or maintained in accordance with the requirements established by the board or the department, or if the governing body of a local agency obligated to operate and maintain that unit by resolution duly adopted and filed with the department declares that it no longer desires to operate and maintain the project unit, the department shall prepare a statement to that effect specifying in detail the particular items of work necessary to be done in order to comply with the standards of the federal government and the requirements of the board or the department together with an estimate of the cost thereof for the current fiscal year and for the immediately ensuing fiscal year.

(b) Subject to subdivision (c), but notwithstanding any other provision of law, the board or the department is not required to proceed in accordance with subdivision (a) or with the formation of a maintenance area under this chapter if neither the board nor the department has given the nonfederal assurances to the United States required for the project. If neither the board nor the department has given the nonfederal assurances to the United States required for
the project, the board or department may elect to proceed with the formation if it determines that the formation of a maintenance area is in the best interest of the state.

(c) If a local agency requests the department to form a maintenance area by resolution duly adopted and filed with the department, the department shall estimate the cost of preparing the statement of necessary work and the cost thereof, and all other applicable costs incurred by the department before the formation of the maintenance area. The department shall submit that estimate to the local agency. The

department is not required to perform any additional work to form that maintenance area until the local agency pays the department the amount estimated pursuant to this subdivision.

SECTION 31. Section 12878.21 of the Water Code is amended to read:

12878.21. Upon the formation of a maintenance area, the department shall thereafter operate and maintain the unit until such time as the maintenance area may be dissolved pursuant to this chapter. If the board or the department forms a maintenance area for a portion of a unit of a project, any remaining portion of the unit of a project not included in the maintenance area shall remain the responsibility of the local agency obligated to operate and maintain that unit.

SECTION 32. Section 12878.23 of the Water Code is amended to read:

12878.23. (a) The board or the department may modify the boundaries of any established maintenance area or zones within the maintenance area, the description of works to be maintained within the maintenance area, and the determination of relative benefits within any zone, upon its own initiative or upon petition by the governing body of the local agency formerly responsible for the operation and maintenance of the unit or by the board of supervisors of the county in which all or a portion of the unit is located.

(b) The board or the department may consolidate maintenance areas that share a common boundary.

SECTION 33. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code. However, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains other costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

SECTION 34. Section 3 of this bill shall only become operative if AB 156 and this bill are enacted and become operative, AB 156 adds Section 13332.11.1 to the Government Code, and this bill is enacted last.

SECTION 35. Section 4 of this bill shall only become operative if AB 156 and this bill are enacted and become operative, AB 156 adds Section 5096.830 to the Public Resources Code, and this bill is enacted last.

SECTION 36. Section 24 of this bill shall only become operative if SB 17 and this bill are enacted and become operative, SB 17 adds Article 8 (commencing with Section 8725) to Chapter 3 of Part 4 of Division 5 of the Water Code, and this bill is enacted last.

Source: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/index.htm I - (Bill Information)

APPENDIX G – SENATE BILL 1240

BILL NUMBER: SB 1241 CHAPTERED
BILL TEXT

CHAPTER 311

FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE SEPTEMBER 13, 2012
PASSED THE SENATE AUGUST 27, 2012
PASSED THE ASSEMBLY AUGUST 23, 2012
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JUNE 25, 2012
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JUNE 7, 2012
AMENDED IN SENATE MAY 29, 2012
AMENDED IN SENATE MAY 3, 2012
AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 24, 2012
AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 10, 2012

INTRODUCED BY Senator Kehoe

FEBRUARY 23, 2012

An act to amend Sections 65302 and 65302.5 of, and to add Sections 65040.20 and 66474.02 to, the Government Code, and to add Section 21083.01 to the Public Resources Code, relating to land use.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1241, Kehoe. Land use: general plan: safety element: fire hazard impacts.

(1) The Planning and Zoning Law requires the legislative body of a city or county to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan that includes various elements, including, among others, a safety element for the protection of the community from unreasonable risks associated with, among other things, wildland and urban fires. The safety element includes requirements for state responsibility areas, as defined, and very high fire hazard severity zones, as defined. This bill would revise the safety element requirements for state responsibility areas and very high fire hazard severity zones, as specified, and require the safety element, upon the next revision of the housing element on or after January 1, 2014, to be reviewed and updated as necessary to address the risk of fire in state responsibility areas and very high fire hazard severity zones, taking into account specified considerations, including, among others, the most recent version of the Office of Planning and Research's "Fire Hazard Planning" document. The bill would also require the office to, at the next update of its general plan guidelines, include these provisions, or a reference to these provisions and any other materials related to fire hazards or fire safety it deems appropriate. By imposing new duties on a city or county with regard to reviewing and updating its general plan, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

(2) The Subdivision Map Act requires the legislative body of a city or county to deny approval of a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, unless it makes certain findings. This bill would require the legislative body of a county to make 3 specified findings before approving a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, for an area located in a state responsibility area or a very high fire hazard severity zone, as defined. The bill would provide that this provision does not supersede the requirements of local ordinances and specified regulations that provide equivalent or more stringent minimum requirements.

(3) The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency to prepare and certify the completion of an environmental impact report on a project, as defined, that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment, or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA requires the Office of Planning and Research to prepare and develop guidelines for the implementation of CEQA by public agencies. This bill would require the office, on or after January 1, 2013, at the time of the next update of the guidelines for implementing CEQA, in cooperation with the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, to prepare, develop, and transmit to the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency recommended proposed changes or amendments to the initial study checklist for the inclusion of questions related to fire hazard impacts for projects in state responsibility areas and very high fire hazard severity zones. The bill would also require the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency to certify and adopt these recommended proposed changes or amendments.

(4) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement. This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 65040.20 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65040.20. The Office of Planning and Research, when it adopts its next edition of the general plan guidelines pursuant to Section 65040.2, shall include the provisions of, or a reference to, paragraph (3) of subdivision (g) of Section 65302, and any other materials related to fire hazards or fire safety it deems appropriate.

SECTION 2. Section 65302 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65302. The general plan shall consist of a statement of development policies and shall include a diagram or diagrams and text setting forth objectives, principles, standards, and plan proposals. The plan shall include the following elements:

(a) A land use element that designates the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of the land for housing, business, industry, open space, including agriculture, natural resources, recreation, and enjoyment of scenic beauty, education, public buildings and grounds, solid and liquid waste disposal facilities, and other categories of public and private uses of land. The location and designation of the extent of the uses of the land for public and private uses shall consider the identification of land and natural resources pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (d). The land use element shall include a statement of the standards of population density and building intensity recommended for the various districts and other territory covered by the plan. The land use element shall identify and annually review those areas covered by the plan that are subject to flooding 91 identified by flood plain mapping prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the Department of Water Resources. The land use element shall also do both of the following:

(1) Designate in a land use category that provides for timber production those parcels of real property zoned for timberland production pursuant to the California Timberland Productivity Act of 1982 (Chapter 6.7 (commencing with Section 51100) of Part 1 of Division 1 of Title 5).

(2) Consider the impact of new growth on military readiness activities carried out on military bases, installations, and operating and training areas, when proposing zoning ordinances or designating land uses covered by the general plan for land, or other territory adjacent to military facilities, or underlying designated military aviation routes and airspace.

(A) In determining the impact of new growth on military readiness activities, information provided by military facilities shall be considered. Cities and counties shall address military impacts based on information from the military and other sources.

(B) The following definitions govern this paragraph:

(i) "Military readiness activities" mean all of the following:

(I) Training, support, and operations that prepare the men and women of the military for combat.

(II) Operation, maintenance, and security of any military installation.

(III) Testing of military equipment, vehicles, weapons, and sensors for proper operation or suitability for combat use.

(ii) "Military installation" means a base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility for any ship, or other activity under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Defense as defined in paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of Section 2687 of Title 10 of the United States Code.

(b) (1) A circulation element consisting of the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, any military airports and ports, and other local public utilities and facilities, all correlated with the land use element of the plan.

(2) (A) Commencing January 1, 2011, upon any substantive revision of the circulation element, the legislative body shall modify the circulation element to plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways for safe and convenient travel in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the general plan.

(B) For purposes of this paragraph, "users of streets, roads, and highways" mean bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, users of public transportation, and seniors.

(c) A housing element as provided in Article 10.6 (commencing with Section 65580).

(d) (1) A conservation element for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources including water and its hydraulic force, forests, soils, rivers and other waters, harbors, fisheries, wildlife, minerals, and other natural resources. The conservation element shall consider the effect of development within the jurisdiction, as described in the land use element, on natural resources located on public lands, including military installations. That portion of the conservation element including waters shall be developed in coordination with any countywide water agency and with all district and city agencies, including flood management, water conservation, or groundwater agencies that have developed, served, controlled, managed, or conserved water of any type for any purpose in the county or city for which the plan is prepared. Coordination shall include the discussion and evaluation of any water supply and demand information described in Section 65352.5, if that information has been submitted by the water agency to the city or county.

(2) The conservation element may also cover all of the following:

(A) The reclamation of land and waters.

(B) Prevention and control of the pollution of streams and other waters.

(C) Regulation of the use of land in stream channels and other areas required for the accomplishment of the conservation plan.

(D) Prevention, control, and correction of the erosion of soils, beaches, and shores.

(E) Protection of watersheds.

(F) The location, quantity and quality of the rock, sand, and gravel resources.

(3) Upon the next revision of the housing element on or after January 1,2009, the conservation element shall identify rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, riparian habitats, and land that may accommodate floodwater for purposes of groundwater recharge and stormwater management.

(e) An open-space element as provided in Article 10.5 (commencing with Section 65560).

(f) (1) A noise element that shall identify and appraise noise problems in the community. The noise element shall recognize the guidelines established by the Office of Noise Control and shall analyze and quantify, to the extent practicable, as determined by the legislative body, current and projected noise levels for all of the following sources:

(A) Highways and freeways.

(B) Primary arterials and major local streets.

(C) Passenger and freight online railroad operations and ground rapid transit systems.

(D) Commercial, general aviation, heliport, helistop, and military airport operations, aircraft overflights, jet engine test stands, and all other ground facilities and maintenance functions related to airport operation.

(E) Local industrial plants, including, but not limited to, railroad classification yards.

(F) Other ground stationary noise sources, including, but not limited to, military installations, identified by local agencies as contributing to the community noise environment.

(2) Noise contours shall be shown for all of these sources and stated in terms of community noise equivalent level (CNEL) or day-night average level (Ldn). The noise contours shall be prepared on the basis of noise monitoring or following generally accepted noise modeling techniques for the various sources identified in paragraphs (1) to (6), inclusive.

(3) The noise contours shall be used as a guide for establishing a pattern of land uses in the land use element that minimizes the exposure of community residents to excessive noise.

(4) The noise element shall include implementation measures and possible solutions that address existing and foreseeable noise problems, if any. The adopted noise element shall serve as a guideline for compliance with the state's noise insulation standards.

(g) (1) A safety element for the protection of the community from any unreasonable risks associated with the effects of seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, tsunami, seiche, and dam failure; slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides; subsidence; liquefaction; and other seismic hazards identified pursuant to Chapter 7.8(commencing with Section 2690) of Division 2 of the Public Resources Code, and other geologic hazards known to the legislative body; flooding; and wildland and urban fires. The safety element shall include mapping of known seismic and other geologic hazards. It shall also address evacuation routes, military installations, peak load water supply requirements, and minimum road widths and clearances around structures, as those items relate to identified fire and geologic hazards.

(2) The safety element, upon the next revision of the housing element on or after January 1, 2009, shall also do the following:

(A) Identify information regarding flood hazards, including, but not limited to, the following:

(i) Flood hazard zones. As used in this subdivision, "flood hazard zone" means an area subject to flooding that is delineated as either a special hazard area or an area of moderate or minimal hazard on an official flood insurance rate map issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The identification of a flood hazard zone does not imply that areas outside the flood hazard zones or uses permitted within flood hazard zones will be free from flooding or flood damage.

(ii) National Flood Insurance Program maps published by FEMA.

(iii) Information about flood hazards that is available from the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

(iv) Designated floodway maps that are available from the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.

(v) Dam failure inundation maps prepared pursuant to Section 8589.5 that are available from the California Emergency Management Agency.

