

# ABAG RPC Infrastructure Subcommittee Meeting #1

## Minutes

*July 27, 2016, 2pm – 4pm*

*Hosted by ABAG at the Metro Center*

*375 Beale Street*

*San Francisco, CA 94105*

**Present:**

Duane Bay, Assistant Director of Planning and Research, Association of Bay Area Governments

Mark Boucher, Senior Hydrologist, Contra Costa County Flood Control & Water District

Allison Brooks, Executive Director, Bay Area Regional Collaborative

Phil Brun, Deputy Director of Public Works, City of Napa

Norma Camacho, Interim CEO, Santa Clara Valley Water District

Arrietta Chakos, Advisor, Association of Bay Area Governments

Miriam Chion, Director of Planning & Research, Association of Bay Area Governments

Grant Davis, General Manager, Sonoma County Water Agency

Asavari Devadiga, Resilience Team Researcher, Association of Bay Area Governments

Natasha Dunn, Resilience Team Researcher Association of Bay Area Governments

Craig Dziedzic, General Manager, Bay Areas Urban Areas Security Initiative

Amparo Flores, Manager of Integrated Planning, Zone 7 Water Agency

Sarah Gambill, Chief of Infrastructure Development and Recovery, Department of Homeland Security, Office of Infrastructure Protection

Michael Germeraad, Resilience Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments

Tracy Hemmeter, Senior Project Manager, Santa Clara Valley Water District

Micah Hilt, Senior Project Planner, City and County of San Francisco

Steve Kinsey, Supervisor, Marin County

Manisha Kothari, Senior Planner, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Darcie Luce, Environmental Planner, Francisco Estuary Partnership

Sara Maatta, Water Operations Analyst, Alameda County Water District

Maureen Martin, Senior Water Resources Specialist, Contra Costa Water District

Karen Mitchoff, Supervisor, Contra Costa County

Patrick Otellini, Chief Resilience Officer, City and County of San Francisco

Julie Pierce, Councilmember, City of Clayton

Cecile Pinto, Manager, PG&E

Jacob Reed, Emergency Response & Security Officer, Alameda County Water District

Steven Ritchie, Assistant General Manager of Water Enterprise, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Merideth Secor, Strategy and Policy Analyst, Department of Homeland Security, Office of Infrastructure Protection

Linda Seifert, Supervisor, Solano County

Catherine Spaulding, Assistant General Manager, Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative

Mike Tognolini, Manager of Water Supply Improvements, East Bay Municipal Utility District

Jodi Van Horne, Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, Office of Infrastructure Protection

Jim Wollbrinck, Manager of Security and Business Resiliency, San Jose Water Company

Present by Phone: Chris Barkley, Vice President, AECOM and SF Lifelines Council; Donald Boland, Executive Director, California Utilities Emergency Association; Kerrie Romanow, Director of Environmental Services, City of San Jose

## **ABAG Goals for the Process:**

- Emphasize local and regional interconnections
- Development of firm and useful relationships between cities and utilities and the examination of how responsibilities shift after a disaster
- Demonstrate the large array and diversity of water districts
- Communicate the opportunity to build enthusiasm and demand for more information
- Start to figure out what the larger process will look like
- Understand what input cities do / don't have to the utility planning process

- Generate ideas for a 21<sup>st</sup> century resilient water system

## Main points expressed by attendees of what they hoped to get out of the meeting:

- Make connections with other cities and agencies, esp. in regard to earthquakes
- Bring together stakeholders to discuss critical infrastructure management
- Find out about the current ABAG initiative
- Address the need for better communication between general purpose entities and agencies

## Background discussion points:

- Introduced the current vision for the process as involving three subcommittee meetings (Aug: the drought scenario, Sept: earthquake disruption and water systems, Oct: vetting a proposal / call to action for Nov forum) and a final symposium convening cities and utilities
- Motivation for current initiative comes from the ABAG General Assembly call for a leadership forum / regional Lifelines Council
- Lifelines Council – how to scale SF’s efforts, water is current focus but can be broadened in coming years
- Three asks: vet a proposed structure for this process, begin dialogue and problem solving on two scenarios, and build enthusiasm among constituency
- Department of Homeland Security piece revolves around long-term investment, planning and design; post-disaster rebuilding; technical assistance to communities; and more broadly taking successes and sharing them nationally
- San Francisco’s Lifelines Council has some lessons learned, specifically around what happens after getting people to come to the table and the importance of establishing relationships between cities and their service providers; also knowing who to call for services is invaluable

