



**Agenda**  
**City of Portland Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan Update**  
**10th Steering Committee Meeting**  
 Wednesday, June 15, 2016, 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



<b>4:00pm – 4:20pm</b>	<b>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</b>
<p>Jeremy O’Leary,  <i>Chairperson</i>, Danielle Butsick, and Kristen Gelino, <i>Planning Team</i></p> <p><b>Handout</b> – SC#9 Summary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Round-table introductions</li> <li>• Establish quorum</li> <li>• Review the agenda</li> <li>• Public comment</li> <li>• Review the action items and approve April meeting summary</li> <li>• Administrative updates</li> <li>• Review of meeting tools</li> </ul>
<b>4:20pm – 4:35pm</b>	<b>REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT RESULTS</b>
<p>Danielle Butsick and Kristen Gelino, <i>Planning Team</i></p> <p><b>Handout#1</b> – Results of the NHMP survey</p> <p><b>Handout#2</b> – Summary of the Planning for Real Meetings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present the results of the NHMP survey and the Planning for Real Meetings</li> </ul> <p><b>Why this matters:</b> The steering committee was integral in the development of the public engagement strategy, so the planning team wanted to be sure to share the results. This information was shared with the Bureaus at the May action item development workshop.</p> <p><b>Feedback requested:</b> Any results that you found interesting or surprising.  <b>Example:</b> “I was surprised by...” or, “In reviewing the selected actions, it seemed like this item identified by the public was not addressed by any selected actions...”</p>
<b>4:35pm – 5:20pm</b>	<b>REVIEW OF SELECTED ACTION ITEMS</b>
<p>Danielle Butsick and Kristen Gelino, <i>Planning Team</i></p> <p><b>Handout#3</b> – Selected Action Items</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present the actions that have been selected by City Bureaus and Offices and any comments received to date</li> <li>• Receive additional comments on selected action items</li> </ul> <p><b>Why this matters:</b> The action plan is the heart of the plan. It identifies actions that City Bureaus and Offices would like to take over the next five years to reduce the risk and vulnerability of the people, property, economy and environment of the City of Portland.</p> <p><b>Feedback requested:</b> Additional comments/clarification on selected action items or questions on gaps.  <b>Example:</b> “The intent of PBEM-1 is unclear to me.” or, “I think there are some equity concerns in PBEM-1. Have you considered...”</p>
<b>5:20pm – 5:30pm</b>	<b>BREAK</b>
<b>5:30pm – 6:00pm</b>	<b>PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENANCE STRATEGY AND CONTINUED INVOLVEMENT</b>
<p><b>Handout #4</b> – Draft Plan Implementation and Maintenance Strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present the Plan Implementation and Maintenance Strategy</li> <li>• Review the next steps of the planning process</li> <li>• Receive feedback on steering committee’s continued involvement</li> </ul> <p><b>Why this matters:</b> Plan maintenance is the process established to track the plan’s implementation progress and to inform the next plan update. Additionally, the planning team would like to hear how the steering committee members would like to be involved in the remainder of this plan update process.</p> <p><b>Feedback requested:</b> Questions on the plan implementation and maintenance strategy. Ideas on continued involvement for steering committee members.</p>

**Example:** “I would like to stay engaged through...” or “Can you please clarify what is meant by....”

<p><b>6:00pm – 6:25pm</b></p> <p>Jeremy O’Leary, <i>Chairperson</i></p> <p><b>Handout #5 – Lessons Learned Feedback Sheet</b></p>	<p><b>LESSONS LEARNED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discuss what worked in this planning process, did not work and ideas for improvement.</li></ul> <p><b>Why this matters:</b> The planning team wants to ensure that we capture lessons learned from this process, so that the NHMP update process can continue to improve.</p> <p><b>Feedback requested:</b> Comments on what worked and what didn’t and ideas for improvement.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “I would have liked to have had more time devoted to....” Or “I had a much better understanding after...”</p>
<p><b>6:25pm – 6:30pm</b></p> <p>Danielle Butsick and Kristen Gelino, <i>Planning Team</i></p>	<p><b>PUBLIC COMMENT AND NEXT STEPS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Public comment</li><li>• Review action items identified in the meeting</li></ul>
<p><b>6:30pm</b></p>	<p><b>ADJOURN</b></p>



# MEETING SUMMARY

---

**Date of Meeting:** June 15, 2016

**Subject:** Steering Committee Meeting No. 10

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

**In Attendance:** **Steering Committee:** Rob Lee, Darise Weller, John Steup, Jeremy O'Leary, Danielle Brooks, Molly Emmons, Kathryn Hartinger, Rich Grant, Kathy Roth, Jonna Papaefthimiou, Jeff Soulages, Micah Meskel, Mary Ellen Collentine, Laurent Picard, Nickole Cheron, \*Jim Mattison, Solamon Ibe, Jessica London, Darlene Urban-Garrett

