



Agenda
City of Portland Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan Update
5th Steering Committee Meeting
 Wednesday, December 16, 2015, 4:00 to 6:30 PM
 Wy'East Conference Room, Level L1, 501 N Dixon St., Portland, OR 97227
 Call in Number: 800-523-8437 Code: 707-186-3750



4:00pm – 4:20pm	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
<p>Jessica London, <i>Chairperson</i> and Danielle Butsick, <i>Planning Team</i></p> <p>Handout – SC#3 Summary and SC#4 Summary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round-table introductions • Establish quorum • Review the agenda • Public comment • Review the action items and approve October and November meeting summary
4:20pm – 4:40pm	RISK REPORTING AREAS
<p>Jessica London, <i>Chairperson</i> and Kristen Gelino, Carol Baumann and Danielle Butsick, <i>Planning Team</i></p> <p>Handout #1 – Recommendation for Risk Reporting Areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present the Planning Team Recommendation • Discuss and confirm risk reporting areas <p><i>Why this matters:</i> Risk reporting areas are how the results of the risk assessment will be broken down and summarized. This information will be used to rank relative risk and to help develop mitigation actions. The planning team realizes that there is probably no ideal way to go about this, but after evaluating many options we believe the recommendation is the best approach.</p> <p><i>Feedback requested:</i> Can you live with the dividing the City into these risk reporting areas? If not, why not?</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Did you consider using this dataset? or I cannot live with the recommendation because...</p>
4:40pm – 5:05pm	PUBLIC QUESTIONNAIRE GOALS – BREAKOUT SESSION
<p>All, <i>breakout session</i></p> <p>Handout #2 – Public Questionnaire Discussion Handout</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss and provide input on goals for the natural hazard mitigation public questionnaire including: what you would hope to find out, method of dissemination, method of advertisement, target audiences <p><i>Why this matters:</i> A questionnaire is one method by which we will seek the public’s input on the hazard mitigation plan. Generally, the goal of the questionnaire is to help gauge the public’s perception of risk and knowledge on local hazards, types of mitigation projects that the public would like to see in the plan, mitigation strategies that members of the public have implemented at their own home, and what barriers to mitigation may exist in the community.</p> <p><i>Feedback requested:</i> Please brainstorm and take notes on your responses to the prompts in the brainstorming handout.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> I think it would be really useful to have a question on... or Having a box where residents can submit questionnaires at the library would be really useful.</p>
5:05pm – 5:15pm	BREAK
5:15pm – 5:45pm	CRITICAL FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE
<p>Jessica London, <i>Chairperson</i> and Kristen Gelino and Danielle Butsick, <i>Planning Team</i></p> <p>Handout #3 – Draft Critical Facility and Infrastructure Definition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present the results of the homework survey • Discuss and confirm a critical facility definition • Discuss datasets being utilized for database development <p><i>Why this matters:</i> The critical facility definition will form the basis for the development of the critical facility database. This will be a component of the risk assessment and will be used to develop mitigation actions.</p> <p><i>Feedback requested:</i> Can you live with the recommendation developed using the survey results? What is still missing? Questions on the purpose of the dataset.</p>

Example: I cannot live with the recommendation because... or I know that a dataset is available from...

5:45pm – 6:20pm

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES DISCUSSION

Jessica London,
Chairperson and Kristen
Gelino and Danielle
Butsick, *Planning Team*

- Review the vision and mission
- Discuss the results of the homework survey
- Discuss and confirm goals
- Introduce objectives development exercise

Why this matters: Hazard mitigation goals represent what Portland seeks to achieve through mitigation plan implementation. Goals will be used to develop objectives and actions.

Feedback requested: Discussion of the results of the survey and planning team recommendations. Confirmation of goals.

Example: Goal #4 seems like it would be more effectively addressed as an objective. or I prefer the wording of goal #6 because...