(vi) Awareness Floodplain Mapping Program maps and 200-year flood plain maps that are or may be available from, or accepted by, the Department of Water Resources.

(vii) Maps of levee protection zones.

(viii) Areas subject to inundation in the event of the failure of project or non-project levees or floodwalls.

(ix) Historical data on flooding, including locally prepared maps of areas that are subject to flooding, areas that are vulnerable to flooding after wildfires, and sites that have been repeatedly damaged by flooding.

(x) Existing and planned development in flood hazard zones, including structures, roads, utilities, and essential public facilities.

(xi) Local, state, and federal agencies with responsibility for flood protection, including special districts and local offices of emergency services.

(B) Establish a set of comprehensive goals, policies, and objectives based on the information identified pursuant to subparagraph (A), for the protection of the community from the unreasonable risks of flooding, including, but not limited to:

(i) Avoiding or minimizing the risks of flooding to new development.

(ii) Evaluating whether new development should be located in flood hazard zones, and identifying construction methods or other methods to minimize damage if new development is located in flood hazard zones.

(iii) Maintaining the structural and operational integrity of essential public facilities during flooding.

(iv) Locating, when feasible, new essential public facilities outside of flood hazard zones, including hospitals and health care facilities, emergency shelters, fire stations, emergency command centers, and emergency communications facilities or identifying construction methods or other methods to minimize damage if these facilities are located in flood hazard zones.

(v) Establishing cooperative working relationships among public agencies with responsibility for flood protection.

(C) Establish a set of feasible implementation measures designed to carry out the goals, policies, and objectives established pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(3) Upon the next revision of the housing element on or after January 1, 2014, the safety element shall be reviewed and updated as necessary to address the risk of fire for land classified as state responsibility areas, as defined in Section 4102 of the Public Resources Code, and land classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, as defined in Section 51177. This review shall consider the advice included in the Office of Planning and Research's most recent publication of "Fire Hazard Planning, General Technical Advice Series" and shall also include all of the following:

(A) Information regarding fire hazards, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

(i) Fire hazard severity zone maps available from the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

(ii) Any historical data on wildfires available from local agencies or a reference to where the data can be found.

(iii) Information about wildfire hazard areas that may be available from the United States Geological Survey.

(iv) General location and distribution of existing and planned uses of land in very high fire hazard severity zones and in state responsibility areas, including structures, roads, utilities, and essential public facilities. The location and distribution of planned uses of land shall not require defensible space compliance measures required by state law or local ordinance to occur on publicly owned lands or open space designations of homeowner associations.

(v) Local, state, and federal agencies with responsibility for fire protection, including special districts and local offices of emergency services.

(B) A set of goals, policies, and objectives based on the information identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) for the protection of the community from the unreasonable risk of wildfire. (C) A set of feasible implementation measures designed to carry out the goals, policies, and objectives based on the information identified pursuant to subparagraph (B) including, but not limited to, all of the following:

(i) Avoiding or minimizing the wildfire hazards associated with new uses of land.

(ii) Locating, when feasible, new essential public facilities outside of high fire risk areas, including, but not limited to, hospitals and health care facilities, emergency shelters, emergency command centers, and emergency communications facilities, or identifying construction

methods or other methods to minimize damage if these facilities are located in a state responsibility area or very high fire hazard severity zone.

(iii) Designing adequate infrastructure if a new development is located in a state responsibility area or in a very high fire hazard severity zone, including safe access for emergency response vehicles, visible street signs, and water supplies for structural fire suppression.

(iv) Working cooperatively with public agencies with responsibility for fire protection.

(D) If a city or county has adopted a fire safety plan or document separate from the general plan, an attachment of, or reference to, a city or county's adopted fire safety plan or document that fulfills commensurate goals and objectives and contains information required pursuant to this paragraph.

(4) After the initial revision of the safety element pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (3), upon each revision of the housing element, the planning agency shall review and, if necessary, revise the safety element to identify new information that was not available during the previous revision of the safety element.

(5) Cities and counties that have flood plain management ordinances that have been approved by FEMA that substantially comply with this section, or have substantially equivalent provisions to this subdivision in their general plans, may use that information in the safety element to comply with this subdivision, and shall summarize and incorporate by reference into the safety element the other general plan provisions or the flood plain ordinance, specifically showing how each requirement of this subdivision has been met.

(6) Prior to the periodic review of its general plan and prior to preparing or revising its safety element, each city and county shall consult the California Geological Survey of the Department of Conservation, the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, if the city or county is located within the boundaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District, as set forth in Section 8501 of the Water Code, and the California Emergency Management Agency for the purpose of including information known by and available to the department, the agency, and the board required by this subdivision.

(7) To the extent that a county's safety element is sufficiently detailed and contains appropriate policies and programs for adoption by a city, a city may adopt that portion of the county's safety element that pertains to the city's planning area in satisfaction of the requirement imposed by this subdivision.

SECTION 3. Section 65302.5 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65302.5.(a) At least 45 days prior to adoption or amendment of the safety element, each county and city shall submit to the California Geological Survey of the Department of Conservation one copy of a draft of the safety element or amendment and any technical studies used for developing the safety element. The division may review drafts submitted to it to determine whether they incorporate known seismic and other geologic hazard information, and report its findings to the planning agency within 30 days of receipt of the draft of the safety element or amendment pursuant to this subdivision. The legislative body shall consider the division's findings prior to final adoption of the safety element or amendment unless the division's findings are not available within the above prescribed time limits or unless the division has indicated to the city or county that the division will not review the safety element. If the division's findings are not available within those prescribed time limits, the legislative body may take the division's findings into consideration at the time it considers future amendments to the safety element. Each county and city shall provide the division with a copy of its adopted safety element or amendments. The division may review adopted safety elements or amendments and report its findings. All findings made by the division shall be advisory to the planning agency and legislative body.

(b) (1) The draft element of or draft amendment to the safety element of a county or a city's general plan shall be submitted to the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection and to every local agency that provides fire protection to territory in the city or county at least 90 days prior to either of the following:

(A) The adoption or amendment to the safety element of its general plan for each county that contains state responsibility areas.

(B) The adoption or amendment to the safety element of its general plan for each city or county that contains a very high fire hazard severity zone as defined pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 51177.

(2) A county that contains state responsibility areas and a city or county that contains a very high fire hazard severity zone as defined pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 51177 shall submit for review the safety element of its general plan to the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection and every local agency that provides fire protection to territory in the city or county in accordance with the following dates, as specified, unless the local government submitted the element within five years prior to that date:

(A) Local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the San Diego Association of Governments: December 31, 2010.

(B) Local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the Southern California Association of Governments: December 31, 2011.

(C) Local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the Association of Bay Area Governments: December 31, 2012.

(D) Local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the Council of Fresno County Governments, the Kern County Council of Governments, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments: June 30, 2013.

(E) Local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments: December 31, 2014.

(F) All other local governments: December 31, 2015.

(3) The State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection shall, and a local agency may, review the draft or an existing safety element and recommend changes to the planning agency within 60 days of its receipt regarding both of the following:

(A) Uses of land and policies in state responsibility areas and very high fire hazard severity zones that will protect life, property, and natural resources from unreasonable risks associated with wildland fires.

(B) Methods and strategies for wildland fire risk reduction and prevention within state responsibility areas and very high fire hazard severity zones.

(4) Prior to the adoption of its draft element or draft amendment, the board of supervisors of the county or the city council of a city shall consider the recommendations, if any, made by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection and any local agency that provides fire protection to territory in the city or county. If the board of supervisors or city council determines not to accept all or some of the recommendations, if any, made by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection or local agency, the board of supervisors or city council shall communicate in writing to the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection or the local agency, its reasons for not accepting the recommendations.

(5) If the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection's or local agency's recommendations are not available within the time limits required by this section, the board of supervisors or city council may act without those recommendations. The board of supervisors or city council shall take the recommendations into consideration the next time it considers amendments to the safety element.

SECTION 4. Section 66474.02 is added to the Government Code, to read:

66474.02.(a) Before approving a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, for an area located in a state responsibility area or a very high fire hazard severity zone, as both are defined in Section 51177, a legislative body of a county shall make the following three findings:

(1) A finding supported by substantial evidence in the record that the design and location of each lot in the subdivision, and the subdivision as a whole, are consistent with any applicable regulations adopted by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection pursuant to Sections 4290 and 4291 of the Public Resources Code.

(2) A finding supported by substantial evidence in the record that structural fire protection and suppression services will be available for the subdivision through any of the following entities:

(A) A county, city, special district, political subdivision of the state, or another entity organized solely to provide fire protection services that is monitored and funded by a county or other public entity.

(B) The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection by contract entered into pursuant to Section 4133, 4142, or 4144 of the Public Resources Code.

(3) A finding that to the extent practicable, ingress and egress for the subdivision meets the regulations regarding road standards for fire equipment access adopted pursuant to Section 4290 of the Public Resources Code and any applicable local ordinance.

(b) This section shall not supersede regulations established by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection or local ordinances that provide equivalent or more stringent minimum requirements than those contained within this section.

SECTION 5. Section 21083.01 is added to the Public Resources Code, to read:

21083.01.(a) On or after January 1, 2013, at the time of the next review of the guidelines prepared and developed to implement this division pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 21083, the Office of Planning and Research, in cooperation with the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, shall prepare, develop, and transmit to the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency recommended proposed changes or amendments to the initial study checklist of the guidelines implementing this division for the inclusion of questions related to fire hazard impacts for projects located on lands classified as state responsibility areas, as defined in Section 4102, and on lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, as defined in subdivision (i) of Section 51177 of the Government Code.

(b) Upon receipt and review, the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency shall certify and adopt the recommended proposed changes or amendments prepared and developed by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to subdivision (a).

SECTION 6. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code.

Source: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/index.html - (Bill Information)

APPENDIX H – SENATE BILL 1278

BILL NUMBER: SB 1278 CHAPTERED
BILL TEXT

CHAPTER 553

FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE SEPTEMBER 25, 2012
APPROVED BY GOVERNOR SEPTEMBER 25, 2012
PASSED THE SENATE AUGUST 23, 2012
PASSED THE ASSEMBLY AUGUST 22, 2012
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY AUGUST 20, 2012
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JUNE 12, 2012
AMENDED IN SENATE MAY 29, 2012
AMENDED IN SENATE MAY 1, 2012
AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 19, 2012
AMENDED IN SENATE MARCH 29, 2012

INTRODUCED BY Senator Wolk

FEBRUARY 23, 2012

An act to amend Sections 65007, 65302.9, 65860.1, and 65865.5 of the Government Code, and to amend Section 9610 of the Water Code, relating to land use.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1278, Wolk. Planning and zoning: flood protection: Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley.

(1) Existing law requires each city and county within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley to amend its general plan, as specified, within 24 months of the adoption of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. Existing law requires the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, the Department of Water Resources, and local flood agencies to collaborate with cities or counties by providing the cities and counties with information and other technical assistance to assist with complying with these requirements. This bill would instead require each city and county to amend its general plan, as specified, within 24 months of July 2, 2013.

(2) Existing law prohibits a city or county within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley from entering into a development agreement for property that is located in a flood hazard zone unless the city or county makes specified findings, including, among others, that certain conditions have been imposed by the city or county.

This bill would additionally authorize a city or county to make a finding that the property in an undetermined risk area, as defined, has met the urban level of flood protection, as specified.

(3) Existing law requires the Department of Water Resources to develop preliminary maps for the 100- and 200-year flood plains protected by project levees, as specified, and to provide the preliminary maps to cities and counties within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley.

This bill would additionally require the department, on or before July 2, 2013, to release floodplain maps, as specified, and the available data as to the water surface elevation of flooding in urban areas, as specified.

The bill would provide that the department's issuance of floodplain maps are not subject to, among other things, the California Environmental Quality Act and the California Endangered Species Act. This bill would provide that the state or any state agency is not liable for any claim based upon the exercise or performance of a discretionary or ministerial function or duty pursuant to these provisions, as specified.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 65007 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65007. As used in this title, the following terms have the following meanings, unless the context requires otherwise:

(a) "Adequate progress" means all of the following:

(1) The total project scope, schedule, and cost of the completed flood protection system have been developed to meet the appropriate standard of protection.

