

Strategic Planning Workshop Steering and Program Committees

May 6, 2013, 1:00 - 5:00 pm

TVFR Command and Business Operations Center
11945 SW 70th Ave., Tigard, OR



RDPO

Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization

Unified. Prepared. Resilient.

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members

1. Scott Porter, *Washington County Representative and Steering Committee Chair*
2. Cheryl Bledsoe, *Clark County Representative*
3. Nancy Bush, *Clackamas County Representative*
4. Eric Corliss, *At-Large Representative, Non-profit Sector*
5. Bob Cozzie, *Public Safety Communications Representative*
6. Chief Mike Duyck, *Fire & EMS Representative*
7. Dave Ford, *At-Large Representative, Private Sector*
8. Rebecca Geisen, *Public Works Representative*
9. Dave Kirby, *Law Enforcement Representative*
10. Carmen Merlo, *City of Portland Representative*
11. Joe Rizzi, *Multnomah County Representative*

Program Committee Members

12. Erin Janssens, *Program Committee Chair (also Steering Committee member)*
13. Adrienne Donner, *Program Committee Vice-Chair*
14. Randy Covey, *Animal MAC Group*
15. Merrill Gonterman, *Fire/EMS WG*
16. Tim Heider, *PIO WG*
17. Michael McGuire, *Transit WG*
18. Sue Mohnkern, *Public Health WG*
19. Kori Nobel, *Marine and Civil Aviation WG*
20. Cindy Stanley, *Citizen Corps WG*
21. Don Strick, *PIO WG*
22. John Wheeler, *Emergency Management WG (interim), Resource Management Subcommittee*
23. Lesley Taylor, *PDCC/Communications WG*
24. Mark McKay, *WebEOC RUG*
25. Mercedes Wilson, *NW Hospitals Emergency Management Committee*

Regional Staff

1. Denise Barrett, *RDPO Administrator/Grants and Finance Committee*
2. Allison Boyd, *Regional Strategic Planning Coordinator*
3. Lorraine Churchill, *Program Coordinator based in Columbia Co. EM*
4. David Gassaway, *Program Coordinator based in Washington County Office of Consolidated EM*
5. Brian Landreth, *Regional Training and Exercise Coordinator*
6. Mike Maloney, *Program Coordinator based in Multnomah Co. EM*
7. Cathrine Collins, *RDPO Intern*

Guests

1. Matt Marheine, *Oregon Emergency Management*

1) Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review [Scott Porter, Steering Committee Chair]

Scott Porter gave a brief welcome and introductions were made. [Note: quorum of both committees was present.]

2) Approval of Minutes from the Previous Meetings [Scott Porter and Chief Janssens, Program Committee Chair]

Steering Committee Minutes: Motion to approve: Dave Ford. Second: Carmen Merlo. Minutes accepted unanimously by the Steering Committee

Program Committee Minutes: Motion to approve: Adrienne Donner. Second: John Wheeler. Minutes accepted unanimously by the Program Committee.

3) Strategic Planning Process Overview [Denise Barrett, RDPO Administrator]

Denise Barrett gave a presentation reviewing the planning process to date and the process going forward. Emphasis is on determining future direction of the organization by identifying priorities. Core capabilities, as described in the Presidential Preparedness Directive 8, will be the framework of the strategic planning process; particularly recognizing the gaps in capabilities. She discussed the capacity of the organization: how the work gets completed by committees, work groups, task forces, and regional staff. She mentioned that funding and sustainability of the organization will be touched on during the strategic planning discussions today.

Process of developing the strategic plan began with the Threats and Hazards Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) for the Portland Urban Area. The second phase included the Work Groups identifying their priorities, which the Program Committee reviewed and synthesized into cohesive themes and potential interdisciplinary projects to pursue.

Now we are engaging the Steering Committee to continue the dialogue on priorities. The Policy Committee will meet in June and receive an update on the drafting of the strategic plan. The planning process timeline has been developed so that if we receive UASI funding we will have priorities in place to develop the UASI application. Today's joint committee meeting incorporates the horizontal and vertical guidance the RDPO structure was designed to facilitate.

4) Review Mission, Vision, and Guiding Principles [Scott Porter]

Scott Porter reviewed the draft RDPO mission, vision, and guiding principles. There were no suggested changes to the mission or vision. There were several comments on the wording of the guiding principles that Allison Boyd noted and will update.