**\*Phone**

**Planning Team:** Danielle Butsick and Kristen Gelino

**Non-voting Attendees and Members of the Public:** Courtney Patterson, Troy Doss, Angela Carkner, Brian Hoop, Peter O'Farrell

**Steering Committee Members (or alternate)** Dean Alby, Maggie Skenderian, Dean Stearman, Karen Tam, Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro, Ronault LS Catalani, Sherrie Forsloff, Simeon Mamaril, Vicente Harrison, Margaret Puckette, Jennifer Levy, Casey Milne

**Not Present:**

**Summary Prepared by:** Kristen Gelino– 06/16/2016

**Project No.:** 103S3954

**Quorum – Yes or No** Yes (19 voting members present)

---

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

## Welcome and Introductions

- Jeremy O'Leary, acting chairperson for the June meeting, opened the meeting and facilitated round-table group introductions for all persons present.
  - It was noted that a quorum of steering committee members was not present, so the approval of the April meeting summary would be postponed until a quorum was reached.
  - The meeting agenda was reviewed and no additional modifications were made.
  - Handouts provided included: Agenda, April Meeting Summary (SC#9), Results of the NHMP Survey (HO#1), Summary of the Planning for Real Meetings (HO#2), Selected Action Items (HO#3), Draft Plan Implementation and Maintenance Strategy (HO#4), and Lessons Learned Feedback (HO#5).
  - Mr. O'Leary asked if any member of the public wished to address the committee. No members of the public were present who wished to provide comment.
  - Danielle Butsick and Kristen Gelino provided a few administrative updates to the committee:
-



Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The second phase of public engagement (which involves presenting information on the draft plan and soliciting comments and feedback) will occur during the upcoming public comment period. Ms. Butsick is planning to schedule five town hall meetings in various locations across the City as well as a follow up meeting with the Coalition of Communities of Color. She indicated that she would like to begin scheduling these meetings next week and that additional information on dates, times and locations would be distributed as it becomes available.</li> </ul>	<p>The planning team will distribute information on the Town Hall meetings as it becomes available.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ms. Butsick indicated that the CEI Hub report was in the process of the being finalized and she anticipated that the report would be distributed to the steering committee within the next week.</li> </ul>	<p>The planning team will distribute the CEI report as soon as it is finalized.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ms. Butsick and Ms. Gelino indicated that due to some recent developments the City would like to develop a linkage procedure so that special purpose districts within the City can develop an annex and link to the plan rather than developing their own plan. Ms. Gelino explained that as a result of this development the timeline would need to be pushed back by a few weeks so appropriate changes could be incorporated into the document and the procedure could be developed. She also indicated that there would be some procedural aspects of plan development that any linking jurisdiction would need to undertake. A steering committee member asked if the outreach tools developed during the process would be used by linking jurisdictions. Ms. Gelino indicated that generally linking jurisdictions are encouraged to use the strategy and tools developed during the base plan development process. Ms. Butsick clarified that the jurisdictions who would be likely to be linking would not have as many resources available for public outreach, so the efforts conducted by these jurisdictions would almost certainly be less extensive.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At this point in the meeting it was determined that a quorum had been reached, so the committee returned to a review the April meeting summary. The April meeting summary was approved by consensus with the understanding that additional clarification would be added to one of the comments regarding the CEI Hub and property values.</li> </ul>	<p>The planning team will correct the April meeting summary as requested.</p>

**Review of the Public Engagement Results**



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

Mr. O’Leary introduced the meeting topic and turned it over to Ms. Butsick. Ms. Butsick introduced the survey results handout and indicated that the survey had received almost 3,000 responses. She thanked the committee members for their role in this accomplishment. Ms. Butsick and Ms. Gelino briefly reviewed some of the results and the committee discussed items that were found interesting. It was clarified that the survey was still open and that it would remain open at least until the subscription to the survey platform was expired.

A steering committee member asked how the results of the survey was to be used. Ms. Butsick indicated that potential actions that came out of comments were included on the master list of actions. Additionally, Ms. Gelino indicated that the survey results provides information that will be used to shape future outreach efforts. For example, East Portland was significantly underrepresented in responses and drought was listed as the third hazard of concern for respondents. Ms. Gelino indicated that many of the actions, especially regarding public engagement, seemed responsive to these results.

Several steering committee members suggested reviewing the responses based on certain demographic or geographic information. A steering committee member pointed out that a significant portion of the population indicated that they spent most of their time in the Central City/Downtown area. She indicated that it was her understanding from previous conversations that the risk assessment results did not take movement through the City into consideration. Ms. Gelino indicated that this was correct as population information is based on census data, which is based on where people reside. It was determined that this should be listed as a limitation in the plan if it was not already included.