(2) (A) Revenues that are sufficient to fund each year of the project schedule developed in paragraph (1) have been identified and, in any given year and consistent with that schedule, at least 90 percent of the revenues scheduled to be received by that year have been appropriated and are currently being expended.

(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), for any year in which state funding is not appropriated consistent with an agreement between a state agency and a local flood management agency, the Central Valley Flood Protection Board may find that the local flood management agency is making adequate progress in working toward the completion of the flood protection system.

(3) Critical features of the flood protection system are under construction, and each critical feature is progressing as indicated by the actual expenditure of the construction budget funds.

(4) The city or county has not been responsible for a significant delay in the completion of the system.

(5) The local flood management agency shall provide the Department of Water Resources and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board with the information specified in this subdivision sufficient to determine substantial completion of the required flood protection. The local flood management agency shall annually report to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board on the efforts in working toward completion of the flood protection system.

(b) "Central Valley Flood Protection Plan" has the same meaning as that set forth in Section 9612 of the Water Code.

(c) "Developed area" has the same meaning as that set forth in Section 59.1 of Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

(d) "Flood hazard zone" means an area subject to flooding that is delineated as either a special hazard area or an area of moderate hazard on an official flood insurance rate map issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The identification of flood hazard zones does not imply that areas outside the flood hazard zones, or uses permitted within flood hazard zones, will be free from flooding or flood damage.

(e) "National Federal Emergency Management Agency standard of flood protection" means the level of flood protection that is necessary to withstand flooding that has a 1-in-100 chance of occurring in any given year using criteria developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency for application in the National Flood Insurance Program.

(f) "Nonurbanized area" means a developed area or an area outside a developed area in which there are fewer than 10,000 residents that is not an urbanizing area.

(g) "Project levee" means any levee that is part of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control.

(h) "Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley" means lands in the bed or along or near the banks of the Sacramento River or San Joaquin River, or their tributaries or connected therewith, or upon any land adjacent thereto, or within the overflow basins thereof, or upon land susceptible to overflow therefrom. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley does not include lands lying within the Tulare Lake basin, including the Kings River.

(i) "State Plan of Flood Control" has the same meaning as that set forth in subdivision (j) of Section 5096.805 of the Public Resources
Code.

(j) "Tulare Lake basin" means the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region as defined in the California Water Plan Update 2009, prepared by the Department of Water Resources pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 10004) of Part 1.5 of Division 6 of the Water Code.

(k) "Undetermined risk area" means an urban or urbanizing area within a moderate flood hazard zone, as delineated on an official flood insurance rate map issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which has not been determined to have an urban level of protection.

(l) "Urban area" means a developed area in which there are 10,000 residents or more.

(m) "Urbanizing area" means a developed area or an area outside a developed area that is planned or anticipated to have 10,000 residents or more within the next 10 years.

(n) "Urban level of flood protection" means the level of protection that is necessary to withstand flooding from a leveed riverine system that has a 1-in-200 chance of occurring in any given year using criteria consistent with, or developed by, the Department of Water Resources. "Urban level of flood protection" shall not mean shallow flooding or flooding from local drainage that meets the criteria of the national Federal Emergency Management Agency standard of flood protection.

SECTION 2. Section 65302.9 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65302.9.(a) Within 24 months of July 2, 2013, each city and county within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley shall amend its general plan to contain all of the following:

(1) (A) The data and analysis contained in the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan pursuant to Section 9612 of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, the locations of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control and the locations of the real property protected by those facilities.

(B) The locations of flood hazard zones, including, but not limited to, locations mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map or the Flood Hazard Boundary Map, locations that participate in the National Flood Insurance Program, locations of undetermined risk areas, and locations mapped by a local flood agency or flood district.

(2) Goals, policies, and objectives, based on the data and analysis identified pursuant to paragraph (1), for the protection of lives and property that will reduce the risk of flood damage.

(3) Feasible implementation measures designed to carry out the goals, policies, and objectives established pursuant to paragraph (2).

(b) An undetermined risk area shall be presumed to be at risk during flooding that has a 1-in-200 chance of occurring in any given year unless deemed otherwise by the State Plan of Flood Control, an official National Flood Insurance Program rate map issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or a finding made by a city or county based on a determination of substantial evidence by a local flood agency.

(c) To assist each city or county in complying with this section, the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, the Department of Water Resources, and local flood agencies shall collaborate with cities or counties by providing them with information and other technical assistance.

(d) In implementing this section, each city and county, both general law and charter, within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, shall comply with this article, including, but not limited to, Sections 65300.5, 65300.7, 65300.9, and 65301.

(e) Notwithstanding any other law, this section shall apply to all cities, including charter cities, and counties within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley. The Legislature finds and declares that flood protection in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers drainage areas is a matter of statewide concern and not a municipal affair as that term is used in Section 5 of Article XI of the California Constitution.

(f) This section shall not be construed to limit or remove any liability of a city or county prior to the amendment of the general plan except as provided in Section 8307 of the Water Code.

SECTION 3. Section 65860.1 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65860.1. (a) Not more than 12 months after the amendment of its general plan pursuant to Section 65302.9, each city and county within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley shall amend its zoning ordinance so that it is consistent with the general plan, as amended.

(b) Notwithstanding any other law, this section shall apply to all cities, including charter cities, and counties within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley. The Legislature finds and declares that flood protection in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers drainage areas is a matter of statewide concern and not a municipal affair as that term is used in Section 5 of Article XI of the California Constitution.

(c) This section shall not be construed to limit or remove any liability of a city or county prior to the amendment of the zoning ordinance except as provided in Section 8307 of the Water Code.

SECTION 4. Section 65865.5 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65865.5.(a) Notwithstanding any other law, after the amendments required by Sections 65302.9 and 65860.1 have become effective, the legislative body of a city or county within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley shall not enter into a development agreement for property that is located within a flood hazard zone unless the city or county finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, one of the following:

(1) The facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control or other flood management facilities protect the property to the urban level of flood protection in urban and urbanizing areas or the national Federal Emergency Management Agency standard of flood protection in nonurbanized areas.

(2) The city or county has imposed conditions on the development agreement that will protect the property to the urban level of flood protection in urban and urbanizing areas or the national Federal Emergency Management Agency standard of flood protection in nonurbanized areas.

(3) The local flood management agency has made adequate progress on the construction of a flood protection system that will result in flood protection equal to or greater than the urban level of flood protection in urban or urbanizing areas or the national Federal Emergency Management Agency standard of flood protection in nonurbanized areas for property located within a flood hazard zone, intended to be protected by the system. For urban and urbanizing areas protected by project levees, the urban level of flood protection shall be achieved by 2025.

(4) The property in an undetermined risk area has met the urban level of flood protection based on substantial evidence in the record.

(b) The effective date of amendments referred to in this section shall be the date upon which the statutes of limitation specified in subdivision (c) of Section 65009 have run or, if the amendments and any associated environmental documents are challenged in court, the validity of the amendments and any associated environmental documents has been upheld in a final decision.

(c) This section does not change or diminish existing requirements of local flood plain management laws, ordinances, resolutions, or regulations necessary to local agency participation in the national flood insurance program.

SECTION 5. Section 9610 of the Water Code is amended to read:

9610. (a) (1) By July 1, 2008, the department shall develop preliminary maps for the 100- and 200-year flood plains protected by project levees. The 100-year flood plain maps shall be prepared using criteria developed or accepted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

(2) The department shall use available information from the 2002 Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study, preliminary and regulatory FEMA flood insurance rate maps, recent flood plain studies, and other sources to compile preliminary maps.

(3) The department shall provide the preliminary maps to cities and counties within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley for use as best available information relating to flood protection.

(4) The department shall post this information on the board's Internet Web site and may periodically update the maps as necessary.

(b) By July 1, 2008, the department shall give notice to cities in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley outside areas protected by project levees regarding maps and other information as to flood risks available from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or another federal, state, or local agency.

(c) On or before December 31, 2010, the department shall prepare a status report on the progress and development of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan pursuant to Section 9612. The department shall post this information on the board's Internet Web site, and make it available to the public.

(d) (1) On or before July 2, 2013, and for the purpose of providing information to cities and counties necessary for their determinations relating to level of flood protection, the department shall release flood plain maps that identify at a minimum the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control and the available data as to the water surface elevation of flooding in urban areas in the event of the failure of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control during flooding that has a 1-in-200 chance of occurring in any given year.

(2) Concurrent with the release of these maps and for the purpose of assisting local agencies in determining their level or flood protection, the department shall make available levee reliability data for the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control identified in the maps.

(e) The department's issuance of flood plain maps shall not be subject to any of the following:

(1) The review and approval of the Office of Administrative Law or to any other requirements of Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

(2) The California Environmental Quality Act or any other requirement of Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code.

(3) The California Endangered Species Act or any other requirement of Chapter 1.5 (commencing with Section 2050) of Division 3 of the Fish and Game Code.

(f) The state, or any state agency, shall not be liable for any claim based upon the exercise or performance of a discretionary or ministerial function or duty on the part of a state agency or a state employee or officer in carrying out this section.

Source: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/index.html - (Bill Information)

APPENDIX I - ASSEMBLY BILL 1965

BILL NUMBER: AB 1965 CHAPTERED
BILL TEXT

CHAPTER 554

FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE SEPTEMBER 25, 2012
APPROVED BY GOVERNOR SEPTEMBER 25, 2012
PASSED THE SENATE AUGUST 31, 2012
PASSED THE ASSEMBLY AUGUST 31, 2012
AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 29, 2012
AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 6, 2012
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 24, 2012
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 9, 2012

INTRODUCED BY Assembly Member Pan
(Principal coauthor: Senator Wolk)

FEBRUARY 23, 2012

An act to amend Section 65007 of the Government Code, and to amend Section 9610 of the Water Code, relating to land use.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1965, Pan. Land use.

Existing law requires the Department of Water Resources to develop preliminary maps for the 100- and 200-year flood plains protected by project levees, as specified, and to provide the preliminary maps to cities and counties within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley

This bill would additionally require the department, on or before July 2, 2013, to release floodplain maps, as specified, and the available data as to the water surface elevation of flooding in urban areas, as specified. The bill would provide that the department's issuance of floodplain maps are not subject to the review and approval of the Office of Administrative Law, as specified. The bill would provide that the state or any state agency is not liable for any claim based upon the reasonable exercise or performance of a discretionary or ministerial function or duty pursuant to this provision. The bill would incorporate additional changes pursuant to SB 1278, as specified.

This bill would become operative only if SB 1278 is enacted and takes effect on or before January 1, 2013, and this bill is enacted last.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 65007 of the Government Code is amended to read:

65007. As used in this title, the following terms have the following meanings, unless the context requires otherwise:

(a) "Adequate progress" means all of the following:

(1) The total project scope, schedule, and cost of the completed flood protection system have been developed to meet the appropriate standard of protection.

(2) (A) Revenues that are sufficient to fund each year of the project schedule developed in paragraph (1) have been identified and, in any given year and consistent with that schedule, at least 90 percent of the revenues scheduled to be received by that year have been appropriated and are currently being expended.

(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), for any year in which state funding is not appropriated consistent with an agreement between a state agency and a local flood management agency, the Central Valley Flood Protection Board may find that the local flood management agency is making adequate progress in working toward the completion of the flood protection system.

(3) Critical features of the flood protection system are under construction, and each critical feature is progressing as indicated by the actual expenditure of the construction budget funds.

(4) The city or county has not been responsible for a significant delay in the completion of the system.

(5) The local flood management agency shall provide the Department of Water Resources and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board with the information specified in this subdivision sufficient to determine substantial completion of the required flood protection. The local flood management agency shall annually report to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board on the efforts in working toward completion of the flood protection system.

(b) "Central Valley Flood Protection Plan" has the same meaning as that set forth in Section 9612 of the Water Code.

(c) "Developed area" has the same meaning as that set forth in Section 59.1 of Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

(d) "Flood hazard zone" means an area subject to flooding that is delineated as either a special hazard area or an area of moderate hazard on an official flood insurance rate map issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The identification of flood hazard zones does not imply that areas outside the flood hazard zones, or uses permitted within flood hazard zones, will be free from flooding or flood damage.

