



Airport Recovery Project Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 8, 2013

BCDC Conference Room

1:00 – 3:00 pm

Meeting Minutes, Agendas and Distributed Materials are available online at

http://quake.abag.ca.gov/airport_resilience

Members Present:

Rosalyn Yu, San Francisco Airport

Patrick Tyner, Caltrans

Joe Aguilar, Caltrans District 4 Freight Mobility

Rod Pharis, BART

Jonathan Frisch, PG&E

Lindsey Fransen, BCDC

Colette Armao, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics

Emery Roe, UC Berkeley

Wendy Goodfriend, BCDC

Staff present:

Dana Brechwald

Michael Germeraad

1. Call to order
2. Introductions/check-in
3. Approval of minutes from last meeting
 - Minutes of April 25, 2013 approved with no corrections
4. Project background/schedule update
5. Discussion of preliminary findings (75 min)
 - *Infrastructure Interdependencies Study: interview questions*
 - Jon suggested that gas and electric be split apart on the hierarchy graphic.
 - Clarification on the audience of the paper was addressed; small and large utility providers, local jurisdictions, and the aviation community. Concern was discussed over making the document accessible to a wide range of audiences might limit its efficacy for each.

- The attendees worked in small groups to discuss each of the three main proposed interview questions. The teams then shared specific and general feedback. Below are the general discussions:
 - The format was discussed in depth and at the end there was general agreement. The questions should be sent out to help the point of contact bring in the right people from the organization to answer the questions. It will give them time to think through the questions, but the expectation is that they will not have answered them prior to the interview. Additionally, the interview might be long, multiple hours, and might require a follow-up interview later on.
 - Jon suggested that using surveys may not engage respondents and may not result in the most accurate answer. He has found value in having a diverse group within the organization have a conversation where they can bounce off each other and recognize internal interdependencies that inform more accurate discussion.
 - Colette brought up concerns about bias and how an interview/conversation might make interviews inconsistent. It was agreed that the best questions to ask may not be thought of until after the first few interviews are completed, which is why a follow up interview would be beneficial. Emery suggested interviews be carried out by a group of two to avoid bias, and record more of the discussion.
 - A number of people agreed the questions might be too broad. Questions need to be more specific (i.e. rather than what damage do you expect in a large earthquake ask, what damage do you expect in scenario X.) Also sector specific questions will be better for some questions. The questions also needed to be formulated with a better idea of what the final kernel of knowledge desired is. Staff should have a better idea of what they're trying to get out of this process.
 - Having a standard set of questions will allow for comparison, but the questions might have to be altered depending on the organization, and which professionals might be present (i.e. manager, technician, engineer, etc.)
 - Jon brought up that this study will be more difficult than the San Francisco lifelines project. An infrastructure system on the Peninsula may be completely different than one in the North Bay.
- Some specifics were discussed about individual questions, see below:

- In response to question 1, the overall agreement was that this question should assume that all utilities are operating at high reliability.
 - In response to questions 2 (a,b,c), the overall agreement was that beyond asking questions about their own assessments, it would be beneficial to know how they coordinate with other organizations. Ask questions like:
 - After completing a vulnerability assessment have you collaborated with other organizations to lower the risk?
 - What relationships with other organizations have you built?
 - Did the assessment recognize points of collocation? Was there any discussion about impacts with the other party?
 - In response to question 2 d, there is a need to bound what system failure means. The group suggested maybe asking specifically about how many customers would lose service. Use case studies and ask what performance would be.
 - In response to question 3, the biggest issue was to emphasize question 3g, about decision-making to respond to disruptions. This question could be combined with the points above to better understand how utilities coordinate with other organizations.
 - Overall, there should be a greater emphasis on understanding relationships and processes rather than an emphasis on how the system works or will be damaged after an earthquake.
 - *Infrastructure Interdependencies Study: mapping and case studies.*
 - Concern over the potential privacy issues was discussed. It is unlikely non-public organizations will be open to sharing much GIS information.
6. Meeting Debrief and Announcements, as Requested (5 min)
- The meeting concluded with a discussion on how to bring in the General Aviation (GA) Airports. Colette would like to see them included more in the interview process and figure out how to incorporate them into the rest of the study. Colette and ABAG staff will discuss these issues week of 8/12.
 - Because the meeting overran Dana asked for additional comments to be submitted by email or phone.
7. Date of Next Meeting – October 24th
8. Additional comments on questions.