## Consistent Themes:

- Communication and collaboration/partnerships are key (communication could be improved)
- Large variety of ways districts and cities approach their own processes; also a large variety of water needs and uses throughout the region
- Many issues within a jurisdiction before tackling regional aspect
- What is ABAG’s role in the process – repository of info/docs? Convener? Lead on where districts should get projections? Should be entering the policy sphere?
- Initiative may be focusing too largely on drought and acute shock; may need tighter focus
- Danger of redundancy in creating this new process

- UWMPs as a consistent tool (also Drought Contingency Plans) and the need/possibility of integrating them or producing a regional one
- Planning projections aren't consistent (would be interesting to look at historical projections vs actual growth)
- Supply side is covered, need to focus on the demand side which is driven by land use planning
- Disconnect between special districts and land use planning
- Challenge that jurisdictional boundaries may not be the best way to manage water
- Lack of recognition/knowledge of interconnectedness of services and what is entailed in provision of that service (and also thus expectations of what happens in the case of an interruption of services)
- Need to clarify metrics of recovery (what % of functionality after what period of time, how fast service providers can re-establish services, what the dependencies are, what changes need to be made to response plans and what the realities are)

## Detailed Minutes

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): Welcomed everyone, Brown Act announcement, call for public comment, housekeeping items, call to what members would like to get out of the meeting

Mayor Techel (Napa): Here to make friends, connect with other cities and agencies especially with regard to earthquakes

Supervisor Kinsey (Marin): Would like to address water supply in regard to desalination

Arrietta Chakos (ABAG): Focus on ideas for a 21<sup>st</sup> century resilient water system

Miriam Chion (ABAG): Emphasis on local and regional level interconnections

Catherine Spaulding (UASI): Consistent increase in risk analysis; stronger infrastructure systems; would like to bring together stakeholders to discuss critical infrastructure management. Interested in collaboration and finding out about the present initiative.

Steven Ritchie (SFPUC): We're in an era of unprecedented cooperation among agencies. One historical issue has been the need to improve communication between general purpose entities and agencies

### ***[Overview and Subcommittee Charge]***

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): This is a dynamic conversation. Talked through agenda; Duane Bay will give an overview; Michael will give a drought overview, then on to questions at hand. Questions encouraged.

Duane Bay (ABAG): Thanked everyone for joining. Summarized contents of information packets. Background on motivation for this discussion including UASI funding for ABAG to hold a series of regional workshops on resilience topics with one area being the interconnectedness of regional systems and the need to establish some sort of leadership forum. Reviewed the LP25 symposium that was built on the Northridge 20 symposium, with one regional policy goal being the formation of a regional lifelines council. Discussed DHS relationship for federal resources and an understanding of the range of approaches appropriate for the Bay Area and how to scale SF's pioneering effort with their Lifelines Council formed in 2009 by Mayor Ed Lee. Lifelines concept is generic to hazards, and is about service continuity and equity. So the question becomes why water, why today? It is timely with the drought, as well as a theme that emerged with ABAG's General Assembly. UC Berkeley Professor David Sedlak sketched a roadmap to achieve a resilient water supply by 2050. This is the first of four meetings with a symposium on 11/10. Part of the ask of members today is to bring people along to the summit. Concerns about the process are encouraged. Outlined 3 tasks in 3 meetings: to vet a proposed structure of what the process looks like, to practice dialogue and problem solving on two scenarios, and to build an enthusiastic constituency. Today, increasing population meets unreliable future water supplies; September will be about the challenge of earthquake disruption; October will be about the task of vetting a proposal for the November forum. Introduction and thanks to DHS, UASI, CalOES, FEMA Region 9. Any feedback before jumping in?

Sarah Gambill (DHS): Introduction to DHS. For those unfamiliar, DHS leads national coordination efforts to secure nation's infrastructure. National Infrastructure Protection Plan guides this, outlining the partnership model. The federal government doesn't own the majority of infrastructure and realizes the need for partnerships. The IP specifically focuses on long-term investment, planning and design; post-disaster rebuilding and technical assistance to communities. Also interested in taking examples of successes and sharing them nationally; this group can be used as an exciting example.

Patrick Otellini (San Francisco): Introduced SF's work and focus on a 30 year trajectory looking at the city's private infrastructure stock. Mentioned the city's Resilience Strategy similar to Berkeley's and Oakland's. Recognizes that utilities are the other piece of the discussion and mentioned the relationship they developed with PG&E means SF knows who to call and how valuable this is. One of their first projects was the Interdependence Study looking at eleven utilities (power, sewer, gas, electric, water, fuel, phone) and risk – this exposed the city's vulnerabilities, which led to an action plan and a chance to talk to a larger audience.

Arrietta Chakos (ABAG): Looking to develop firm and useful relationships between cities and utilities and how responsibility shifts in a disaster. Discussed the incredible array of water districts and their diversity. Looking to understand demand and supply in communities. Have the opportunity to build up to the event in November – members here will set the tone and create demand for more information.