(e) "National Federal Emergency Management Agency standard of flood protection" means the level of flood protection that is necessary to withstand flooding that has a 1-in-100 chance of occurring in any given year using criteria developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency for application in the National Flood Insurance Program.

(f) "Nonurbanized area" means a developed area or an area outside a developed area in which there are fewer than 10,000 residents that is not an urbanizing area.

(g) "Project levee" means any levee that is part of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control.

(h) "Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley" means lands in the bed or along or near the banks of the Sacramento River or San Joaquin River, or their tributaries or connected therewith, or upon any land adjacent thereto, or within the overflow basins thereof, or upon land susceptible to overflow therefrom. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley does not include lands lying within the Tulare Lake basin, including the Kings River.

(i) "State Plan of Flood Control" has the same meaning as that set forth in subdivision (j) of Section 5096.805 of the Public Resources Code.

(j) "Tulare Lake basin" means the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region as defined in the California Water Plan Update 2009, prepared by the Department of Water Resources pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 10004) of Part 1.5 of Division 6 of the Water Code.

(k) "Undetermined risk area" means an urban or urbanizing area within a moderate flood hazard zone, as delineated on an official flood insurance rate map issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which has not been determined to have an urban level of protection.

(l) "Urban area" means a developed area in which there are 10,000 residents or more.

(m) "Urbanizing area" means a developed area or an area outside a developed area that is planned or anticipated to have 10,000 residents or more within the next 10 years.

(n) "Urban level of flood protection" means the level of protection that is necessary to withstand flooding that has a 1-in-200 chance of occurring in any given year using criteria consistent with, or developed by, the Department of Water Resources. "Urban level of flood protection" shall not mean shallow flooding or flooding from local drainage that meets the criteria of the national Federal Emergency Management Agency standard of flood protection.

SECTION 2. Section 9610 of the Water Code is amended to read:

9610. (a) (1) By July 1, 2008, the department shall develop preliminary maps for the 100- and 200-year flood plains protected by project levees. The 100-year flood plain maps shall be prepared using criteria developed or accepted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

(2) The department shall use available information from the 2002 Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study, preliminary and regulatory FEMA flood insurance rate maps, recent flood plain studies, and other sources to compile preliminary maps.

(3) The department shall provide the preliminary maps to cities and counties within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley for use as best available information relating to flood protection.

(4) The department shall post this information on the board's Internet Web site and may periodically update the maps as necessary.

(b) By July 1, 2008, the department shall give notice to cities in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley outside areas protected by project levees regarding maps and other information as to flood risks available from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or another federal, state, or local agency.

(c) On or before December 31, 2010, the department shall prepare a status report on the progress and development of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan pursuant to Section 9612. The department shall post this information on the board's Internet Web site, and make it available to the public.

(d) (1) On or before July 2, 2013, and for the purpose of providing information to cities and counties necessary for their determinations relating to level of flood protection, the department shall release flood plain maps that identify at a minimum the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control and the available data

as to the water surface elevation of flooding in urban areas in the event of the failure of the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control during flooding that has a 1-in-200 chance of occurring in any given year.

(2) Concurrent with the release of these maps and for the purpose of assisting local agencies in determining their level of flood protection, the department shall make available levee reliability data for the facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control identified in the maps.

(e) The department's issuance of flood plain maps shall not be subject to the review and approval of the Office of Administrative Law or to any other requirements of Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

(f) The state, or any state agency, shall not be liable for any claim based upon the reasonable exercise or performance of a discretionary or ministerial function or duty on the part of a state agency or a state employee or officer in carrying out subdivision (d).

SECTION 3. This act shall become operative only if Senate Bill 1278 is enacted and takes effect on or before January 1, 2013, and this bill is enacted last.

Source: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/index.html - (Bill Information)

APPENDIX J - SHMP OUTREACH CONTACTS

CALIFORNIA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS (MPOs)	
1	Association of Bay Area Governments
2	Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
3	Butte County Association of Governments
4	Calaveras Council of Governments
5	Coachella Valley Association of Governments
6	Contra Costa Transportation Authority
7	Council of Fresno County Governments
8	Council of San Benito County Governments
9	El Dorado County Transportation Committee
10	Humboldt County Association of Governments
11	Kern Council of Governments
12	Kings County Association of Governments
13	Lake County/City Area Planning Council
14	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
15	Madera County Transportation Committee
16	Mendocino Council of Governments
17	Merced County Association of Governments
18	Metropolitan Transportation Authority
19	Orange County Transportation Authority
20	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
21	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
22	San Bernardino Associated Governments
23	San Diego Association of Governments
24	San Joaquin Council of Governments
25	San Luis Obispo Council of Governments
26	Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
27	Southern California Association of Governments
28	Stanislaus Council of Governments
29	Tulare County Association of Governments

CALIFORNIA CITIES AND COUNTIES

1	City of Adelanto	25	City of Avenal	49	City of Dana Point
2	City of Agoura Hills	26	City of Azusa	50	City of Danville
3	City of Alameda	27	City of Bakersfield	51	City of Half Moon Bay
4	City of Albany	28	City of Baldwin Park	52	City of Hanford
5	City of Alhambra	29	City of Banning	53	City of Hawaiian Gardens
6	City of Aliso Viejo	30	City of Barstow	54	City of Hawthorne
7	City of Alturas	31	City of Beaumont	55	City of Blythe
8	City of Amador City	32	City of Bell	56	City of Bradbury
9	City of American Canyon	33	City of Bell Gardens	57	City of Brawley
10	City of Anaheim	34	City of Bellflower	58	City of Brea
11	City of Anderson	35	City of Belmont	59	City of Brentwood
12	City of Angels Camp	36	City of Belvedere	60	City of Brisbane
13	City of Antioch	37	City of Benicia	61	City of Buellton
14	City of Apple Valley	38	City of Berkeley	62	City of Buena Park
15	City of Arcadia	39	City of Beverly Hills	63	City of Burbank
16	City of Arcata	40	City of Big Bear Lake	64	City of Burlingame
17	City of Arroyo Grande	41	City of Biggs	65	City of Calabasas
18	City of Artesia	42	City of Bishop	66	City of Calexico
19	City of Arvin	43	City of Blue Lake	67	City of California City
20	City of Atascadero	44	City of Cudahy	68	City of Calimesa
21	Town of Atherton	45	City of Culver City	69	City of Calipatria
22	City of Atwater	46	City of Cupertino	70	City of Calistoga
23	City of Auburn	47	City of Cypress	71	City of Camarillo
24	City of Avalon	48	City of Daly City	72	City of Campbell

73	City of Canyon Lake	98	City of Colusa	123	City of Dublin
74	City of Capitola	99	City of Commerce	124	City of Dunsmuir
75	City of Carlsbad	100	City of Compton	125	City of East Palo Alto
76	City of Carmel-by-the-Sea	101	City of Concord	126	City of El Cajon
77	City of Carpinteria	102	City of Corcoran	127	City of El Centro
78	City of Carson	103	City of Corning	128	City of El Cerrito
79	City of Cathedral City	104	City of Corona	129	City of El Monte
80	City of Ceres	105	City of Coronado	130	City of El Segundo
81	City of Cerritos	106	City of Corte Madera	131	City of Elk Grove
82	City of Chico	107	City of Costa Mesa	132	City of Emeryville
83	City of Chino	108	City of Cotati	133	City of Encinitas
84	City of Chino Hills	109	City of Covina	134	City of Escalon
85	City of Chowchilla	110	City of Crescent City	135	City of Escondido
86	City of Chula Vista	111	City of Davis	136	City of Etna
87	City of Citrus Heights	112	City of Del Mar	137	City of Eureka
88	City of Claremont	113	City of Del Rey Oaks	138	City of Exeter
89	City of Clayton	114	City of Delano	139	City of Fairfax
90	City of Clearlake	115	City of Desert Hot Springs	140	City of Fairfield
91	City of Cloverdale	116	City of Diamond Bar	141	City of Farmersville
92	City of Clovis	117	City of Dinuba	142	City of Ferndale
93	City of Coachella	118	City of Dixon	143	City of Fillmore
94	City of Coalinga	119	City of Dorris	144	City of Firebaugh
95	City of Colfax	120	City of Dos Palos	145	City of Folsom
96	City of Colma	121	City of Downey	146	City of Fontana
97	City of Colton	122	City of Duarte	147	City of Fort Bragg

148	City of Fort Jones	173	City of Hemet	198	City of Ione
149	City of Fortuna	174	City of Hercules	199	City of Irvine
150	City of Foster City	175	City of Hermosa Beach	200	City of Irwindale
151	City of Fountain Valley	176	City of Hesperia	201	City of Isleton
152	City of Fowler	177	City of Hidden Hills	202	City of Jackson
153	City of Fremont	178	City of Highland	203	City of Kerman
154	City of Fresno	179	City of Hillsborough	204	City of King City
155	City of Fullerton	180	City of Hollister	205	City of Kingsburg
156	City of Galt	181	City of Holtville	206	City of La Cañada Flintridge
157	City of Garden Grove	182	City of Los Gatos	207	City of La Habra
158	City of Gardena	183	City of Loyalton	208	City of La Habra Heights
159	City of Gilroy	184	City of Lynwood	209	City of La Mesa
160	City of Glendale	185	City of Madera	210	City of La Mirada
161	City of Glendora	186	City of Malibu	211	City of La Palma
162	City of Goleta	187	Town of Mammoth Lakes	212	City of La Puente
163	City of Gonzales	188	City of Hughson	213	City of La Quinta
164	City of Grand Terrace	189	City of Huntington Beach	214	City of La Verne
165	City of Grass Valley	190	City of Huntington Park	215	City of Lafayette
166	City of Greenfield	191	City of Huron	216	City of Laguna Beach
167	City of Gridley	192	City of Imperial	217	City of Laguna Hills
168	City of Grover Beach	193	City of Imperial Beach	218	City of Laguna Niguel
169	City of Guadalupe	194	City of Indian Wells	219	City of Laguna Woods
170	City of Gustine	195	City of Indio	220	City of Lake Elsinore
171	City of Hayward	196	City of Industry	221	City of Lake Forest
172	City of Healdsburg	197	City of Inglewood	222	City of Lakeport

223	City of Lakewood	248	City of Maricopa	273	City of Moorpark
224	City of Lancaster	249	City of Marina	274	City of Moraga
225	City of Larkspur	250	City of Martinez	275	City of Moreno Valley
226	City of Lathrop	251	City of Marysville	276	City of Morgan Hill
227	City of Lawndale	252	City of Maywood	277	City of Morro Bay
228	City of Lemon Grove	253	City of McFarland	278	City of Mount Shasta
229	City of Lemoore	254	City of Mendota	279	City of Mountain View
230	City of Lincoln	255	City of Menifee	280	City of Murrieta
231	City of Lindsay	256	City of Menlo Park	281	City of Napa
232	City of Live Oak	257	City of Merced	282	City of National City
233	City of Livermore	258	City of Mill Valley	283	City of Needles
234	City of Livingston	259	City of Millbrae	284	City of Nevada City
235	City of Lodi	260	City of Milpitas	285	City of Newark
236	City of Loma Linda	261	City of Mission Viejo	286	City of Newman
237	City of Lomita	262	City of Modesto	287	City of Newport Beach
238	City of Lompoc	263	City of Monrovia	288	City of Norco
239	City of Long Beach	264	City of Montague	289	City of Norwalk
240	Town of Loomis	265	City of Pleasanton	290	City of Novato
241	City of Los Alamitos	266	City of Plymouth	291	City of Oakdale
242	City of Los Altos	267	City of Point Arena	292	City of Oakland
243	City of Los Altos Hills	268	City of Montclair	293	City of Oakley
244	City of Los Angeles	269	City of Monte Sereno	294	City of Oceanside
245	City of Los Banos	270	City of Montebello	295	City of Ojai
246	City of Manhattan Beach	271	City of Monterey	296	City of Ontario
247	City of Manteca	272	City of Monterey Park	297	City of Orange

