

Hazardous Materials Commission

Draft Minutes

Planning and Policy Development Committee

July 21, 2021

Members and Alternates:

Present:, Don Bristol, Ken Carlson, Mark Hughes, George Smith, Ed Morales (alternate), Madeline Kronenberg (alternate),

Absent: Jim Payne, Mark Ross, Jonathan Bash (represented by alternate)

Staff: Michael Kent, Matt Kaufmann, Susan Pasara

Members of the Public: None

1) Announcements:

Michael Kent announced:

- He will be providing the Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Commission of the Board of Supervisors with an update on the Commission's efforts to develop a specific recommendation to them on sea level rise at their August 9, 2021 meeting.
- The Operations Committee is working on filling the Labor seat vacated by Rick Alcaraz, the Environmental Engineer seat that expires at the end of the year and the Student intern seat which is intended to start in the Fall.
- The Board of Supervisors Sustainability committee is meeting on July 26th at 1:00.

Commissioner Smith announced that he attended the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Board meeting today where after extensive testimony they approved a new rule, 6-5, to control particulate emissions from catalytic crackers.

2) Public Comments: None

3) Approval of Minutes:

The minutes from the May 19, 2021 meeting were moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Carlson and approved 5 - 0 with corrections.

4) Old Business:

a) Review proposed new language for the survey of the business community concerning sea level rise issues.

The committee began by looking at modifications to the survey the Operations committee developed at their last meeting on July 9th, and associated information on sea level rise from the Adapting to Rising Tides studies.

Commissioner Hughes thought the proposed language needed to be simplified, and that is should just say that a state study says you may be impacted by sea level rise by 2100.

Commissioner Bristol commented that the language of the survey should use consistent measurement units throughout, either inches or feet. He said he thought the survey should be sent to businesses that might be impacted in the next 20 years. Otherwise, he didn't think businesses would be interested in taking the survey. He said he would be ok with sending it to businesses potentially impacted by 2050. He added that the Commission could always send it to more businesses at a later date if it wants to.

Commissioner Kronenberg thought that the survey should only be sent to businesses directly impacted by sea level rise. She thought sending to businesses potentially impacted by 2050 was ok.

The committee then edited the survey that had been modified by the Operations committee to the following, and agreed it should be forwarded to the full Commission for consideration.

Hazardous Materials Commission Sea Level Rise Survey

Introduction

The Contra Costa County Hazardous Materials Commission is an advisory board to the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors made up of representatives from cities, businesses, environmental groups, labor, and others.

Based on State guidelines that predict a 24 inches of sea level rise by 2050 the Commission is concerned about the potential impact of future sea level rise caused by climate change on the transportation, storage and use of hazardous materials in areas of the County near the shoreline susceptible to flooding.

The Commission is conducting this survey to better understand the interests and concerns of others so that they can better advise the Board of Supervisors about what actions to take to address the impacts of sea level rise. The Commission is sending this survey to businesses that use, store, generate or transport hazardous materials or hazardous waste, and are predicted to be in an area impacted by sea level rise. Some of these businesses will be impacted at a lower levels of sea level rise at earlier dates. The Commission chose to include this set of businesses in this survey to cast the widest net possible for understanding the actions and planning efforts of businesses possibly expected to be impacted by sea level rise.

- 1) How significant do you anticipate the impacts of sea level rise will be on your operation(s) and assets?*

On a scale from 1 – 5 with 1 being no impact at all and 5 being significant impact

- 2) Have you considered the impacts of sea level rise in your strategic planning efforts?*

On a scale from 1 – 5 with 1 being no consideration at all and 5 being significant consideration

3) *Have your planning efforts included impacts to vulnerable communities?*

Y or N or Not Applicable

4) *A. Has your business identified any risks to your assets or operations that need to be addressed due to anticipated impacts from sea level rise.*

Yes or No, have not assessed risks yet

B. If yes, has your business already taken measures to address these risks?

On a scale from 0 – 5 with 0 being no measures taken yet and 5 being significant measures have already been taken

Open-ended question – Please provide some examples of these measures

5) *Who do you think should be responsible for addressing the impacts of sea level rise that affect your business?*

Choose as many as apply – business owner, property owner, Local government, regional government, state government, federal government, all of these

6) *Would your business be interested in engaging with the County Government to address the impacts of sea level rise on your business?*

Yes or No

7) *If you answered Yes to question 6, would you like to include your contact information in the space below to be contacted? If you do, please remember that this information cannot be kept confidential and your responses may no longer remain anonymous.*

5) New Business:

a) Review draft DTSC regulatory framework addressing SB 673 requirements for Cumulative Impacts and Community Vulnerability

Michael Kent began the discussion by giving an overview of the framework being proposed by DTSC. He also reported that at the webinar about the framework conducted by DTSC on July 14th they said they will be holding a workshop on the framework later in the summer, will take public comment in the fall of 2022, will revise the language of the framework in the spring and summer of 2022 and they will do formal rulemaking in 2023.

The committee discussed this timeline and decided that because the specifics of the framework will likely change from what it is now, they didn't think the Commission should ask the Board of Supervisors to weigh in at this time. They decided to recommend that the appropriate time for

the Commission to consider asking the Board of Supervisors to weigh in would be during the official rulemaking process.

6) Items of Interest: None

7) Plan Next Agenda: The committee will continue the discussion about the sea level rise survey if necessary, and will develop recommendations for the full Commission to consider concerning making specific recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about sea level rise.

8) Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 5:30.