



**COMMUNITY ASSET MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CAMP)
OUTREACH COMMITTEE**

**REGULAR MEETING
Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 5:00 p.m.
Minutes**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Yeamans at 5:07 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Committee Members	Vice Chair Jennifer Yeamans Steve Stamos Neal Pann Mark Palajac Steven Dunbar Dawn Argula
-------------------	--

Absent	Chair Donna Allen - excused Marco Torres- excused
--------	--

Staff Present	Uyiosa Oviawe, Management Analyst II Kathy Hughes, Administrative Assistant
---------------	--

3. CITIZENS FORUM

Vice Chair Yeamans opened the item for public comments. There were none, and the item was then closed to public comments.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

4.1 Approval of draft minutes from June 22, 2022

ON A MOTION FROM COMMITTEE MEMBER DUNBAR, SECONDED BY

COMMITTEE MEMBER ARGULA, CARRIED ON A 5-0 VOTE, THE JUNE 22, 2022 MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

5. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

5.1 Report from CAMP Outreach Committee Members

Vice Chair Yeamans opened the item for public comments. There were none, and the item was closed to public comments.

Uyiosa Oviawe asked the committee members about their experience with outreach at the Farmer's Market in July and September. Staff said that the committee did not attend the September Farmer's Market. Several staff members said they recalled attending a Farmer's Market, but it may have been prior to the July date.

Committee member Argula expressed interest in hearing a report on the recent storms and the impact to the infrastructure. Staff will compile a report and bring that information to a future meeting.

Vice Chair Yeamans added that it was nice to see such a high degree of awareness among the residents during the storms about preparations for possible flooding and cleaning debris away from storm drains. She felt that social media played a key role in storm preparedness.

Committee member Stamos said the storms highlighted the importance of Asset Management and the need for it to continue and expand. He saw questions raised on social media about the storm drains asking who is responsible for maintaining them and when were they last inspected. He said there were also a lot of questions about water storage. He said the city should be aware of what their water providers are doing and what they plan to do.

Committee member Dunbar said that as a regular trail user he saw firsthand some of the changes that Zone 7 had made between the Holmes and Royal and Arroyo where they lowered the trail to save the Holmes Street bridge. He also saw a You Tube video from a former Zone 7 worker explaining why it was done and how it was designed to overflow to protect the bridge.

5.2 Discussion Regarding Asset Management Fact Sheets

Uyiosa Oviawe told the committee that the city has been working on gathering information on walls and fences for the asset inventory. He said that after the inventory was completed, they began work on a condition assessment report and rating system to determine the state of the walls and fences. After that he began working with the city engineers and the GIS team to determine the ownership of each area of walls and fences. Using this information, it was determined that 9.7

miles of walls are actually owned by the city, and approximately 25 miles is privately owned or LMD or CFD maintained. Currently the walls are funded with \$175,000 per year, leaving a gap of \$1.5 to \$1.6 million annually. He told the committee about the Holmes Street wall replacement project where the city worked collaboratively with the homeowners to replace the walls and install vegetation and irrigation in exchange for the homeowners agreeing to maintain the walls from now on. He said that the City currently has approximately 3 miles of walls that are rated as poor condition that would take approximately \$15 million to repair or replace. He also explained that the reason the walls are rated "F" is because of the huge funding gap between what is budgeted and what is needed. He asked the committee to provide input on the draft fact sheet.

Committee member Dunbar said the sheet doesn't specify what replacement materials will be used. Mr. Oviawe said the city will have a design team that will come up with material specifications based on the locations of the walls. He stressed that the design team is a separate project, and the costs will be factored in to the finalized asset management plan for walls. Committee member Dunbar suggested the last sentence should then be changed to "the city is evaluating wall type materials for appropriate locations". He also pointed out there is a typo in the second paragraph on page one, where it references "buildings" but should be referencing "walls". He thought it would be helpful to show an example of a high-risk wall. He also asked what would happen if a wall failed in a LMD or CFD and the residents objected to a fee increase. Mr. Oviawe said staff is still working on figuring that out.

Committee member Argula said it should be made clear that the fact sheet should emphasize it's talking about City owned walls. She said it was nice to have the information that will help the city make informed decisions for the various neighborhoods. She said she wasn't clear on the replacement cost portion of the fact sheet. She asked for clarification on the difference between high risk and high probability replacement costs. Mr. Oviawe explained that the high risk is referring to the three miles of that are rated in poor condition. He said the replacement cost was based on the costs of the Holmes Street project that was \$950 per linear foot for replacement. Committee member Argula pointed out that if the graphic was unclear for her, there would probably be others asking questions, so it needs to be more specific. Mr. Oviawe asked if it would be helpful to include a breakdown on the location of the high-risk walls.

Committee member Palajac asked how the value of the walls was calculated. Mr. Oviawe said the costs were calculated using the \$950 per linear foot that was charged for the Holmes Street fence replacement project. He stressed that the cost included landscaping materials as well as irrigation. Committee member Palajac asked if the cost was on the high side because of the number of homeowner that pushed dirt up against the wall that wasn't intended to be a retaining wall. Mr. Oviawe said that yes it was on the high side because of the amount of work that went into removing the dirt and creating a retaining wall.

Committee member Palajac wanted to clarify that the special districts were not included in the costs stated, and Mr. Oviawe said they were not.

Committee member Pann suggested making it clear that the spotlight is on City owned/maintained walls. He also suggested adding language that explains that the type of material used is based on the street type and function. He said it was confusing to see the asset health grade of “F” because it gives the impression that every wall in town is failing. He thinks it should be made clear the “F” grade is because of funding. He said it would be helpful to mention the scoring in the fact sheet to help explain the grade. He also thought it would be helpful to call out the type of replacement material for each designated area to help people understand where these types of walls would go.