298	Orange Cove	323	City of Placentia	348	City of Rio Dell
299	City of Orinda	324	City of Placerville	349	City of Rio Vista
300	City of Orland	325	City of Pleasant Hill	350	City of Ripon
301	City of Oroville	326	City of Pomona	351	City of Riverbank
302	City of Oxnard	327	City of Port Hueneme	352	City of Riverside
303	City of Pacific Grove	328	City of Porterville	353	City of Rocklin
304	City of Pacifica	329	City of Portola	354	City of Rohnert Park
305	City of Palm Desert	330	City of Portola Valley	355	City of Rolling Hills
306	City of Palm Springs	331	City of Poway	356	City of Rolling Hills Estates
307	City of Palmdale	332	City of Rancho Cordova	357	City of Rosemead
308	City of Palo Alto	333	City of Rancho Cucamonga	358	City of Roseville
309	City of Palos Verdes Estates	334	City of Rancho Mirage	359	City of Ross
310	City of Paradise	335	City of Rancho Palos Verdes	360	City of Sacramento
311	City of Paramount	336	City of Rancho Santa Margarita	361	City of St. Helena
312	City of Parlier	337	City of Red Bluff	362	City of Salinas
313	City of Pasadena	338	City of Redding	363	City of San Anselmo
314	City of Paso Robles	339	City of Redlands	364	City of San Bernardino
315	City of Patterson	340	City of Sausalito	365	City of San Bruno
316	City of Perris	341	City of Scotts Valley	366	City of San Carlos
317	City of Petaluma	342	City of Redondo Beach	367	City of San Clemente
318	City of Pico Rivera	343	City of Redwood City	368	City of San Diego
319	City of Piedmont	344	City of Reedley	369	City of San Dimas
320	City of Pinole	345	City of Rialto	370	City of San Fernando
321	City of Pismo Beach	346	City of Richmond	371	City of San Francisco
322	City of Pittsburg	347	City of Ridgecrest	372	City of San Gabriel

373	City of San Jacinto	398	City of Santee	423	City of Suisun City
374	City of San Joaquin	399	City of Saratoga	424	City of Sunnyvale
375	City of San Jose	400	City of Seal Beach	425	City of Susanville
376	City of San Juan Bautista	401	City of Seaside	426	City of Sutter Creek
377	City of San Juan Capistrano	402	City of Sebastopol	427	City of Taft
378	City of San Leandro	403	City of Selma	428	City of Tehachapi
379	City of San Luis Obispo	404	City of Shafter	429	City of Tehama
380	City of San Marcos	405	City of Shasta Lake	430	City of Temecula
381	City of San Marino	406	City of Sierra Madre	431	City of Temple City
382	City of San Mateo	407	City of Winters	432	City of Thousand Oaks
383	City of San Pablo	408	City of Woodlake	433	Town of Tiburon
384	City of San Rafael	409	City of Signal Hill	434	City of Torrance
385	City of San Ramon	410	City of Simi Valley	435	City of Tracy
386	City of Sand City	411	City of Solana Beach	436	City of Trinidad
387	City of Sanger	412	City of Soledad	437	City of Truckee
388	City of Santa Ana	413	City of Solvang	438	City of Tulare
389	City of Santa Barbara	414	City of Sonoma	439	City of Tulelake
390	City of Santa Clara	415	City of Sonora	440	City of Turlock
391	City of Santa Clarita	416	City of South El Monte	441	City of Tustin
392	City of Santa Cruz	417	City of South Gate	442	City of Twentynine Palms
393	City of Santa Fe Springs	418	City of South Lake Tahoe	443	City of Ukiah
394	City of Santa Maria	419	City of South Pasadena	444	City of Union City
395	City of Santa Monica	420	City of South San Francisco	445	City of Upland
396	City of Santa Paula	421	City of Stanton	446	City of Vacaville
397	City of Santa Rosa	422	City of Stockton	447	City of Vallejo

448	City of Ventura	473	City of Woodland	498	County of Lassen
449	City of Vernon	474	City of Woodside	499	County of Los Angeles
450	City of Victorville	475	City of Yorba Linda	500	County of Madera
451	City of Villa Park	476	Town of Yountville	501	County of Marin
452	City of Visalia	477	City of Yreka	502	County of Mariposa
453	City of Vista	478	City of Yuba City	503	County of Mendocino
454	City of Walnut	479	City of Yucaipa	504	County of Merced
455	City of Walnut Creek	480	City of Yucca Valley	505	County of Modoc
456	City of Wasco	481	County of Alameda	506	County of Mono
457	City of Waterford	482	County of Alpine	507	County of Monterey
458	City of Watsonville	483	County of Amador	508	County of Napa
459	City of Weed	484	County of Butte	509	County of Nevada
460	City of West Covina	485	County of Calaveras	510	County of Orange
461	City of West Hollywood	486	County of Colusa	511	County of Placer
462	City of West Sacramento	487	County of Contra Costa	512	County of Plumas
463	City of Westlake Village	488	County of Del Norte	513	County of Riverside
464	City of Westminster	489	County of El Dorado	514	County of Sacramento
465	City of Westmorland	490	County of Fresno	515	County of San Benito
466	City of Wheatland	491	County of Glenn	516	County of San Bernardino
467	City of Whittier	492	County of Humboldt	517	County of San Diego
468	City of Wildomar	493	County of Imperial	518	County of San Francisco
469	City of Williams	494	County of Inyo	519	County of San Joaquin
470	City of Willits	495	County of Kern	520	County of San Luis Obispo
471	City of Willows	496	County of Kings	521	County of San Mateo
472	Town of Windsor	497	County of Lake	522	County of Santa Barbara

523 County of Santa Clara

524 County of Santa Cruz

525 County of Shasta

526 County of Sierra

527 County of Siskiyou

528 County of Solano

529 County of Sonoma

530 County of Stanislaus

531 County of Sutter

532 County of Tehama

533 County of Trinity

534 County of Tulare

535 County of Tuolumne

536 County of Ventura

537 County of Yolo

538 County of Yuba

Statewide Business, Professional and Private Sector Nonprofit and Related Associations			
1	Association of Contingency Planners - Los Angeles Chapter	22	Association of California Water Agencies
2	Association of Contingency Planners - San Francisco/Bay Area Chapter	23	Association of Contingency Planners
3	AECOM	24	Association of Contingency Planners - Orange County Chapter
4	Agricultural Council of California	25	Association of Contingency Planners - Sacramento Chapter
5	Alliance of Insurance Agents and Brokers	26	Association of Contingency Planners - San Diego Chapter
6	American Institute of Architects - California Council	27	Association of Environmental Professionals
7	American Insurance Association	28	Association of Regional Center Agencies
8	American Planning Association - California Chapter	29	Automobile Club of Southern California
9	American Red Cross	30	BFP Engineers, Inc.
10	American Society of Civil Engineers	31	Business and Industry Council for Emergency Planning and Preparedness (BICEPP)
11	American Society of State Floodplain Managers	32	Business Executives for National Security (BENS)
12	Americorps Vista	33	Business Recovery Managers Association
13	Associated Builders and Contractors of California - Central California Chapter	34	California American Water
14	Associated Builders and Contractors of California - Golden Gate Chapter	35	California Association for Local Economic Development
15	Associated Builders and Contractors of California - Los Angeles/Venture Chapter	36	California Association of Councils of Government
16	Associated Builders and Contractors of California - San Diego Chapter	37	California Association of Independent Business
17	Associated Builders and Contractors of California - Southern California Chapter	38	California Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies
18	Associated California Self-Insured Businesses	39	California Association of Nonprofits
19	Association of Bay Area Governments	40	California Association of Port Authorities
20	Association of California Insurance Companies	41	California Association of Realtors
21	Association of California Surety Companies	42	California Association of Urban League Executives - Greater Sacramento Urban

43	California Association of Urban League Executives - Los Angeles Urban League	65	California Housing Authorities Association
44	California Association of Urban League Executives - San Diego Urban League	66	California Housing Council
45	California Association Public Hospitals & Health Systems	67	California Independent Bankers/Independent Comm.
46	California Automotive Business Coalition	68	California Independent Grocers Association
47	California Bankers Association	69	California ISO
48	California Black Chamber of Commerce	70	California Lodging Industry Association
49	California Building Industry Association	71	California Manufacturers & Technology Association
50	California Business Roundtable	72	California Mortgage Association
51	California Cable & Telecom Association	73	California Mortgage Bankers Association
52	California Central Valley Flood Control Association	74	California Motor Car Dealers Association
53	California Chamber of Commerce	75	California Municipal Utilities Association
54	California Council for Environmental & Economic Balance	76	California Newspaper Publishers Association
55	California Earthquake Authority	77	California Police Chiefs' Association
56	California Emergency Services Association	78	California Professional Firefighters
57	California Farm Bureau Federation	79	California Redevelopment Association
58	California Financial Services Association	80	California Retailers Association
59	California Fire Chiefs Association	81	California Self-Insurers Association
60	California Fire Safe Council	82	California Sierra Club
61	California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce	83	California Small Business Association/Council
62	California Historical Society	84	California Special Districts Association
63	California Hospital Association	85	California State Association of Counties
64	California Hotel & Lodging Association	86	California Tahoe Conservancy

87	California Taxpayers' Association	93	CH2M HILL
88	California Travel Industry Association	94	Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy
89	CaliforniaVolunteers	95	Community Outreach Promoting Emergency (COPE) Preparedness
90	California Water Association	96	CYS Structural Engineers, Inc.
91	California Water Service Company	97	Degenkolb Engineers
92	Caltrans	98	Earthquake Engineering Research Institute

APPENDIX K - WORKING GROUP REPORTS

CROSS-SECTOR COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGIC WORKING GROUP
2011 END OF YEAR REPORT

Recommendations for Action:

The Cross-Sector Communications Strategic Working Group has been striving to build collaboration between state and local governments, business associations, and other private sector organizations to increase California's long-term resiliency. After several outreach efforts and working group discussions during 2011, it is recommended that the Cross-Sector Communications Strategic Working Group continue developing appropriate messaging and collaborating with key organizations to identify effective forums for facilitating a dialogue regarding hazard mitigation planning. Specific recommendations are:

1. **Identify, clarify, and refine custom messages for key stakeholder groups**. Several groups have been identified with the initial priority given to elected officials. Local planners, agricultural workers, the firefighting community, etc will each respond more effectively to a mitigation message tailored to their efforts.

2. **Prepare and provide materials for identified key organizations to disseminate to their membership.** These materials are recommended to include custom messages that will resonate with the audience regarding how mitigation programs will benefit them. The materials may be articles for newsletters, flyers for distribution at conferences, announcements for large email distributions, etc.

3. **Offer custom presentations (at conferences or similar association meetings) to promote mitigation programs to key stakeholder groups.** Several contacts with key organizations have been established (below) and may be utilized for scheduling presentation opportunities. In person or webinar presentations allow for dialogue between the Working Group and the key stakeholders. These conversations will help the Working Group evaluate the effectiveness of the custom mitigation messages.

4. **Integrate custom messaging into the Cal EMA Hazard Mitigation Web Portal.** The website should be clear and easy to use by local, private, and non-profit stakeholders. Many tools for planning and implementing mitigation programs are available on the Cal EMA Hazard Mitigation Web Portal. The Work Group can help organize these tools and integrate custom messaging to make them more meaningful to key stakeholders.

5. **Support the other work groups.** The Cross-Sector Communications Strategic Work Group has established contacts with several statewide public and private organizations. Through these associations, the Cross-Sector Communications Strategic Work Group Work Group may support the GIS TAWC, the Land Use, and the Progress Monitoring work groups by conducting outreach, preparing materials, and soliciting input (i.e. success stories) useful for their objectives.

Established Contacts:

The Cross-Sector Communications Strategic Work Group initially prioritized reaching out to local elected officials. As a result, the following organizations were identified as those that are statewide with a majority membership of local elected officials. Points of contact and identified opportunities for collaboration are included for reference in continuing the Working Group's efforts.

California State Association of Counties
Karen Keene, CSAC Senior Legislative Representative

1100 K Street, Ste 101
Sacramento, CA 95814
kkeene@counties.org
916.327.7500
http://www.csac.counties.org/
Summary of Opportunities: Karen Keene organized an opportunity for Ken Worman, State Hazard Mitigation Officer, Cal EMA, to give a presentation titled "Ensuring Resilient Local Infrastructure through Hazard Mitigation" to the annual meeting of public works directors on December 1, 2011. CSAC also has a regular publication which could host an article regarding mitigation.

