

Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

December 2, 2013, 1:00 – 3:00 pm

TVFR Command and Business Operations Center

11945 SW 70th, Tigard, OR 97227



Attendance:

Steering Committee Members

1. Dave Kirby, *Committee Chair and Law Enforcement Representative*
2. Bob Cozzie, *Committee Vice Chair and Public Safety Communications Representative*
3. Scott Porter, *Washington County Representative*
4. Nancy Bush, *Clackamas County Representative*
5. Adrienne Donner, *Program Committee Vice Chair (Representing Erin Janssens, Program Committee Chair)*
6. Chief Mike Duyck, *Fire & EMS Representative*
7. Carmen Merlo, *City of Portland Representative*
8. Joe Rizzi, *Multnomah County Representative*
9. Eric Corliss, *At-Large Representative, Non-profit Sector*
10. Rebecca Geisen, *Public Works Representative (Water)*
11. Cheryl Bledsoe, *Clark County Representative*
12. Larry Stevens, *Public Works Representative (Transportation)*

Regional Staff

1. Denise Barrett, *RDPO Administrator*
2. David Gassaway, *RDPO Regional Staff (Washington County EM)*
3. Kristen Baird Romero, *RDPO Regional Staff (Multnomah County EM)*

1) Welcome, Opening Remarks and Introductions [Dave Kirby, Chair]

- a) Dave Kirby opened the meeting with introductions and a review of the agenda.

2) Committee Business Items [Dave Kirby]

- a) Action: Approval of the November 4, 2013 Steering Committee Meeting Minutes <Document: 11042013_SC_Minutes>. No changes needed.
- b) Motion to approve: Scott Porter. Seconded by: Adrienne Donner. Minutes approved unanimously.

3) Grant & Finance Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) Approval

- a) Action: Motion to approve Grant & Finance SOP: Scott Porter. Seconded by: Eric Corliss. SOP approved unanimously.

4) Translating the RDPO 2014-2016 Strategic Priorities into a two-year Work Plan and Budget [Dave Kirby & Denise Barrett]

- a) Review of the document: <RDPO Work Plan and Cost Options_2014-2016_v4.xls>. This document encompasses two fiscal years. Left side July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015. Right side July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016. Decided to include both years in document but concentration on the first year.
- b) Tried to prioritize the most important projects or initiatives. Deliverables for each option, with three implementation strategies and associated costs. Options highlighted in yellow are proposed by the RDPO Administrator, following her analysis of which option would likely work best in achieving the desired deliverables.
- c) When added together, the ideal “implementation plan” for all projects listed (current, plus a couple of new ones) totals \$377,000. Cost of current projects alone under the recommended options comes to \$312,500.
- d) Explanation of priority projects with costs (Year One):
 - i) RDPO Governance Coordination & Resource Development: Maintain a regional administrator (\$175,000/yr) to help coordinate the governance structure, raise funds, monitor and support the progress of RDPO projects. That would be most basic level to attempt to fund.

For Steering Committee Review - APPROVED

- ii) Regional MACS Development: Contractor would be hired in order to finish and maintain MACS development (\$30,000/yr.). Specifically: the contractor would be paid to train the MAC Group.
- iii) Regional Disaster Debris Planning Program: Contractor would be hired to provide technical support to the task force to complete regional concepts of operation, as well as to select local jurisdictions completing or updating their own disaster debris management plan (\$75,000/yr.)
- iv) Titan Fusion Center: Law Enforcement Workgroup and other RDPO Steering Committee members to help strengthen project. (No cost option.)
- v) Regional WEBEOC Sustainability: Contractor would provide targeted technical assistance for regional board development and to solve programming issues. (\$45,000)
- vi) Regional Disaster Preparedness Messaging: Contractor would be hired to support a regional task force in developing new disaster preparedness messaging strategies (\$10,000)
- e) Discussion on the Proposal:
 - i) Joe Rizzi asked if the cost reflected for the MACS Con Ops Project includes any funding to cover the cost of the current project manager, Dave Houghton, which is currently covered by Multnomah County.
 - (1) Denise explained that there will no longer be a paid project manager. The cost reflected in the recommended implementation option is purely to cover a technical contractor to build the MAC Group's capacity and to support the task force in orienting regional partners on the MACS ConOps plan.
 - ii) Carmen Merlo expressed that she would be hesitant to support the cost option for the WebEOC project, if it entails paying a contractor to be on retainer.
 - (1) Denise explained that the contractor costs are intended to cover a specific set of deliverables that the WebEOC Regional Users Group would need to define. Denise also clarified for another committee member that the WebEOC project covers only regional objectives and costs, and, therefore, owners of each system may have other costs (e.g., license fees), which they will need to take care of on their own.