**Handout #4 – Draft
Vision, Mission and
Goals**

6:20pm – 6:30pm

PUBLIC COMMENT AND NEXT STEPS

Jessica London,
Chairperson and Kristen
Gelino and Danielle
Butsick, *Planning Team*

- Public comment
- Planning process update
- Introduce next homework items – Objectives, Document Outline, Data Gap Analysis
- Review action items identified in the meeting

6:30pm

ADJOURN



MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: December 16, 2015

Subject: Steering Committee Meeting No. 5

Project Name: City of Portland 2016 Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

In Attendance: **Steering Committee:** Bob Burkholder (for Karen Tam), Casey Milne, Danielle Brooks*, Darise Weller, Glen Collins, Jeff Soulages, Jeremy O’Leary*, Jessica London, Jonna Papaefthimiou, Kathryn Hartinger, Laurent Picard, Lisha Shrestha (for Ronault LS Catalani), Maggie Skendarian, Margaret Puckette (for Jeff Geisler), Mark Feters (for Kathy Roth), Mary Ellen Collentine, Micah Meskel (for Bob Sallinger), Molly Emmons, Nickole Cheron, Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro, Rich Grant, Rob Lee, Solamon Ibe, and Vicente Harrison*

***Phone**

Planning Team: Danielle Butsick, Carol Baumann and Kristen Gelino

Non-voting Attendees and Members of the Public: James Ryan and Jason Holmgren

Steering Committee Members (or alternate) Not Present: Darlene Urban Garrett, Dean Alby, Dean Stearman, Jennifer Levy, Jim Mattison, John Steup, Sherrie Forsloff, and Simeon Mamaril

Summary Prepared by: Kristen Gelino and Carol Baumann – 12/23/2015

Project No.: 103S3954

Quorum – Yes or No Yes (24 voting members present)

Item	Action
------	--------

Welcome and Introductions

- Jessica London, acting chairperson for the December meeting, opened the meeting and facilitated round-table group introductions for all persons present and on the phone. Solamon Ibe was identified as acting vice-chairperson for the meeting.
 - It was determined that a quorum was present.
 - Ms. London reviewed the meeting agenda and no modifications were made.
 - Handouts provided included: Agenda, October Meeting Summary (SC#3), November Meeting Summary (SC#4), Recommendation for Risk Reporting Areas (HO#1), Public Questionnaire Discussion Handout (HO#2), Draft Critical Facility and Infrastructure Definition (HO#3) and Draft Vision, Mission and Goals (HO#4).
 - Ms. London asked if any member of the public wished to address the committee. No members of the public were present who wished to provide comment.
-



Item	Action
------	--------

- The October and November meeting summaries were reviewed and approved by the committee.

Risk Reporting Areas

Ms. London introduced the risk reporting areas discussion. Kristen Gelino provided some additional background information regarding the risk reporting area recommendation and handout. She indicated that the planning team had considered several different approaches to dividing the City in order to report risk and had determined that there was no ideal way, but that the recommendation put forth was believed to be the best option. Ms. Gelino indicated that the dataset was utilized in the City’s budget mapping project. Danielle Butsick further explained that the planning team liked the idea of using these risk reporting areas because they provided linkage to these financial reporting areas and mitigation actions often require financial expenditures.

Ms. Gelino informed the committee that the names of the areas presented on the handout were also the names used in the budget mapping with the exception of the airport area. The airport area was added on to the risk reporting map by the planning team so that the entire City limits would be covered. After reviewing the handout, several questions were raised regarding Maywood Park and whether or not the area would be considered in the plan. The planning team indicated that Multnomah County is also in the process of updating their hazard mitigation plan and that Maywood Park would likely be covered under that planning process. Additionally, it was noted that the City lacks the jurisdictional authority in Maywood Park that would be needed to implement mitigation actions and the planning team did not have access to the general building stock data that underlies the risk assessment. The planning team recommended that Maywood Park be excluded from the risk assessment, although the plan could mention the issue of a city within a city and/or it could be a mitigation action to partner with Maywood Park. After discussion the steering committee approved the risk reporting areas and names as recommended by the planning team.

The planning team will follow up with Multnomah County regarding coverage of Maywood Park in the County hazard mitigation plan.

Public Questionnaire Goals – Breakout Session

Ms. London introduced the public questionnaire breakout session handout. She indicated that the committee would be splitting into groups to provide input on the development of the public mitigation questionnaire. A member of the committee asked what the timeline and budget was for the questionnaire. Ms.