5) Regional Capabilities in Action [Undersheriff David Kirby, Clackamas County Sheriff's Office]

David Kirby gave a presentation on the response to the Clackamas Town Center Shooting. The presentation and discussion identified key lessons learned, benefits of the regional capabilities in place, and areas for improvement. Highlights of these points include:

- Importance of interdisciplinary training and exercising, i.e. law enforcement with fire & EMS
- Lessons were learned on facilitating better communication between command posts and the benefits of using emergency management personnel to coordinate resources from the many agencies that can assist, e.g. transportation, transit, etc
- More work needed to be able to effectively use regional and self-deployed personnel

- Many of the UASI investments were used including: plate readers, CAD-to-CAD, Medical Care Point tents, Mobile Command, like-equipped/trained tactical teams, communications equipment, PIO coordination, interdisciplinary training and exercising.
- Some gaps that could be improved: credentialing (especially given self-dispatch), patient tracking, donations management, common language not yet achieved, and protocols on inserting fire/EMS with tactical cells.

6) Choose your Core Capabilities [Brian Landreth, RDPO Training and Exercise Coordinator]

A group activity to assess gaps and current status of regional capabilities was led by Brian Landreth. Two handouts were distributed: 1) a draft ranking of capability status in the region done as inputs for the State Preparedness Report and 2) a chart showing the core capabilities addressed in the draft priorities for the strategic plan. A scenario of a Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake was used and volunteers from the group discussed some of the 31 core capabilities that would be needed to mitigate, respond to, or recover from such a scenario. The capabilities were then quickly assessed as to the general current status. The activity led to discussion of what is the appropriate level of preparedness for the region for different disaster scenarios, especially catastrophic scenarios.

7) Comparing our Regional Capabilities to National Trends [Mike Maloney, RDPO Regional Staff]

Mike Maloney gave a presentation on the nation’s strengths and weaknesses in preparedness and a look at what might be the focus of future national directives. The presentation focused on the National Preparedness Report and the proposal for FY 2014 National Preparedness Grant Program. Our regional strengths and weaknesses in the core capabilities are very similar to the national assessment. Proposed changes to preparedness grant funding put more focus on reducing duplication of capabilities within a region through more requirements for deployable resources and whole community integration. There is a potential for more competitive grant funding in the future.

8) Identify Drivers of Change for RDPO [Scott Porter]

Scott Porter introduced this agenda item to discuss factors that will influence the RDPO’s disaster preparedness work that should be reflected in the strategic plan. Table discussions followed guided by a set of questions. Each table reported back on their discussions and a summary follows:

1. Are there any emerging threats or new risk information that will require attention over the next 3 years?
 - Global Warming
 - Cyber terrorism activity increasing
 - Terrorism (domestic and “small ball”/anti-social radicals)
 - Global public health outbreaks/pandemics
 - Better science increasing awareness of vulnerabilities (e.g. Cascadia Subduction Zone not previously known; yielded new Oregon Resilience Plan)
 - Infrastructure vulnerability (age and increasing cost of)
 - Preparedness apathy
2. Are there new technological challenges or expectations that need to be addressed or would be beneficial to address?
 - Social media- increasing use and reliance
 - Cyber security

- Increase in cellular demand
 - Increased dependence on technology
 - Rapidity of change in technology
3. Are there any emerging social or community preparedness issues within the region that will require RDPO focus in the next 3 years?
 - Vulnerable populations (definition, services supporting)
 - Public expectations for technology and response/recovery
 - Changes in community resilience
 - Emergency management profession is maturing as a field
 - Micro-engagement (e.g. neighborhood-level preparedness)
 4. Are there economic and budgetary driving forces that will impact the RDPO over the next 3 years?
 - Fluctuations in amount of funding
 - Possibility of limited or no continuous funding stream
 - How do we better educate the public to increase support of resiliency/preparedness investments
 - Local government budgets shrinking ; loss of personnel while need for regional coordination remains
 5. Are there national or local political trends that may impact the work of the RDPO?
 - Education for RDPO Policy Committee and other elected officials
 - Disaster occurrences influence political attention (potential opportunity)
 - National and local political trends (including limited government views and focus internal to jurisdiction)
 - Momentum of RDPO/ future participation/ governance
 6. Which factors do you think are most critical for the next 3 years to be able to sustain the RDPO and implement high priority initiatives?
 - Recognition of jurisdictional voice in context of regional dialogue
 - Participation/interest to keep momentum; relevancy and value
 - Value proposition
 - Moving away from grant streams as driver of collaboration; decreased funding can serve as opportunity to build greater partnership/teamwork environment
 - Increase sharing of human resources