Committee member Palajac asked for the locations of the 3 miles of failing fences. He thought the spreadsheet made it look like “the sky is falling”. He felt the approach was too simplistic because it doesn’t consider the various types of replacement materials. He thought he would have a difficult time trying to present it to his various groups with the current language.

Vice Chair Yeamans said that because the walls are so visible this fact sheet needs to take a close look at the story the city is trying to tell. She felt there was an intuitive part of the story that was missing. She suggested showing by linear feet of the walls the ages of the walls. She felt that most people would be able to understand the situation that way.

Committee member Stamos did not like the “road ahead” graphic on page two. While he understood what it was trying to convey, he felt it was too simple and didn’t contribute much to the fact sheet. He mentioned that he’s noticed that some residents will put up a new fence, but leave the old one behind it, and he wondered why the city lets that happen and what are the rules governing that practice.

Committee member Argula said that this was the only fact sheet that shows there is no funding for replacement, which suggests that the city never contemplated maintaining the walls. She felt if that was stated in a different way it would explain why the grade was an “F” and might lift the overall grade to “C” or “D”. She also suggested including a redline map showing the areas where immediate replacement is needed, and including the cost for those areas.

Vice Chair Yeamans agreed with committee member Stamos about the graphic on page two not being helpful. She felt the bar graph was confusing and asked that it be reworked.

Committee member Dunbar agreed that a map would be helpful and questioned how to color the map to get the message across. He pointed out the inconsistency in the language of the replacement cost of the walls and what the

walls are worth, as two sections mention the replacement cost as \$48 million, and one section mentions the worth of the walls as \$48 million. He suggested better explaining the health grade by saying that while most of the walls are in good shape, there is no funding for the portions that are not. He also noted a discrepancy on the graph on page two where there is a bracket on the graph for the high probability costs, there is no bracket on the high risk costs.

The committee asked that staff bring the walls fact sheet back to the next meeting with the suggested changes incorporated prior to releasing the sheet to the public.

Vice Chair Yeamans opened the item for public comments. There were none, and the item was closed to public comments.

5.3 **Report on Asset Management Technology Advances**

Uyiosa Oviawe showed the committee a short “how to” video for the Livermore Connects app. The video showed how to download the app, and how to use the app to report various non-emergency issues throughout the city. He said that several committee members have been testing it out. Committee members Pann and Argula requested staff send them both the link to the site so they could also test it. Mr. Oviawe said there will be flyers posted strategically around the city advertising the Livermore Connects app, and the “go live” date is set for February 15, 2023.

Committee member Argula was very excited about the app and remembered that it had been talked about several years ago. She said to see it come to fruition was very satisfying and a great advance for the program.

Committee member Palajac thought it was a great tool and asked if staff was prepared for the additional work this would create. Mr. Oviawe said that it was the right time to move forward with the program, as Livermore is a forward thinking city.

Committee member Pann asked if any of our neighboring cities had a similar system. Mr. Oviawe said he would double check, but that he thought that Pleasanton had something like it, and that Berkeley definitely has a similar app.

Committee member Argula asked if there would be a standard turnaround time. Mr. Oviawe said they were working on that, and that the staff would have to first screen the requests to validate if they are true service requests. He also told the committee that the 3-1-1 app is currently live and citizens are engaging with it, although it is not fully publicized. He said staff is prepared for the influx of requests that are expected to come in.

Vice Chair Yeamans said she was very excited about the app. She suggested having business cards made up with the information for the Chamber of Commerce and Livermore Downtown, Inc. to pass out. She asked if there was something on the back end of the program that would help improve the efficiency of the workflows, such as identifying duplicate requests. She asked if there were any benchmarks for cities that use this type of program that shows the increased efficiency. Mr. Oviawe said it would be a daunting task to set expectations of when a request will be completed, but that the software is able to prioritize the work and identify duplicates.

Vice Chair Yeamans opened the item for public comment. There were none, and the item was closed for public comment.

5.4 **Discussion Regarding Asset Management Outreach Program Updates and Next Steps**

Vice Chair Yeamans asked if the new Council would be briefed on the Asset Management program. Mr. Oviawe said they had several briefings scheduled in the first part of February. He said there will be a summary of all the general fund assets, funding gaps and conditions.

Committee member Stamos said that since it's been a while since the last meeting, it would be helpful to know what was planned for the committee for the year.

Uyiosa Oviawe said the MIG is under contract for another year. He said the committee is set to sunset in December of this year. He anticipates having a meeting every two to three months. He said that there are 11 more fact sheets to complete and they are the much more complicated classes. He said that will play a huge factor on how often the committee meets.

Committee member Pann suggested meeting more often to help get through as many fact sheets as possible. He felt it would be easier to discuss one or two fact sheets at a time would be easier for the committee to go through.

Vice Chair Yeamans suggested that staff email the group any feedback they received at the Council briefings.

Committee member Pann asked that when Livermore Connect goes live, that staff share the links with the committee so that they might share them with their outreach groups.

Vice Chair Yeamans opened the item for public comment. There were none and the item was closed for public comment.

6.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 6:09 PM TO THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING TO BE HELAD AT A FUTURE DATE AND TIME, IN THE MENDENHALL ROOM OF THE LIVERMORE CIVIC CENTER MEETING HALL, 1016 S. LIVERMORE AVENUE, LIVERMORE CA 94550.