Item	Action
------	--------

Butsick indicated that the timeline was as soon as possible and that the budget was not unlimited but was substantial enough to do a good job. She further indicated that the planning team would be using the results of the breakout session to adapt and finalize the questionnaire that was currently being developed by the planning team.

The steering committee broke out into groups and discussed suggestions/goals for the public questionnaire. Notes from the groups were collected at the end of the session and the planning team will aggregate the input for use in the development of the questionnaire.

Key recommendations from the breakout session were:

- Use existing steering committee connections to reach a broad audience, and reach out to schools and existing community organizations. Emphasize vulnerable, underserved, and potentially isolated populations.
- Use a variety of technology and media to distribute the survey. Distribute at community gathering places or events and remove barriers to participation (face-to-face, phone calls).
- Use give-aways and incentives for participation and advertise using techniques that will reach all groups, especially the most vulnerable – radio, TV, billboards, water/utility bill inserts, and get support from other city departments including the mayor.
- The survey should be short, simple, and direct; it should be accessible to those who do not speak English and able to adapt to different cultures. It should be used as an educational tool with links or other ways to get additional information.

Critical Facilities and Infrastructure

Ms. London introduced the critical facilities and infrastructure handout. Ms. Gelino explained that there are three different components to the critical facilities discussion: the definition, the categories by which results would be aggregated, and the data sources for the categories. Ms. Gelino indicated that the steering committee had approved the recommended definition of critical facilities in the homework survey and no further comments on the definition were received. The steering committee then discussed the categories and data sources at length. Several recommendations for additional data to be included were made by steering committee members including: surgical centers and large clinics, levees, ADA accessible transport facilities, rivers, courts, and



Item	Action
------	--------

animal shelters. Additionally, it was suggested that hazardous material facilities be considered high potential loss facilities and that supporting infrastructure be a subcategory in utility systems.

In addition the steering committee discussed the concept of consequences and the desire to target facilities that have a greater impact if they fail. Ms. Gelino indicated that they would use consequence data as it is available in prioritizing mitigation actions; however, she noted that the focus of the risk assessment for this planning process is on exposure and vulnerability rather than consequence. She noted that the critical facility definition that had been approved was from an entire planning effort devoted to identifying consequences and that information would be utilized if available.

The planning team will continue to develop the critical facilities database.

The steering committee also discussed acquiring datasets from other local governments and/or private entities. It was noted that the Port of Portland has contributed data and information for the risk assessment and that other entities had been contacted. The planning team noted that part of this planning process is about identifying gaps in information and about building partnerships. It was noted that if there is information that is currently unavailable, acquisition can be listed as a mitigation action.

The planning team will adjust the mission and goals as requested.

It was noted that the time allotted for the discussion had passed, so the planning team indicated that they would take the comments that had been received under consideration as they continued to build the critical facilities database.

Goals and Objectives Discussion

Ms. London introduced the vision, mission and goals handout. Ms. Gelino reminded the committee that at the November meeting the committee had agreed upon a vision and mission statement and that the committee had asked the planning team to draft goals based on the mitigation typologies. Ms. Gelino indicated that the goals had been approved by the committee in the homework survey, but there were a few comments that the planning team wanted to address. After discussion, the following was decided:

- Cost-effective would be added to the mission statement,
- Public and private would be added to goal number 3,
- Cost-effective would be removed from goal number 7,
- Goal 4 would be revised to eliminate the term environmental processes.



Item	Action
------	--------

The committee also discussed different interpretations of what is meant by and conveyed in goals, objectives and actions. The planning team will work to provide clarification on how the terms are being used in this planning process.

Public Comment and Next Steps

- No members of the public were present at the close of the meeting.
- Ms. Gelino noted that homework assignments for the January meeting would likely address objectives, the document outline and the data gap analysis.
- The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 PM. The next steering committee meeting is:

January 20, 2016 at 4:00 PM
Portland Public Schools Blanchard Education Service Center
Wy'East Conference Room, Level L1
501 N Dixon St.
Portland, OR 97227
Call in number: 1-800-523-8437 code: 707-186-3750