9) Criteria for Priority Validation [John Wheeler, EM WG Interim Chair, Resource Management Subcommittee Chair]

John Wheeler facilitated a group discussion on what criteria should be used to prioritize regional strategies. A summary of the discussion follows:

- Projects that can't be done elsewhere (i.e. regional implementation is best level/source vs. local, state, or federal)
- Thresholds for capacity needed
- Long-term value
- Identifying and addressing gaps
- Identify performance-based goal
- Sustainability/ helps us maintain capabilities (realistic to maintain)
- Reduces impacts on life/environment
- Value-added to partners

- No duplication – unique product/services
- Intent and plan is clear and can be communicated accurately
- Constraints: 1) Funding, 2) Capacity (including staff resources), 3) 3-year focus
- Priorities should still be listed even if there are current funding constraints so that if funding does become available they are included in the plan (e.g. list as “can’t meet due to funding limitations”)

10) Emerging Themes and Interdisciplinary Initiatives from Work Groups’ Draft Plans [Chief Janssens]

Chief Janssens introduced this agenda item and small table discussions followed focusing on a set of questions. A summary of the table reports at the end of the discussion is below. Due to previous agenda items running over on time, there was not enough time to adequately discuss all of the questions. Further discussion on these items will be held at future Program and Steering Committee meetings.

1. Are there additional priority areas (themes) or interdisciplinary initiatives that you think should be added to the lists for this 3-year period?
 - What is the first step in determining RDPO’s role in recovery?
 - Assess cyber security vulnerabilities
 - Vulnerable populations with access and functional needs
 - Private sector integration (mechanism to coordinate role in response/recovery)
 - Public education/engagement and outreach
 - Social media included in expended technological capabilities theme
 - How to include social media in regional incident response?
 - Clarify interoperability of voice and data communications in technological capabilities theme
 - Mass care/recovery
 - Disaster housing (regional)
 - Fuel planning (interface with state, regional, local)
 - Utilities (public/private partnerships)
 - Regional evaluation and improvement plan
 - Recovery planning
 - Disaster transportation planning
2. Are there any priority areas (themes) that should be consolidated or deleted for this 3-year period?
 - Potentially consolidate governance and cross-discipline themes
3. Are there any interdisciplinary projects that should be modified or deleted?
 - Add additional partners
4. Which priority areas (themes) are most and least essential to improving the quality of regional preparedness in the next 3 years? Please use the criteria for validating priorities developed in the last session to guide your discussion.
 - Cross-disciplinary and jurisdictional coordination themes and projects important based on lessons learned from Clackamas Town Center shooting (need communications/EM expertise at command post if the EOC not activated in order to get big picture of all resources available)
 - Who has additional capacity to implement could drive prioritization
5. Do you agree with the current prioritization of the interdisciplinary projects or do they need to be reordered due to new criteria for prioritization or the discussion of priority areas you just completed (question 4)?

- Insufficient time to address this question

11) Putting it all Together [Allison Boyd, RDPO Strategic Planning Coordinator]

This agenda item was cut short due to limited time left in the meeting. It was discussed that a key take-away of the meeting was that more time needs to be allotted for discussion of priorities and proposed interdisciplinary projects at future meetings of the Steering and Program Committee meetings. It was also noted that more information on the proposed projects would assist in making decisions about priorities. Comments included the importance of planning with capacity and funding in mind and the need to develop a focused list for the three-year time horizon of the strategic plan.

12) Three-year Strategic Direction [Scott Porter]

Deferred to a future meeting due to need for further discussion.

13) Planning Process Next Steps [Denise Barrett]

Next steps include developing a strategic direction and goals that can be presented to the Policy Committee. The Steering and Program Committees will need to meet more to further refine what has been discussed today.

14) Good of Order [Scott Porter]

No items.

15) Meeting adjourned.