



Regional Disaster Debris Management Planning Project – Stakeholder Meeting #1 Summary

The Regional Disaster Debris Management Planning (RDDMP) Project held the first in a series of three stakeholder meetings for the project on Wednesday, July 10, 2013 from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. at the Clackamas County Development Services Building in Oregon City, OR.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Kickoff a new phase of the regional disaster debris management planning process
- Review project history including past accomplishments and findings
- Present the current project scope and introduce the contractor selected to assist the Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization in this effort
- Enhance regional awareness of debris operations
- Discuss and prioritize critical issues identified in the last planning process and provide feedback on current project goals and objectives

The meeting was staffed and facilitated by members of the project team including representatives of the City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS), Multnomah County, Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization (RDPO), Ecology and Environment Inc. and EnviroIssues.

The facilitator welcomed attendees, introduced the project team and asked attendees to introduce themselves to the broader group. The BPS project manager, Kevin Veaudry Casaus, provided background information, history and work to date on the project. A tri-county Metro taskforce began work on a regional planning effort several years ago. Planning efforts continued with the development of the RDPO in 2010 and funding for developing a regional disaster debris planning project. The first phase of the project added Clark and Columbia counties to the regional planning effort, and identified six critical issues needing to be addressed in the next phase of work (outlined below).

Denise Barrett, RDPO Administrator, discussed key roles and responsibilities of the RDPO. The project contractor, Matthew Lieuallen from Ecology and Environment, presented a brief overview of the project scope, purpose, timeframe and key milestones. The project is funded by an Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant. The scope includes reviewing and clarifying jurisdictional authority, developing an online project information portal, reviewing, assessing and supporting jurisdictional disaster debris plans and developing a regional framework and operations toolkit. The project schedule is June – December 2013.

After a short break, the project manager, Kevin Veaudry Casaus and RDPO representative, Mike Maloney presented the context for considering six critical issues for regional disaster debris management (outlined below under “breakout groups”). Critical issues were identified during stakeholder engagement for the previous phase of the project.

The six issues include:

1. Plan ownership, regional coordination and plan development
2. Thresholds triggering a regional response to disaster debris management
3. Mutual aid availability and scope
4. Identification of debris sites
5. Defining jurisdictional roles and responsibilities



6. Local disaster debris management plan components

The facilitator then introduced the breakout group discussion including the purpose of the groups, tools and materials available at each table for the group to use. Each group was assigned 30 minutes to discuss one critical issue. A member from the RDDMP project team was assigned to each table to help facilitate discussion. The group was asked to review a summary handout, nominate a scribe to take notes and discuss the following questions:

- a) What progress has been made toward achieving the action items identified?
- b) What new tasks might be considered?
- c) Are there specific planning tools that would be helpful in addressing outstanding action items (i.e. checklists, tools, templates)?
- d) What challenges might be encountered (by the region or your jurisdiction) as action items are completed?

After the group breakout, each group presented their findings back to the larger meeting and answered any specific questions about the results.

All six groups identified several findings and suggestions to the four questions for their assigned critical issue. These findings will help determine useful information, resources and recommendations to be reviewed, considered and integrated for the project and incorporated into next stages. A summary of key findings for each issue is outlined below.

Critical Issue 1:

- RDPO is an appropriate structure
- Funding source for RDPO is a challenge – raise the profile on funding needs
- Should budget based on capacity/needs
- Base planning scenario exists, but more refinement is needed
- Components for debris framework have draft (Metro), but needs revisiting
- Continuous need based on changes to leaders
- Pass ownership of products and share information – need stable organization (RDPO), workgroup or to work with similar other groups i.e. LEPC

Critical Issue 2:

- Progress:
 - Threshold identification is scenario based and related to the specifics any particular event
 - When any one party reaches the limits of their capabilities and help is needed, it is likely that the nearest jurisdictions are also affected by the same event and help needs to come from farther away from unaffected jurisdictions.
 - Plans should anticipate multiple triggers and allow of interaction among triggers to trip thresholds
- New tasks:
 - Maintenance of access to the library of Consultant documents and regional plans served on consultant website for this project
 - A disaster debris scenario exercise