### ***[The Drought Challenge and Moderated Discussion]***

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): One of the things she hears is “why are we building more housing if there's not enough water?” Also recognizes the variety of jurisdictions and that everyone does things differently.

Michael (ABAG): Would like look at how cities, counties and utilities can share knowledge to drive better outcomes. Envision this through a series of meetings, but more generally on the lifelines challenge. Background on Plan Bay Area and population growth coupled with decrease in water supply reliability

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): We're at the confluence of water systems geographically and it will be important to look at how water quality will be impacted in the future.

Kerrie Romanow (San Jose) (phone): How to define how much water is to be allocated; looking at past years' drought and the amount allocated – where does water for landscaping fit in?

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): In her district, it is a socio-economic issue and what are the criteria that restrictions are based on?

Supervisor Seifert (Solano): Many have issues within their own jurisdictions without even beginning to look at regional issue, which is even more difficult; regions also contain variety of users (ag vs urban use). Also changes in water available in regions such as the Central Valley drives farmers from those areas into the Bay Area in search of water – sometimes this brings more water intensive crops, and what are the implications of this? How to balance the fact that high value crops bring benefits for only some members of the community? Other issues that come in: government's intent on allocation water supply for everyone; groundwater issues; Delta tunnels; looking at regulation that will only get more severe. Also, ABAG hasn't been in the regulatory/legislative sphere of water – how to incorporate this into the role of the agency?

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): Return to desal – could Steve Kinsey speak on this?

Steve Kinsey (Marin): Desal requires regional cooperation and a look at relationships to other groups. Tremendous amount of environmental and regulatory issues; it is an unsolved problem.

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): This brings up NIMBY attitudes as well. Can Mark speak on having less money to do the things we need to do, from a flood control district point of view.

Mark Boucher (Contra Costa Flood Dist): Discussed the revenue issues with flood control districts and both the tough time getting funds to improve infrastructure and the hidden/interconnectedness of infrastructure

Allison Brooks (BARC): Pointed out that every county does things differently – it's important to look at who is making the decisions and what is their jurisdiction. What is the regional role? Information? Convening? Where are there needs for bringing people together and around what? Where do we take this discussion in terms of deliverables? Every county is using water differently. What are the essential water needs, and how can we think beyond jurisdiction and be creative?

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): Taxpayers don't see jurisdictional lines.

Norma Camacho (SCVWD): Just coming into this – a Regional Lifelines Council that addresses growth, water and coordination – seems like too big of a chunk to bite off. Do we focus on disruption first that allows everyone to get to know one another?

Duane Bay (ABAG): Wanted to back up and asked if someone from BARR could respond to Allison's point.

Mike Tognolini (EBMUD): Defined Bay Area Regional Reliability (BARR) for the group as a partnership between 8 of the largest suppliers looking for solutions to work together.

Duane Bay (ABAG): Sounds redundant with this; can you expand on this?

Mike Tognolini (EBMUD): Here to learn about what ABAG is up to and make sure it's complementary to what BARR is working on.

Steve Ritchie (SFPUC): BARR grew out of a regional desal project and how all the utilities touch each other. Realized what kind of water doesn't matter (fresh, brackish, etc.) and that there could be mutual benefit to all. There are limits with existing plumbing and what kind of needs there are. Brought up that all urban water suppliers (over a certain size) need Urban Water Management Plans with land use planning roots and showing where water comes from. Also need Drought Contingency Plans that require utilities to look at future drought conditions. The hard part for example is: where is the growth going to be taking place and the different projections and planning processes different utilities use. The opportunity here is to use ABAG's planning projections. During the PBA process, there's been lots of contention about where growth will occur. But there's little linkage between local districts and water agencies. There is little coordination with other cities, even adjacent cities like Brisbane – we focus on San Francisco. There needs to be greater understanding in General Plans of UWMPs.

Duane Bay (ABAG): What he hears is that BARR doesn't have any city input.

Mike Tognolini (EBMUD): Correct, the Big 8 represent most of the Bay Area except Solano/Napa/Sonoma counties.

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): Is work being duplicating work then?

Maureen Martin (CCWD): Has been responding to more requests for BARR. One of the first projects is a Drought Contingency Plan with Bureau funding; this will be out in about a year. There is potential for redundancy, but plenty of room for discussion on the region as a whole. Concurs with Norma that we may need to focus on emergency response/ something smaller. Delta, for instance, hasn't been included in Bay Area planning and this could help.