League of California Cities
Dorothy Holzem
1400 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
dholzem@cacities.org
916.658.8200
http://cacities.org/
Summary of Opportunities: The Working group published an article titled "Disaster Mitigation Planning Builds Sustainable Communities" in Western City, a monthly magazine distributed to the membership, in October, 2011. The League of Cities hosts an annual meeting which may be an opportunity to give a presentation to elected officials regarding the importance of hazard mitigation planning.

Regional Council of Rural Counties
Cyndi Hillery, Legislative Advocate
1215 K Street, Suite 1650
Sacramento CA 95814
chillery@rcrcnet.org
916.447. 4806
http://www.rcrcnet.org/rcrc/
Summary of Opportunities: The Regional Council issues a weekly newsletter. The Working Group may be able to give a presentation to the Board of Directors. The Council may be able to send representatives to future Cross-Sector Communications Working Group meetings.

Floodplain Management Association
Iovanka Todt
iovanka_todt@floodplain.org
http://www.floodplain.org/
Summary of Opportunities: The next annual conference will be September 4- 8, 2012 in Sacramento, CA. The Floodplain Management Association holds monthly luncheons that feature an educational speaker. Hazard mitigation planning could be a topic for one of these luncheons in 2012. Additionally, FMA could publish an article which gets disseminated to the membership.

Cross-Sector Communication Strategic Working Group Overview:

The participants of the Cross-Sector Working Group span national and state agencies, private sector professional associations, and local government representatives. The intent of this group is to answer questions such as:

- How is the State Hazard Mitigation Plan being used?
- How do stakeholders prioritize mitigation related activities?

At the start of 2011, the Cross-Sector Communication Strategic Working Group (Working Group) set out to increase awareness of hazard mitigation planning among local communities as well as the private sector.

This group discussed the definitions of mitigation, response, and recovery; how they differ; and what they mean to various stakeholders in the private and local government sectors. The Working Group brainstormed slogans that could be used to advertise hazard mitigation planning such as "Anticipate! Mitigate! What's your Plan?" The Working Group also discussed alternative terminology since the term "mitigation" is an unfamiliar concept; terms such as "sustainable resiliency" are more mainstream and comprehensible among the general population.

There are currently several tools and assistance resources provided by Cal EMA to support local hazard mitigation planning. The Working Group was posed with the question of how best to utilize these tools and increase awareness. It was expressed that the State could provide guidance on which hazards affect different geographies within the state for local planners to know which hazards are relevant. The Working Group agreed there is value in working as a statewide umbrella organization to pool resources and advocate for hazard mitigation planning. In addition, it was recognized that the SHMP is useful to the various stakeholders in different ways. For that reason, the Working Group realized that messaging and communication outreach should be tailored to a somewhat specific audience.

Cross-Sector Communications Working Group Objectives:

1. Encourage/promote/facilitate mitigation communications across organization boundaries between public-private sectors and statewide-local levels
2. Expand awareness of/commitment to hazard mitigation among government and private sector organizations
3. Establish new communication channels for multiple purposes through systematically organized outreach

2011 Working Group History:

Over the course of one year, the Cross-Sector Communications Working Group met four times on a quarterly basis. Meeting records for these meetings are included in Appendix A of the 2013 SHMP. The fourth meeting of the Cross-Sector Communications Working Group was part of a full State Hazard Mitigation Team meeting on October 25, 2011 where each group reported their annual progress. Cal EMA issued a YouTube video in March, 2011 which announced the adoption of the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and discusses its importance. In May, 2011, the Working Group issued a statewide email blast to an exhaustive list of public and private sector stakeholders announcing the adoption of the plan and presenting a link to the YouTube video. The executive summary of the State Hazard Mitigation Plan was finalized in September, 2011 after concerted efforts to emphasize the relevance of the state plan to local governments. In October, 2011 the article "Disaster Mitigation Planning Builds Sustainable Communities" was published as an online feature to Western City magazine (http://www.westerncity.com/Western-City/October-2011/Disaster-Mitigation-Planning-Builds-Sustainable-Communities/). In December, 2011 Ken Worman will be addressing county public works directors with a talk titled "Ensuring Resilient Local Infrastructure through Hazard Mitigation".

Through these efforts, the Cross-Sector Communications Work Group has identified several means of distributing the message to local and private sector stakeholders. These include issuing press releases, speaking at conferences or professional association meetings, and developing one-page flyers for specific stakeholder groups and the State Hazard Mitigation Plan (SHMP) Executive Summary. It was noted that there is something in the SHMP for everyone and the messaging may need to be tailored to different stakeholder groups. It was suggested that a user guide be developed for the SHMP.

Key Themes, Interests, and Issues:

The Work Group identified several potential stakeholder groups which may require specific messaging with regard to why hazard mitigation planning is relevant to them. The identified groups include:

- Individual/Private Homeowners
- Elected Officials
- Emergency Managers
- City Planners
- Agricultural Community
- Disaster Corps
- Community Emergency Response Teams
- Private Sector

Of these groups, the Work Group agreed the priority stakeholders are Elected Officials due to their influence in driving mitigation planning at the local level. For this reason, CSAC, the League of Cities, the Regional Council of Rural Counties, and the Floodplain Management Association have been identified as key organizations for the initial outreach efforts.

The Work Group brainstormed many ideas/topics to include in the stakeholder outreach. These are listed here for reference in developing future flyers or presentations. These ideas/topics are the key points that will inform and resonate with key stakeholders.

- Using the SHMP to inform CEQA reviews and EIRs
- Explaining what California is doing as an "enhanced" state
- Outlining the benefits of the SHMP
- Describing how the SHMP is a resource for completing local hazard mitigation plans
- Exploring grant and funding opportunities (Seismic Safety Commission and CEA)
- Accomplishing smaller, do-able mitigation actions for local jurisdictions
- Providing financial incentives (i.e., mitigation reduces response and recovery costs)
- Assisting local jurisdictions to identify current actions contributing to mitigation
- Discussing resiliency as a pertinent concept for the private sector (COOP)
- Posting State websites and resources with information regarding hazards and mitigation practices
- Publicizing local mitigation success stories
- Attending upcoming workshops
- Contacting Cal EMA for mitigation planning assistance

Through all of the discussions and solicitation for input, the Cross-Sector Communications Working Group confirmed the following points which will guide future coordination efforts.

1. Mitigation reduces response and recovery costs
2. Mitigation saves lives and investments
3. Mitigation success relies on a local champion to make it happen
4. People don't relate to the word Mitigation, so we need to convey the concept using different words such as "Sustainable resiliency". Further work needs to be done to establish consistent terminology used across the state that stakeholders will recognize.

LAND USE MITIGATION STRATEGIC WORKING GROUP REPORT
2011 END OF YEAR REPORT

Recommendations for Action

The key challenge that emerged from the Working Group is how to integrate many parallel planning efforts that support hazard mitigation and planning for more sustainable communities.

Most regional planning efforts to enhance sustainability focus on incorporating smart growth principles into regional land use plans. These principles are aimed at more compact development whereby residences, workplaces and transportation systems are integrated to reduce reliance on vehicles. The intended outcome is the reduction of transportation related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions whereby each community or region can do its part to address sustainability on a global level.

By contrast, hazard mitigation efforts typically focus on local safety and resiliency based on natural disaster threats such as earthquake, flood and wildfire. This duality means that land plans that are best suited for reducing GHG emissions may not be well suited to (or may be in conflict with) land use plans designed to reduce vulnerability to natural hazards.

Recognizing these inherent challenges, the Working Group formulated 10 specific recommendations for practical actions that can be implemented now:

Primary Recommendations:

1. *Develop regional hazard mitigation strategies through or in concert with the preparation of SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategies*.
2. *Encourage local hazard mitigation plans (LHMPS) and special districts to tie into these regional hazard mitigation strategies. In addition, encourage the regional agencies to integrate local hazard mitigation efforts into their regional plans.*
3. *Continue to encourage the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) to add hazard mitigation as a priority grant-eligible planning activity supporting resilient and sustainable growth planning.*

Additional Recommendations:

1. *Prioritize mitigation projects on a regional level such that they benefit multiple communities e.g. money spent on regional flood control benefits many communities.*
2. *Add a safety element update requirement to the General Plan guidelines and require consistency with LHMP efforts*.
3. *Encourage cities and counties to update the safety elements of their General Plans to meet the LHMP requirements rather than writing separate plans.*
4. *Pursue incentives for integration of LHMPs with safety elements involving both Cal EMA and FEMA grant programs.*
5. *Emphasize cost-effectiveness as an important incentive for mitigation actions at the local level.*
6. *Promote the concept of a one-stop mechanism supporting local government pursuit of existing and emerging grant programs.*
7. *Compile and provide easy access to mapping initiatives that support land use and mitigation planning.*

Working Group History

The Land Use Mitigation Strategic Working Group's primary objective is to encourage, promote and facilitate land use based hazard mitigation that will:

- Expand awareness of and commitment to land use mitigation
- Identify best practices in land use mitigation that support sustainability

- Support sustainable growth planning under SB 375
- Understand Flood mitigation planning under AB 162 and SB 5 and the relationship between sustainable growth planning, General Plan Safety Elements, and LHMPs

The Working Group conducted a total of three meetings in 2011 focused specifically on sustainable growth planning under SB 375 and recent flood mitigation legislation involving local and regional hazard mitigation planning[82]. Discussions benefited from the active participation of a diverse group , including representatives from Federal, State, regional agencies (COGs and MPOs), local governments, and emergency managers. Participation of the invited agencies was intended to improve understanding of various mandates and to encourage collaboration in planning.

The Working Group focused on the growing awareness and concern over climate change and its anticipated effects, and how this is playing out in California planning legislation and practice. Awareness of climate change has spawned a flurry of legislation and multi-level planning/work efforts aimed at reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, especially those associated with transportation.

Foremost among these from a land use perspective is SB 375, adopted in 2008 to enhance California's ability to reach its AB 32 goals by promoting good planning with the goal of more sustainable communities. The bill requires the Air Resources Board (ARB) to develop regional GHG emission reduction targets for passenger vehicle for each region covered by one of the State's 18 metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). Each MPO must then prepare a "Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)" that demonstrates how the region will meet its greenhouse gas reduction target through integrated land use, housing and transportation planning.

Much attention is also being given to the potential impacts of global warming – i.e. the frequency and severity of a range of weather events such as heat waves, floods, droughts and storms. In a recently issued report on global warming and extreme weather events, the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) highlighted the need for governments at all levels to reduce vulnerabilities and increase the resilience of their citizens to such events. It also emphasizes that opportunities need to be taken advantage of at every scale – the local scale, the national scale, and the international scale.

Such mitigation efforts are the subject of State legislation and programs. In 2007, the Legislature passed flood legislation aimed at raising public awareness of the potential for catastrophic storm events and addressing the problems of flood protection and liability. These included Senate Bills (SB) 5 and 17, and Assembly Bills (AB) 5, 70 and 156. A sixth bill AB 162, require additional consideration of flood risk in local land use planning throughout California.

[82] Work Group participants included representatives from:
- Regional agencies such as ABAG (Association of Bay Area Governments), San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council, and SACOG (Sacramento Area Council of Governments)
- State agencies such California Emergency Management Association, CGS, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Parks, CalTrans, DWR, HCD, CDFA
- Local agencies such as City of Sacramento
- Federal agencies such as USACE (Corps), FEMA, ACOE
- California Department of Insurance
- California Polytechnic University San Luis Obispo
- Other state universities and colleges
- Strategic Growth Council
- Land use and planning consultants
- California Geological Service (CGS)
- California Seismic Safety Commission
- State Department of Insurance
- Bay Conservation and Development District
- California Coastal Commission

In addition, the Central Valley Flood Protection Act of 2008, enacted by SB5, seeks to address these problems by directing the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) to prepare and adopt a Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) by Mid-2012.