- Tools:
 - The described toolkit under development in this project would be helpful. Any checklists or templates to compare existing plans or to model the development of local plans would be beneficial.
 - Access to other jurisdictions plans for comparison, contrast and lessons learned.
 - A regional framework to coordinate elements among partner jurisdictions.
 - Access to national and regional standards.
- Challenges:
 - Lack of available local resources
 - Lack of coordination both within and among jurisdictions
 - Lack of capability to identify and manage HAZMAT among debris
 - Lack of training, inter-departmental and inter-jurisdictional coordination.

Critical Issue 3:

- Progress:
 - Need an improved inventory of equipment
 - Important to have contracts/lists for equipment supply and operations – can these be integrated into Mutual Aid Agreements?
- New tasks:
 - Get Clark County in the fold; expand tri-county work to five counties
 - Sort out franchise haulers, priorities – which agency is most important?
- Tools:
 - Get all stakeholders together in the same room, bridge the gap through contact lists, videos?
 - Tabletop exercises at the jurisdictional level – report back at regional/ RDPO level
 - Backup radios – standardization for communication, 900 MHz? Satellites?
 - Web EOC
- Challenges:
 - Time constraints
 - Legal binding document to commit agencies to Mutual Aid Agreement
 - Legal issues
 - Distribution of resource evenly despite population concentrations = equity

Critical Issue 4:

- Progress:
 - Models for cross border coordination and exercising
 - Existing Metro planning on debris sites
 - Columbia County has done good work
- New tasks:
 - Clarify Metro's role
 - How to integrate Clark and Columbia counties/State/National Guard
 - Pre-identification criteria
 - Identification of local sites
 - Role of MAC group



- Tools:
 - Standardized
 - Checklist/clearance form
 - Coordinate with DEQ
- Challenges:
 - Clarify local authorities
 - Engaging decision makers
 - How to integrate Clark and Columbia counties
 - Conflicts in use of identified sites

Critical Issue 5:

- Progress:
 - Some cities have identified roles and responsibilities of all bureaus, others have no plans for large events
 - Unresolved issues – where after 72 hours? Who is responsible for sorting and final disposition?
 - Some threshold triggers to escalate to counties are not defined
- New tasks:
 - Define thresholds
 - Need tool to estimate volumes of debris by type for various scales of events by event scenario and geography
 - Identify response recovery capacity by jurisdiction
 - Assess reliability and resiliency of debris responders

Critical Issue 6:

- Progress:
 - General components have been coordinated
 - New tasks:
 - GIS incorporation
 - Redundant communications
 - Resource typing
 - Scenario based plan or exercise
- Tools:
 - Common scenarios
 - Plan library
 - Formalized/standardized Mutual Aid equipment usage agreements
 - Temporary debris site checklist pre-approval certification/authorization
- Challenges:
 - Resources
 - Visibility of key stakeholders

The facilitator and project team then summarized the next steps in the project, including developing a regional framework and toolkit and sharing information on the portal. The project team also thanked people for attending and requested attendees to complete a feedback and evaluation form.



Feedback & evaluation forms:

A total of 32 attendees completed feedback forms. Overall, the feedback received was generally positive.

Responders also provided suggestions for improving future meetings, including more time for small group discussion and questions, incorporating case studies and specialized workshop topics.

Approximately half of the responders requested access to the project portal website.

Attendance:

A total of 42 people attended the stakeholder meeting. Attendees included representatives from multiple jurisdictions including:

- Boring Water
- City of Beaverton
- City of Gresham
- City of Hillsboro
- City of Lake Oswego
- City of Portland
- City of Tigard
- City of Vancouver
- City of Wilsonville
- Clackamas County
- Clark County
- Metro
- Multnomah County
- Oregon City
- Port of Portland
- Portland Police Bureau
- Sandy Police
- State of Oregon
 - Department of Human Services
 - Office of Emergency Management
- Washington County