Adapting to Rising Tides project
www.adaptingtorisingtides.org
Meeting #2 Review – January 22, 2014

- Confirmed initial resilience goals for project
- Began Assess step
  - Vulnerability and Risk
  - Data collection
  - Relationships among assets
With funding from FHWA and ACFCWCD, AECOM has been doing detailed exposure mapping of the entire SF Bay, including the focus area. Another FHWA-funded project is supporting AECOM’s work for BCDC, conducting detailed vulnerability and risk assessments and developing adaptation strategies for a number of transportation assets in the original ART subregion, including a number of assets in the focus area. Maggie Wenger has been leading a similar process to the OAK/ALA work in Hayward; that working group is currently in the “Plan” step of the adaptation planning process.

ABAG and BCDC are leading the Bay Area Housing and Community Multiple Hazards Risk Assessment project, funded by USGS, US EPA, US FEMA, and the Strategic Growth Council. The project is assessing the vulnerability of housing and communities to seismic and sea level rise hazards, focusing on the region’s planned high growth areas. This project area includes the focus area, and a case study may be conducted for Bay Farm Island.

The regional interdependencies study, one of the two main projects on which the OAK/ALA work is built, is up and running again after some administrative delays.
This is what the OAK/ALA team has been working on since the last meeting,

OAK/ALA progress

- Gathered specific data on ~30 assets
- Sent vulnerability and risk summaries to asset owners and managers for review
- Compiled general data on 5 asset categories / sectors
- Dependencies mapping
- Began identifying preliminary focus area vulnerabilities
Table of assets for which asset-specific information was sought; grayed-out assets are those for which we have not yet been able to collect detailed information.
Example of the vulnerability and risk summaries, which serve as a first draft of the profile sheets, the communication tool for the vulnerability and risk analysis. These have been sent to asset owners and managers for review.
### General asset vulnerabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Materials &amp; Design</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Madison Middle School</td>
<td>Flooding: not under any scenarios considered (up to 96&quot;) Seismic: very strong ground shaking with both scenarios; moderate liquefaction susceptibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access roads to the west may be flooded; to the east roads are clear. To west of school is more susceptible to liquefaction and subject to heavier shaking, so those roads may be inaccessible. Water and power?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Pan Academy</td>
<td>Flooding: possible with 35&quot; SLR, very likely by 48,&quot; flooded by 72&quot; Seismic: very strong ground shaking with both scenarios; very high liquefaction susceptibility.</td>
<td>Property to east and north flooded before school. Surrounded by land with same ground shaking and liquefaction susceptibility.</td>
<td>Water and power?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Earhart Elementary</td>
<td>Flooding: Playing fields possibly flooded with 48&quot;; whole property flooded with 72&quot;. Seismic: very strong ground shaking with both scenarios; very high liquefaction susceptibility.</td>
<td>The golf course, Island Drive, and some properties to the west flooded before the school does; could be isolated. Surrounded by land with same ground shaking and liquefaction susceptibility. Water and power?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Farm Elementary</td>
<td>Flooding: no Seismic: very strong ground shaking with both scenarios; very high liquefaction susceptibility.</td>
<td>The school will be surrounded by flooded properties with 72&quot;; with 48&quot; the lagoon to the south will be flooding, so access could be cut off.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example of how information is being organized for assets for which we are not collecting specific information; these tables will help guide further investigation, if it becomes necessary during a later phase of the project.
Last meeting we were in the Assess step; we have moved through the components of this step into the define step.
Today we are discussing the Define step and preparing for the Plan step.
Meeting #3 Objectives – April 8, 2014

- Discuss exposure mapping
- Share dependencies mapping
- Share findings from vulnerability and risk analysis
- Begin identifying key focus area vulnerabilities
- Transition to Plan step