5) Developing the RDPO Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) and Cost Share Agreement Options[Scott Porter, Bob Cozzie]

- a) Review of the document: < RDPO_IGA_draft2_112713.doc>. The small task force working on the RDPO IGA includes Scott Porter, Dave Kirby, Bob Cozzie and Denise Barrett.
 - i) This first RDPO IGA draft consists of relevant clauses extracted from several IGA examples, including those of the Regional Emergency Management Group (REMG), the Washington County Emergency Management Cooperative, the Regional Water Providers Consortium, and others, as well as language from our governance standard operating procedures.
 - ii) Relevant text was adapted to fit our needs. Several sections require answering some key questions first before writing them or editing the text that is there.
 - iii) Cost share options are going to roll into component of IGA.
 - iv) We also need to decide what to present to the policy committee at their February 7, 2014 meeting.
 - v) Preamble - Reviewed. No significant concerns.
- b) Scott's section-by-section review with the Committee:
 - i) Purpose of Agreement section: taken from RDPO guiding organizational documents. No significant changes needed.
 - ii) Membership section: As written, there are voting and Non-voting members. Voting members make a financial contribution. Additionally, language includes members are only 'local governments.'
 - (1) Change to make to the current language: include private sector organizations, non-profits, and special districts in the list.
 - (2) Need to discuss whether to divide membership by voting/non-voting members based on financial contribution.
 - (3) Concerning the private and non-profit sector agencies, as well as Federal and State public sector agencies, that cannot sign the IGA: Proposed to have a membership document for them, such as a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) similar to the Partners for a Sustainable Washington.
 - (4) The Committee suggested using language to open up membership to special districts, private sector organizations, and others.

For Steering Committee Review - APPROVED

- (5) A separate agreement (MOU) for other agencies that cannot sign the IGA may or may not be needed.
 - (6) Cheryl Bledsoe voiced a request that for agencies joining and paying, the benefits of membership in the RDPO need to be laid out. Likewise, the consequence for not contributing financially needs to be explained, either in this section or another. Just as other associations, such as professional associations, have to consistently sell benefits to their members.
 - (7) Scott expressed hopes that the benefit would be that the organization exists for everyone to come together and continue to do work and not have to spell out more benefit than that.
- iii) Administrator & Agency: section will be tied to funding and work plan. Include a section on lead administration agency (LAA) and financial manager to oversee and manage people, money, and contracts. Identify role and responsibilities of LAA.
 - (1) Members agreed need of LAA and to identify role and responsibilities in IGA
 - (2) Members suggested that using a separate agreement between the RDPO and the LAA would be appropriate, especially to help avoid the IGA having to be revised if the LAA were to change.
 - iv) Organization Structure: Highly detailed section naming agencies, members etc. Could simplify organization general composition by outlining basic structure, rules, and responsibilities to avoid putting IGA back on table for a complex amendment process when any change is needed. Also, IGA presents some new responsibilities/authorities for the Policy and Steering Committees, which need to be reviewed in greater detail.
 - (1) Committee agreed that it is necessary to streamline the descriptions of the committees to basic information in the IGA. The SOP documents can contain more information; Steering Committee to maintain responsibility for updating/approving the committee/work group SOPs.
 - (2) Due to anticipated additional changes in the IGA language, especially around membership and benefits of paying members, review of proposed new responsibilities for the Policy and Steering Committees will occur at the January 6, 2014 Steering Committee meeting.
 - v) Disputes: may need to move to where other legal clauses exist at the end of the IGA.
 - vi) Decision-making: discussion on the consensus nature of the RDPO, but the need to have voting in some circumstances, such as when funds need to be allocated.
 - (1) The next draft of the IGA will reflect concepts for when voting is needed.
 - vii) Administrative support: Section assumes basic level of financial contribution; which means RDPO would have an Administrator to provide this support. Otherwise this would be provided by RDPO members in-kind.
 - viii) Operating Guidelines: Concept here is for RDPO partners to agree on maintaining certain standards of operating, such as requiring all members to be compliant with the National Incident Management System (NIMS).
 - (a) Include standards that reflect all disciplines/all organizational members. This may eliminate naming the Incident Command System since not all organizations use this as an expectation, especially within the private sector.
 - (b) Language must also include local considerations to be inclusive- e.g. using both EOCs and ECCs
 - (c) May be easier to eliminate section for simplicity.
 - ix) Regional Strategy, Work plan, and Annual Budget noting these components within IGA.
 - (1) Suggestion to approve the work plan and budget on a bi-annual basis to avoid wasting time each year reviewing documents.
 - (a) Agreed.
 - (2) Effective Date, Duration, Termination and Withdrawal: This section is wrapped around the chosen cost option. Overall this section needs to be clearer. How or when does the IGA become effective: by date or signatures? Majority of signatures has been used in past.
 - (a) Suggested option: use all funding agencies for document to be effective. However, need to review further.
 - (b) For agencies withdrawing from the RDPO include extended duration provision – i.e. 180 days notice of intention to withdraw.
 - (3) Exclusivity, Insurance and Indemnification