Key Themes, Overview of Agency Actions

Land Use Planning for Hazard Mitigation and Sustainability

Land use planning efforts aimed specifically at reducing GHG emissions (SB 375) can yield very different outcomes than those focused on reducing vulnerability to natural hazards (AB 162, SB 5 and others). Both directives are important for sustainable, resilient communities. This duality has the following consequences:

- Land plans that are best suited for reducing GHG emissions may not be well suited to (or may be in conflict with) land use plans designed to reduce vulnerability to natural hazards. For example, smart growth emphasis on higher density development in existing urban core areas often involves areas that are particularly susceptible to natural hazards such as flooding.
- Awareness and integration of land use based hazard mitigation within California's Sustainable Communities Strategies and other long-range regional planning efforts is at an early phase and is still evolving in practice.
- Land use planning to reduce hazard risk may need to be introduced and/or elevated in priority and needs to be explicitly incorporated into (Smart Growth principles)

SB 375 and the defined objectives for developing Sustainable Communities Strategies currently use GHG reduction as the primary means or measure of enhancing sustainability. However, resilience to natural hazards is also a key aspect of community sustainability. Clearly a community that is vulnerable to devastating losses due to natural hazards, or which suffers repeated losses, is less sustainable than a community where hazard mitigation is prominent in land use planning and development decisions.

As the impacts of climate change intensify, the potential impact of many natural hazards and a community's ability to adapt to and mitigate these hazards will affect long-term physical and economic sustainability. While hazard mitigation may be addressed in environmental review documents accompanying SCS planning programs, focus on avoidance of, or resilience to, natural hazards may increasingly need to move to the forefront of these planning endeavors.

Both the reduction of GHG emissions and mitigating climate change related hazards involve land use decisions. The following summarizes relevant land use planning activities of some of the agencies participating in the Working Group discussions that are moving toward greater integration between sustainability planning and hazard mitigation.

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is the regional planning agency for the nine counties and 101 cities and towns of the San Francisco Bay region which are home to over 7,000,000 people. ABAG is currently in the process of developing a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for the region. Existing infrastructure is a key element and growth is to be focused on infill and more compact development of housing, employment and transportation.

ABAG is considering issues regarding land use and hazard mitigation, and is working to more fully integrate them into their planning framework. Future growth scenarios and hazard areas are often co-located, and urban densification areas are often in potentially hazardous areas, so this is a particularly challenging task.

Three growth scenarios are currently being analyzed. A preferred scenario will be developed and adopted in early 2012.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is the MPO and COG for the Sacramento region. SACOG is preparing the region's first Sustainable Communities Strategy and Regional Transportation Plan that implements SB 375, and anticipates adoption of the plan in 2012.

The Sacramento Valley is one of the most complex hydrologic systems in the world. The majority of the SACOG population is living in a floodplain

The SACOG region adopted its Blueprint Plan in 2005, which set a new land use and transportation pattern for the region, emphasizing compact, transit-oriented infill development that would maximize use of existing investments in transit facilities, increasing the number of people who could live closer to work, school and services. Plan objectives include reducing air pollution, traffic congestion, vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.

Sacramento, the urban center of SACOG subsequently adopted its new 2030 General Plan in 2009, which was based on Blueprint principles. The plan seeks to direct most development to infill areas in the Central City, around light rail stations, and along older commercial corridors that are well-served by transit and tend to be more walkable communities. One of the key implementation measures and environmental mitigation measures is the preparation of a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to identify ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

San Joaquin Valley Region

The San Joaquin Valley Region is made up of eight counties and 62 incorporated cities. Unlike the other major regions in California, the San Joaquin Valley does not have a strong regional planning agency.
There are a number of important opportunities in the future to address hazard mitigation at the local and regional levels in San Joaquin Valley, including the following:

- SB 5 and AB 162 require cities and counties in the San Joaquin Valley to adopt policies and programs consistent with the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan, to be prepared and adopted by 2012.
- The Sustainable Communities Strategies/Alternative Planning Strategies to be prepared by the eight MPOs/COGs in the Valley under the requirements of SB 375 will have to address hazards in the plans themselves or in their companion environmental documents.
- There will be an opportunity to collect and disseminate hazards information in an efficient and standardized manner on a valley-wide basis if a centralized regional data center is created.
- A federal sustainable communities grant to the Smart Valley Places consortium of the 14 large cities in the Valley, commits cities to update their general plans, zoning ordinances, and other planning documents, providing an opportunity to address hazards issues.
- A state Sustainable Communities grant from the Strategic Growth Council similarly commits the smaller Valley cities to update their general plans and other regulations, providing an opportunity to address hazards issues.

There is potential for safety issues to be addressed regionally in these planning efforts. The likelihood of developing an effective regional approach to addressing hazards will depend in large part on the willingness of the Valley's eight counties and 62 cities to create a stronger valley-wide governance structure and centralized data collection and sharing capacity.

Department of Water Resources - 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP)

The Central Valley Flood Protection Act of 2008, enacted by SB5 directs the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Board) to prepare and adopt a Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) by Mid-2012. Work to date includes:

- Identifying regional flood management and related resources problems and opportunities

- Defining planning goals, principles, and objectives
- Formulating management actions to address the planning goals
- Initiating environmental reviews

A comprehensive communication and engagement program has been initiated to work with partners and interested parties, and a number of technical analyses have been initiated as part of the process. Documentation on efforts to date is available at http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/documents.cfm.

The concluding phase of 2012 CVFPP will focus on formulating and comparing different combinations of potential actions to achieve CVFPP goals, articulating a preferred set of actions the State of California (State) can pursue, and developing a phased implementation approach for the 2012 CVFPP recommendations.
When completed, the CVFPP will serve as the framework for Sacramento and San Joaquin River levee improvements. Cities then must make their general plans consistent with the CVFPP within two years following its adoption. Zoning will need to be made consistent within an additional one-year time frame.

Moreover, proposed development approvals, discretionary permits, and subdivision maps must have a finding of urban local flood protection. DWR is working on developing criteria for making the finding, meeting with stakeholders, striving to finalize this by the end of the year.

Strategic Growth Council
The Strategic Growth Council is charged with coordinating the activities of state agencies to improve air and water quality, protect natural resources and agriculture lands, increase the availability of affordable housing, improve infrastructure systems, promote public health, and assist state and local entities in the planning of sustainable communities and meeting AB 32 goals. The goal is a more sustainable California - environmentally, socially, and economically.

Under SB 732, the Council must support the following activities:
1. Identify and review activities and funding programs of member state agencies that may be coordinated to meet the objectives of the Council.
2. Review and comment on the five-year infrastructure plan and the State Environmental Goals and Policy Report.
3. Recommend policies and investment strategies and priorities to the Governor, the Legislature, and to appropriate state agencies to encourage the development of sustainable communities.
4. Provide, fund, and distribute data and information to local governments and regional agencies that will assist in developing and planning sustainable communities.
5. Manage and award grants and loans to support the planning and development of sustainable communities.

Sustainable Communities Planning Grants Program: The Strategic Growth Council is responsible for developing and administering a grant program to promote sustainable communities consistent with SB 732. The program is designed to help local and regional governments meet the challenges of adopting land use plans and integrating strategies in order to transform communities and create long term prosperity. The Natural Resources Agency, working with SGC key staff, under took two separate yet consistent processes to develop grant criteria for each of the SGC grant programs. The SGC convened a technical advisory committee (TAC) for each grant program to provide multi-agency expertise in developing the criteria.

Cal EMA
A Climate Adaptation Policy Guide is currently being prepared by Cal EMA and the CNRA for use by local governments. A key purpose of the guide is to help communities become more resilient through informed local planning leading to reduced losses from climate change impacts such as flooding, severe storms, mudslides, levee failure, wildfires, extreme heat, prolonged drought, and sea level rise.

Conclusions: Next Steps

The Land Use Mitigation Planning Strategic Working Group can continue to improve coordination, cross agency understanding, and provide advocacy in the advancement of formulating policies and practices that will support long term hazard mitigation. Specific tasks for the group in advance of the next State Hazard Mitigation Plan update include the following:

- Assign responsibilities for leadership in advancing work group recommendations
- Build and extend relationships that foster collaboration and policy correlation among agencies
- Track implementation progress
- Monitor legislative changes and agency activity
- Identify challenges and opportunities
- Update strategies and adjust priorities
- Increase engagement with the private sector in mitigation
- Advocate for appropriate mitigation policy and policy integration

MITIGATION PROGRESS INDICATORS AND MONITORING STRATEGIC WORKING GROUP
2011 END OF YEAR REPORT

Recommendations for Action

Defining what constitutes mitigation progress and developing a framework for collecting, documenting, and disseminating that progress has been the central theme addressed by the Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring Strategic Work Group. Discussions have identified a wealth of existing information and data to support mitigation progress tracking.

The challenge moving forward is to refine key baseline data, institutionalize progress tracking, and provide a forum for highlighting and sharing success stories and best practices to support mitigation planning, programs and practices. The following recommended actions represent achievable next steps in this process.

1. **Track mitigation progress on a consistent and continuing basis**. Systematic, easy to access and easy to use reporting tools, such as the SHMP Progress Report Form being developed for the Cal EMA Web Portal will provide for on-going updates on mitigation projects and programs. The form will not only facilitate updating the State Hazard Mitigation Plan on a real-time basis, but can also be a useful tool for collecting mitigation success stories, documenting legislative or regulatory compliance, or announcing new mitigation initiatives.

2. **Seek good examples of mitigation progress that address a variety of hazards and program types.** Three examples addressing the state's primary hazards of earthquake, flood, and wildfire were identified and presented to the Work Group this year. Additional examples should be sought to address the other hazards, specifically those hazards included in MyPlan. Case studies and success stories are sought representing state, local, special district and private sector initiatives.

3. **Request Local Hazard Mitigation Plans (LHMPs) and plan updates include progress reports on status of key state mitigation legislation/requirements**. Local hazard mitigation plans provide our best snapshot of mitigation being implemented by local jurisdictions and special districts. It is difficult to capture and compile the diverse amount of information included in the plans that have been developed to date or to track progress documented in the LHMP updates. Cal EMA should at a minimum request and encourage progress reports on state mitigation mandates be included in LHMPs. Guidance and format for updates would be prepared by Cal EMA and incorporated into on-going mitigation planning trainings. An option could also be to post the guidance and format on the mitigation web portal accompanied by a request to report annually

4. I**ncorporate local and private sector mitigation progress into the 2013 State Hazard Mitigation Plan.** The primary focus of the State Hazard Mitigation Plan is to document mitigation programs carried out by state agencies and guided by state legislation. The plan can be strengthened by integrating local government and private sector mitigation initiatives. The Progress Report Form currently under development is one mechanism for collecting data, another is continuing to identify and document mitigation success stories.

5. **Produce and publish state, local, and private sector mitigation success stories on the Cal EMA Mitigation Web Portal.** Mitigation success stories identified by the Work Groups or other means must be documented and shared with the larger community of mitigation professionals. These examples of effective risk reduction are important tools that can motivate others to undertake similar mitigation efforts to address their community specific hazards. Success stories can document a variety of mitigation initiatives, including specific stand-alone retrofit projects, long-term community-wide programs, and planning processes. Common components of the published success stories could

include a description of the problem being addressed, hazard event history or scope, triggers to action, political commitment, community outreach and support, legislative or regulatory requirements, planning and land use issues, financing incentives and disincentives, results, keys to success, and, lessons learned.

6. **Incorporate mitigation indicators baseline data into Cal EMA GIS or MyPlan.** Several potential sources for baseline data have been identified by the Work Group. Additional research into the structure and quality of these databases must be conducted to determine applicability and appropriateness for incorporation into the mitigation planning and progress monitoring tool kit. These data sources, as described elsewhere in this report represent opportunities to develop inventories of critical facilities and structures and to quantify vulnerability at the local and state level.

7. **Cross-pollinate with other work groups and planning activities.** There are overlapping themes and commonalities between the Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring Strategic Work Group and the Cross Sector Communications, Land Use, and GIS TAWC Strategic Work Groups. The Cross Sector Communications Work Group has access to public and private organizations that can serve as a conduit for identifying mitigation success stories and publicizing results. The Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring Work Group, through the local government mitigation success stories presentations has gained insights into how local governments have used land use planning to support their mitigation objectives, and strengthened the linkages between general plans and local hazard mitigation plans. Sources of mitigation baseline data identified and prioritized by the Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring Work Group can be incorporated into the Cal EMA GIS and MyPlan through the efforts of the GIS TAWC Work Group.

Brief Work Group History

The Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring Strategic Work Group is one of three topic specific work groups formed to explore options for improving the coordination and integration of hazard mitigation related activities in California. The Work Group has been meeting regularly since September 2009 to support the State Hazard Mitigation Plan update process and to develop strategies to identify and document the state's mitigation progress.