Tracy Hemmeter (SCVWD): As far as being a BARR member, the demand equation is driven by land use plans and if the group is going to focus on supply and reliability, land use planning should be part of that. Between BARR members, we serve the majority of Bay Area counties, and they have a plan to look at supply. The demand side may be more important to focus on for this group.

Manisha Kothari (SFPUC): As a part of BARR, they all had to build off of UWMPs. There's not a lot of new info for this group, but if we're talking about a larger group, the planning processes in UWMPs is a commonality.

Arrietta Chakos (ABAG): Is there a summary document of these that is less technical and available to decision makers?

Steve Ritchie (SFPUC): Do you mean is there a Bay Area-wide UWMP? That would be great. SPUR did some work with this. These are urban, though, and don't get into agriculture.

Grant Davis (SCWA): BARR is a process and very effective. Marin/Sonoma/Napa have the North Bay Water Reuse Authority with federal involvement. Don't want to further complicate things, but the North Bay has a similar process that meets regularly and already integrates UWMPs. Our nexus is with flood management/water quality/sea level rise and there's lots of fertile ground here.

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): How does it work, a planning department gives the ok to developers, the city goes to the district, the UWMP has a 25 year horizon. Then if city A wants a certain amount of water and city B needs a certain amount – how does it work? Does the UWMP allow a utility to put the brakes on development?

Maureen Martin (CCWD): There lots of development all the time in the Bay Area. Demand projections are the basis, and there are multiple tools for projections. And, as demands change, that can change when build out demand occurs. Water districts do account for change in the larger sense (not necessarily city by city). We give room for planned growth. But demand projections are somewhat contentious on a regional level. Aligned projections could inform regional planning in a defensible way.

Phil Brun (Napa): Napa does it a little differently, there is lots of autonomy. We have relationships with Solano County and other cities and we're doing a pretty good job on the supply side of things.

Allison Brooks (BARC): This highlights the disconnect between special districts and land use planning. This is happening on sea level rise. Do we have any governance improvements to manage the challenges? Jurisdictional boundaries aren't always the best way to manage water.

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): What is the bite we want to take? Land use and water supply and reliability seem to be themes.

Steve Ritchie (SFPUC): This sounds voluntary, but UWMPs are legal obligations.

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): Sounds like jurisdictionally it is working but should ABAG be a repository of these types of reports?

Duane Bay (ABAG): Water is a good place to start for a Lifelines Council idea. Is there a formalized institutional structure that supports these ad-hoc and sub-regional structures? ABAG is a convening and hosting body with skepticism around duplicating another government structure. What are the challenges? How is it working? Do we need to do something different?

Arrietta Chakos (ABAG): There is little coordination between elected officials and utilities that serve them, based on recent disasters. Mentioned the Charleston regional pilot. There is a need for cities to understand the services they get; and that many of these services are interconnected across services and jurisdictions both.

Patrick Otellini (San Francisco): Stressed the need for transparency in the process of the Lifelines Council and what doesn't work. Getting people around a table is critical, but figuring out the next steps is tough. Important considerations: not being funded – can this be codified to work; how do we look at it as an organization; who's in the room; how do you leverage the work already done? And regionally this is even harder. ABAG is good, but we need to get the larger coordinators together. Where are the shared goals? Figure out what the needs are. And can we narrow the focus of water? Realistically, regional coordination has the danger of just being a lot of talk.

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): Can Patrick talk to disaster recovery timeline?

Patrick Otellini (San Francisco): Service restoration is key, but coordination requires relationships. It's also important to look at 18 months to 5 years out. The recovery piece is critical and relationships are critical.

Chris Barkley (PG&E) (phone): Recovery isn't a defined thing. Expectations of lifelines performance aren't clear. I don't think elected officials' expectations match reality. From the SPUR study: there are layers of priority. For example, what percentage of functionality is needed after what time period? What changes in response / mitigation plans need to be made? SF Lifelines Council needs parameters and agreement among partners.

Mayor Techel (Napa): We have to plan as though we don't have any friends – that they'll be dealing with their own disaster recovery.

Catherine Spaulding (UASI): Went over Yellow Command flyer and exercise and invited all to the September event.

Cecile Pinto (PG&E): From the private sector perspective, this gave us the great opportunity to practice around scenarios. The biggest takeaway was that it exposed assumptions about how fast or slow service providers can re-establish service and what the dependencies are. Good chance to identify what has to come first (water, power), and gives them a seat at the table.

Supervisor Mitchoff (Contra Costa): Any other comments?

Amparo Flores (Zone 7): Echoed the importance of demand side of things. They've looked at alternatives but rely on suppliers to give projections and they rely on ABAG.

***[Next Steps]***

Duane Bay (ABAG): Wrap up, calling for the group to stick with the process and it is up to the staff to synthesize this in a compelling way.