The planning team will make sure that the limitation indicated is listed in the document.

Ms. Butsick briefly reviewed the planning for real summary report and asked if there were any questions or comments from the committee. It was mentioned that the outreach effort was impressive and the meetings were quite a bit of fun.

**Review of the Selected Action Items**

Mr. O’Leary introduced the review of selected action items topic and turned it over to Ms. Butsick. She indicated that the Bureaus had worked really hard on developing these actions very quickly with competing demands on their time (mainly Cascadia Rising). She informed the committee that some changes had been made since the document was emailed out to the group and that changes were shown in track changes in the meeting packets. Ms. Butsick then opened it up to the group for thoughts or concerns regarding the actions. Comments received are summarized as follows:



Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are quite a few acronyms in the tables and they need to be spelled out so that the table can be reviewed more easily.</li> <li>- It was clarified that a table listing actions by hazard type and by mitigation type would be included in the plan.</li> <li>- It was noted that the Portland Water Bureau (PWB) and the Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) did not have any actions flagged as equity actions. No member of BES was present, but a representative from PWB thought they might be able to review in more detail if more time was allotted. Ms. Gelino indicated that since the timeline had been moved back by a few weeks, the planning team may be able to adjust the July 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for revised actions. Ms. Gelino and Ms. Butsick indicated that they would follow up with Bureaus after reviewing the updated timeline. It was further clarified that the forum for providing comments on the action plan for steering committee members was today's meeting, but the document would be put through a 30-day public comment period.</li> <li>- It was noted that the steering committee recommended actions (even those that were not selected) and the entire mitigation best practices catalog would be included in the plan document.</li> <li>- It was noted that a 30 day public comment period is a short-time frame and that August is not an ideal month to hold the comment period due to vacations.</li> <li>- Concerns were raised about the fact that not all steering committee recommended actions were selected by the Bureaus. Ms. Butsick requested that steering committee members follow up with her on any specific action items that had not been selected. She indicated that action selection occurred within the realities of budget constraints and what could be accomplished in the next five years.</li> <li>- Concerns were raised about the steering committee action item reconciliation document. After review it seemed like some of the action items that were referenced did not meet the intent of the steering committee recommendation (for example – SC-54; SC-62; SC-71).</li> <li>- Some of the selected action items may not be within the powers and authority of the Bureaus to implement. Action items should be reviewed to determine if state level support is needed and then the actions should be assigned to the City's Office of Government Relations to advocate or lobby for this support.</li> </ul>	<p>The planning team will follow up as appropriate on comments on the action item. Follow-up will include including a review of the actions for items that require City Council or Office of Government Relations support. These items will be flagged as needing higher-level support.</p>

Also during the course of this conversation there was discussion regarding the proposed alternatives for the new fossil fuel regulations. They are not currently



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

out for public review, but PBEM staff indicated that they would send an email to the committee when it becomes available. Finally, the steering committee roster was passed around for member review and corrections. Steering committee members requested that a version of the roster with member email addresses be distributed to the committee.

**Plan Implementation and Maintenance Strategy and Continued Involvement**

Mr. O’Leary introduced the Plan Implementation and Maintenance item and turned over the discussion to Ms. Gelino. Ms. Gelino introduced handout #4 and reminded the committee that they had discussed plan implementation and maintenance at several times and that the planning team had folded the recommendations into the draft strategy. She quickly reviewed the main components of the strategy and indicated that upon her review she realized that the language indicating the review of recommended actions was not as explicit as it was meant to be and this would be rectified in a revised version. The committee members reviewed the strategy and offered the following comments and revisions:

- A bullet should be added about coordinating with the Office of Governmental Relations annually before they have set their agenda.
- The equity implementation section should explicitly call out recommendations/best practices regarding data collection, opportunities to inform other processes and identifying mechanisms for accountability.
- The annual progress report should include information on what data was or should be collected for equity concerns.
- In the plan update section a bullet should be added about reviewing the equity implementation strategy to see if adjustments are needed and if projects were meeting their equity objectives.
- The continued public engagement discussion should be revised so that annual public engagement events will be pursued as they arise and on the advice of the committee and may include things such as utilizing existing networks and communication systems to distribute the annual progress report, speaking to groups upon request and as resources allow, and recorded webinars or other online engagement.

The planning team will distribute a steering committee roster that includes members’ email addresses.