The overall purpose statement and objectives initially developed to guide the Work Group discussions remain vital and valid.

Purpose Statement:

To track mitigation progress and record successful outcomes toward increasing California's long-term resiliency.

Objectives:

- Encourage, promote, facilitate, or if necessary, mandate progress monitoring
- Communicate progress in relation to plan goals
- Establish general systems and methods for tracking progress

Process:

The Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring Work Group held quarterly meetings this year in January, April, August and December. Agencies represented at the Work Group meetings includes: California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA), California Department of Insurance (CDI), California Resources Agency (CRA), California Seismic Safety Commission (CSSC), California Utilities Emergency Association (CUEA), Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), Department of General Services (DGS), Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), Department of Transportation (Caltrans), State Lands Commission (SLC), California Earthquake Authority (CEA), Rural Counties Association (RCA),

Business Recovery Managers Association (BRMA), California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly), University of California, Davis (UCD), United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

Key Themes, Interests and Issues

At the outset of the year, the Work Group adopted four focus areas to guide its work for the year, based on recommendations included in the 2010 SHMP. Each of the focus areas was addressed to some degree as described below. However, early in the year the primary focus shifted from identifying and collecting state agency data, to a greater emphasis on how best to incorporate local mitigation efforts into progress monitoring.

Select Types of Mitigation Units to be Measured:

Considerable discussion was held at the January Work Group Meeting to develop a framework for defining and collecting mitigation inventories that would provide a baseline for future progress monitoring efforts. Desirable categories to be incorporated into the framework included: defining the hazard, level of vulnerability, exposure of priority areas and items such as structures (public/private and state/local), land area, lifelines and other factors, i.e., cost/benefit.

Various sources of data to populate the framework were suggested, including: NRPI (Natural Resource Projects Index, funded by State Water Board and housed at UC Davis); Army Corps of Engineers flood mitigation projects with local communities; California Geologic Survey 2006 Summary Report on State Hazard Mapping Act projects; Board of Equalization data on building demolition (could be a source for identifying structures mitigated); Department of Insurance 1995 inventory of residential structures in California; California Earthquake Authority wood frame residential retrofit projects; EERI non-ductile concrete inventory study ; Inventory of Strong Motion Instrumented buildings to identify pre and post-event condition. It was also suggested that data gaps could be filled in by using sampling and estimating techniques and creating proxy inventories.

Measure Mitigation Costs:

The topic of mitigation costs, both as an indicator of California's commitment to risk reduction, and as an integral part of measuring the overall effectiveness of mitigation, is a recurring theme in the Work Group deliberations. It was agreed that economic research should be incorporated into the mitigation monitoring and evaluation efforts. Although not a current factor in determining the cost effectiveness of a project from the standpoint of mitigation grant awards, it was suggested that economic impacts be considered as part of benefit/cost calculations due to the potential long term impacts on a community from business interruption. Additionally, it was suggested the longitudinal benefits including economic impact and community sustainability should be studied.

Identify Mitigation Level and Priorities to be Included:

Based on the framework developed above, priority categories include hazard vulnerability, land use, infrastructure, and building stock. Cal EMA's ongoing efforts to develop MyPlan have included hazard vulnerability for seven primary hazards and land use data for the state. The Cal VIVA project will incorporate information on infrastructure. The Department of General Services has provided data on the location of state owned buildings, which was incorporated into the SHMP. State agencies participating on the Work Group routinely provide updates on their regulatory programs. Members have volunteered to "pilot test" the new progress report form developed by Cal EMA and Cal Poly to facilitate the 2013 SHMP Update. The general consensus was that the focus for future data collection efforts should target local level information, including building inventories, and implementation or compliance with state or local regulatory programs.

Develop Local Mitigation Progress Data:
Based on discussions held at the January 2011 Work Group Meeting that revolved around strategies to better integrate state and local mitigation planning, and types of data that might be included in future LHMP's, the Work Group requested presentations from local governments who are implementing mitigation best practices. The first of these presentations was made at the April 2011 meeting by Claire Clark, the Economic Development Manager for the City of San Luis Obispo, who provided information about the city's successful Unreinforced Masonry Building retrofit program. At the August 2011 meeting, Carl Walker, the Floodplain Manager for the City of Roseville presented his city's exemplary floodplain management program. The December 5, 2011 featured a presentation by Michael Harris on the County of Santa Barbara's integrated planning process and post-fire mitigation progress. A brief description of the significance of each success story is provided below.

The City of San Luis Obispo presentation provides a good example of political commitment to addressing a specific hazardous building type and complying with a state legislative mandate. To comply with SB547, the City of San Luis Obispo identified 125 unreinforced masonry buildings to be mitigated by 2000. Between 1997 and 2004, 27 of those retrofits were completed. A large number of the remaining buildings were located in the in the downtown core area. The proximity of the 2004 Paso Robles Earthquake, and the damage and impact to the downtown business district in the City of Paso Robles stimulated renewed interest in the City of San Luis Obispo's URM retrofit program. The City Council collaborated with local businesses and building owners to establish revised retrofit requirements, timelines, incentives and penalties that would contribute to implementation. At this time only 19 buildings remain to be retrofit, the majority of which are located in the downtown core area and part of 3 large redevelopment projects currently in the planning stage. In addition to providing increased safety to the community, the retrofit program has increased the resiliency of the City's building stock to future earthquake events. The program has also contributed to a renewed economic viability by returning the historic quality of the downtown district, spurring ownership changes and redevelopment projects, and increasing the economic vibrancy of the core area.

Floodplain management for existing and new development is the focus of the City of Roseville mitigation success story. Roseville has a 30 year history of flooding and structural damage resulting from 6 major flood events. The population of the City increased from 45,000 to 120,593 in the past 22 years. However, standards put into place in the 1980's have mitigated the flood risk to new development. Floodplain mapping initiated by the city is based on projected build-out rather than existing development, which differs from FEMA's Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), and represents a forward thinking approach to floodplain management based on a "no adverse impact" policy. Currently 79% of the mapped floodplain is in open space or easement, which is an increase of 33% since program inception. Building codes and standards requiring 2 foot freeboard provide a strong disincentive to development in the floodplain. By implementing both structural and non-structural mitigation, the flood risk to the city has decreased by 600%. Roseville has a well-integrated mitigation planning process whereby flood mitigation policies and programs are consistent across plans, including the General Plan, the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and the Community Rating System. Program coordination and annual reporting requirements ensure interdepartmental plan maintenance and progress monitoring. By monitoring and documenting flood mitigation programs and progress, the City of Roseville has received credit for 16 of the 18 possible CRS activities, resulting in changing its CRS rating from Class 6 to Class 1 over a 15-year period, thus reducing flood insurance premiums for properties in the SFHA by 45%.

Multi-hazard planning and coordination is emphasized by the Santa Barbara County presentation on plan integration and post-wildfire mitigation planning and implementation. When initiating the County LHMP Update process, the Emergency Operations Chief reviewed the existing plan and recognized its value for identifying hazards and critical infrastructure, as a tool for emergency planning and response exercises, and as a means of seeking hazard mitigation funding. When the updated LHMP was placed on the Board of Supervisors meeting agenda for approval, the Board recognized the connection between vulnerable critical

facilities identified in the LHMP and projects that were included in the County Improvement Plan (CIP). All facilities included in the CIP must now be reviewed for potential hazard vulnerabilities which resulted in several planned mitigation projects.

Santa Barbara County experienced several major wildfires within during 2008 and 2009. Concerns about potential post-fire erosion and flooding downstream of the burn areas during the winter rainy season resulted in Santa Barbara taking an advanced planning approach to flood mitigation. The Flood Control District was given a seat in the fire Emergency Operations Center (EOC), and with access to GIS maps they were able to quickly identify burn areas that would be most susceptible to post-fire flooding and landslides. Flood response plans developed while fires were still burning included designating areas for debris basins, hydromulching, and channel clearing. The NCRS provided $4 million for post-fire mitigation implementation. The County divided the burn areas into sections and assigned a planner to each section to monitor recovery and mitigation effectiveness. One example is the effectiveness of the post-fire flood mitigation strategy put into place following the July 2009 Jesusita Fire. In October 2009, over ten inches of rain fell in one day and no flooding occurred as a result of the hydromulching, debris basins, and channel clearing that had been implemented following the fire.

Mitigation Progress Indicators and Monitoring Strategic Work Group Participants	
State Agencies	
	California Department of Insurance
	California Emergency Management Agency (now Cal OES)
	California Resources Agency
	California Seismic Safety Commission
	California Utilities Emergency Association
	Department of Food and Agriculture
	Department of General Services
	Department of Housing and Community Development
	Department of Transportation
	State Lands Commission
Local Government	
	City of Roseville
	City of San Luis Obispo
	Rural Counties Association
Private Sector	
	Business Recovery Managers Association
	California Earthquake Authority
Academic/Research Institutions	
	California Polytechnic State University
	University of California, Davis
Federal Agencies	
	United States Army Corps of Engineers
	United States Department of Agriculture

GISTAWC STRATEGIC WORKING GROUP
MYPLAN PLANNING MEETING *DECEMBER 5, 2011*

Original Data Layer List for Phase 1

Phase 1 GIS Data Layers	
Base Layers	**Hazard Layers**
Aerial photo layer	** Special Flood Hazard Areas (FEMA)
*County Boundaries	200-year flood plains (DWR) + USACE
*City Boundaries	** SRA Fire Hazard Severity Zones (CAL FIRE)
*Major Roads	Wildfire Threat (CAL FIRE)
*Local Streets	** Earthquake Fault Zone Mapping (CGS)
Water Features	** State Hazard Mapping Act data - liquefaction, landslide, ground shaking (CGS)
Population (Density) + "Add layers"	Tsunami Inundation (CGS)
# Dams	**/# Dam inundation boundaries
Railroads	Sea Level Rise (Pacific Institute)
Airports	Active faults
# State lands	**/# WUI boundaries
# Federal lands	Community Wildfire Protection Plan
Shaded relief	

** Included in base map*
*** Includes Hazards included in the CA Natural Hazards Disclosure Act for which mapping is available*
 # Not implemented

Potential Phase 2 GIS Data Layers	
Base Layers	**Hazard Layers**
Parcel Boundaries	Coastal Erosion
Existing Land Use	Storm Surge
General Plan Land Use	Past & Projected Temperature
Critical Infrastructure	Past & Projected Rain Fall
Levees / Sea Walls	Species Change
Contours	Fire Threat Projections
Hill-shade	Unreinforced Masonry/Other Retrofit Tracking
CA-SVI	Climate Change Adaptation Guidance
Water Treatment Plants	
Power Plants	

(Continued on next page)

New layers for Phase 2 - for discussion (includes carryover layers)

Potential GIS Data Layers	
Base Layers	**Hazard Layers**
Left from Phase 1:	*Left from Phase 1:*
Dams	** Potential Dam inundation boundaries
State lands	* Sea Level Rise
Federal lands	* Wildfire Threat (CAL FIRE and/or Pacific Institute)
	**WUI boundaries
	Community Wildfire Protection Plan Boundaries (?)
Planned for Phase 2:	*Planned for Phase 2:*
Parcel Boundaries	Coastal Erosion
Existing Land Use	Storm Surge
General Plan Land Use	* Past & Projected Temperature
Critical Infrastructure	* Past & Projected Precipitation
Social Vulnerability, i.e., vulnerable population facilities – schools, nursing homes, hospitals etc.	Species Change
Water Treatment Plants	Fire Threat Projections
Power Plants	Unreinforced Masonry/Other Retrofit Tracking
Levees / Sea Walls	Climate Change Adaptation Guidance
Contours	
Hill-shade	
	Other Possible Hazard Layers:
	* Bay Area Inundation
	* Projected Snow Water Equivalent
	Previous disaster history
	Levees/sea walls

**From Cal-Adapt website*
***Hazards included in the CA Natural Hazards Disclosure Act for which mapping is available*

Discussion to include:
- Whether statewide data is available for each topic
- Where to get data
- Data Steward for data
- Legend for each topic

Also to discuss:
- Are we going to allow local entities to upload their data?
- Is MyPlan going to include links to important articles about mitigation/hazards?
- Other?