**Lessons Learned**



Item	Action
<p>Mr. O’Leary introduced the lessons learned discussion. He indicated that the committee would engage in a discussion, but if participants wanted to submit anonymous feedback, he would take the questionnaire provided in the handout packet or committee members could send him their thoughts via email and he would anonymously submit comments to the planning team. A summary of the comments received during the time allotted for discussion follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The timing of Cascadia Rising and the Bureau time to work on the action item selection was unfortunate and caused even greater time constraints.</li><li>- It would have been preferable to engage the Bureaus earlier in the process to plan for actions.</li><li>- It would have been nice to see more members of the community represented and to keep people engaged throughout the process.</li><li>- The meeting time is not ideal and is difficult for community members.</li><li>- The process felt disjointed and there was not enough circling back to prior topics.</li><li>- There was confusion early in the process as many members of the committee had not attended the kick-off meeting. It would have been better to have the kick-off meeting content reiterated in the 1<sup>st</sup> steering committee meeting. Although this issue was rectified at a later meeting in the process.</li><li>- The planning process seemed rushed at the end. It would have been nice to have solicited projects earlier and to have given Bureaus the opportunity to talk about projects earlier and present possible actions.</li><li>- It was unfortunate that most of the equity review happened behind the scenes.</li><li>- The planning process should have been flipped with working on actions first and the other items last.</li><li>- Bureaus should have been given an opportunity to talk about what they perceived priorities to be.</li><li>- It would have been nice to have more breakout sessions from the larger group and then reporting back.</li><li>- It would have been nice to have a meeting dedicated to doing a more thorough review of the previous plan and highlighting priority items.</li><li>- The Hazus data (risk assessment results) would have been useful earlier in the process.</li><li>- Accessibility to the process was an issue, although it is clear that PBEM is trying. In the future, keep thinking about ways to improve –</li></ul>	<p>The planning team will revise the plan implementation and maintenance strategy based on the committee feedback.</p> <p>Steering committee members should submit other lessons learned to Mr. O’Leary of directly to the planning team.</p>



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

why this is important to community groups and how this plan may impact their lives.

- A session where Bureaus could discuss action item selection and development with each other would have been useful.
- It may have been useful to have a Bureau-specific coordinating committee.
- The information for meetings was well put together, but it would have been nice to have a cheat sheet about what the key points were.
- All the actions that were developed during the planning process should be captured in the plan even if they were not ultimately selected.
- Timing of meetings in general is a challenge as there is no convenient time for everyone. This issue may be alleviated if dinner and child care are offered. There is a need to be mindful of community members needing to leave their jobs early in order to attend meetings.
- It was great to have an opportunity for community members to learn more about the bureaus.
- The momentum of the equity work should be carried forward.
- The relationship building that happened during this process should be carried forward.
- It was great to see that representatives came to the meetings and we were able to achieve quorum at all meetings.
- The equity trainings were useful.
- The breakout sessions and smaller group discussions were appreciated.
- There is a need to continue to be really intentional about inclusivity. Who is not here? Make sure there is continual outreach and invitations to participate or present on community groups.
- It was very nice to be able to put some faces on the Bureaus.
- Even though some community groups were missing from the process, there were still a lot of diverse interests and viewpoints represented from a huge segment of the population. It was a large committee but we were still able to move through topics and get things done.
- It was a great learning experience.
- The community outreach and engagement was a huge success.
- It is important that federal and state agencies are listed as partners in the action plan if grant money is available.

The planning team thanked the committee for their thoughtful comments and encouraged them to submit any more comments about the process. Ms. Gelino specifically asked for agenda topics that the committee would have liked to



**Item**

**Action**

have skipped to make time for some of the items mentioned during the discussion.

**Public Comment and Next Steps**

- There were several announcements regarding related issues and upcoming events:
  - Committee members should keep their eyes out for the City Club of Portland Earthquake Recommendations that will be released in February.
  - The EPA’s proposed plan for cleanup of the Superfund site on the Willamette has been released and comments regarding the plan would be greatly appreciated. There is a public forum scheduled from 7pm to 9pm on June 21<sup>st</sup>.
  - A staff representative from Multnomah County Drainage District indicated that she had copies of the District’s Levee Ready Columbia annual report.
  - Committee members were encouraged to contact appropriate representatives about oil and energy facilities in the area, as the city is currently in the process of developing regulations to implement the Fossil Fuels Infrastructure Resolution, Resolution 37168.
- The planning team thanked the committee for their work and advised them that an updated timeline would be passed along as soon as it was finalized. It was noted that as the review and adoption process moves forward, participation from the steering committee at events, such as a council hearing, would be greatly appreciated.
- The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 PM. This was likely the last steering committee for the plan development process, unless one is deemed necessary after the public comment period. PBEM staff will coordinate meetings as indicated in the plan implementation and coordination strategy.