For Steering Committee Review - APPROVED

- (a) Exclusivity: need a clause to enable members to sign other agreements related to disaster preparedness; in other words, by signing the RDPO IGA members are not limiting their options to join other similar organizations.
 - (b) Insurance: Is it necessary to hold? Cost can be up to a couple of thousand per year but limits exposure.
 - (i) Follow-up: Intend to review other agreements (example: Portland Dispatch Center Consortium IGA).
 - (c) May want to include some kind of indemnification clause.
- (4) Review series of costs outlined in documents <RDPO Work Plan & Cost Option Analysis_v4.doc>. [Bob Cozzie led this section.]
- (a) At this time, with no UASI funding, simplest way to structure resources would be to allocate funding from City of Portland and the five counties. Considering this option, if you have all major entities paying cost is relatively low.
 - (b) Determination of priority projects presented in document. Projects in blue boxes are already in-process, while those in green boxes represent a 'wish list' to take on in the future.
 - (c) If we want to add any projects from the wish list, then we need to stand by these and present to our elected officials options for funding them.
 - (d) It's vitally important that whatever is agreed to we stand by it and explain why these projects are important. And we need to demonstrate what the incentive is (votes, eligibility of funding in future etc.)
 - (e) Proposed Year 1 total for all projects \$377,500 (implementation strategies/cost options proposed by the RDPO Administrator).
 - (i) Local cost share could be population based or a flat-fee, with each of the five counties and the City of Portland contributing an equal share.
 - (ii) Developing options: Per capita/county option, possibility to reach out to cities. For example, if Multnomah County is responsible for \$100,000, then the county can ask their cities for a contribution. The county would then make up the difference. Some hesitation expressed on how to express incentive for the contributing cities and/or reinforcing penalty for those that do not contribute.
 - (iii) Deciding base amount equally shared among the five counties and the City of Portland: Core funding (meaning administrator only @ \$175,000) would be about \$29,150 per major jurisdiction. Anything left over will go towards projects in order of priority.
 - (iv) Creating incentives: Voting/Non-Voting structure can possibly be detrimental to overall purpose of the RDPO for regional work if everyone does not participate because they are not financially contributing.
 - (v) Non-profits often encounter the "pay to play" model. But our main concern is how to sustain what we've done so far and not use the financial piece as a deterrent for jurisdictions to participate in the future.
 - (vi) Follow-up: Continue developing cost share models, based on core funding \$175,000 for administrator only, with options for adding projects. Include transition to grant funding and strengthen "deliverables section" to specifically convey what can be expected at end of Year 1 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015), as well as what will not happen if left unfunded. Emphasis on presenting tangible regional deliverables that benefit all jurisdictions as result of coordination efforts.

6) Program Committee Update [Adrienne Donner]

- a) Leadership transition: Erin Janssens and Adrienne Donner have completed their terms as the first RDPO Program Committee Chair and Vice Chair, respectively. The Program Committee elected Mark Daniel, Sherwood Police Captain and outgoing Chair of the Law Enforcement Work Group, to serve as the new Chair, and Sue Mohnkern from the Washington County Health and Human Services Department and the outgoing Public Health Work

For Steering Committee Review - APPROVED

Group Chair, to serve as the new Vice Chair. Denise will invite both Mark and Sue to the next Steering Committee meeting.

7) UASI FY2012 Extension Request Letter [Carmen Merlo]

- a) Will submit letter of extension to Oregon Emergency Management (OEM) by mid- to late-January. Asking for 5-month extension (to October 31, 2014).
- b) If FEMA/DHS does not grant extension, OEM may give a 1-2 month extension until June or July 2014.

8) MACS ConOps Task Force [David Gassaway]

- a) Currently incorporating feedback from Task Force members, discipline work groups, federal and regional agencies on elements of the MACS ConOps. Upcoming second round of conversations to be held with PIO Work Group and emergency managers. Draft available by end of December of for wider stakeholder review.

9) Steering Committee Member Sharing [All]

- a) [J.Rizzi]: Re-establishing UASI funding. If Portland Metropolitan Region (PMR) gets back on top 25 list [of high-threat, high-density urban areas eligible for UASI funding], then (in theory) we'll be able to receive UASI funding once again. Joe would like to move forward in talks with the Titan Fusion Center (TFC) on the following proposal: *if PMR qualifies for UASI funding, the TFC would be guaranteed some funding*. Will be coordinating with director of OEM and Law Enforcement Work group (LEWG) on the following: 1) Get UASI funding back for region, 2) Possibly develop a Fusion Center Committee to give guidance to the TFC (postscript: the Center does have a Board, with Henry Reimann as its Chair), and 3) Provide more incentive for jurisdictions to contribute based on availability of a high-level security information from the TFC as a tangible deliverable/resource encouraging buy-in from jurisdictions.
 - i) Discussion: There are reasons why the TFC lost funding; it failed to demonstrate how it directly benefited the Portland Urban Area.
 - (1) [Joe] Agreed. TFC's loss of funding and likely inadequate reporting to the Feds added to Region's decline in its 2013 Risk Profile Ranking.
 - ii) Skeptical how the promise of money now will encourage them to enhance their work beyond what they have not been able to produce in the past before they lost funding.
 - iii) Uncomfortable with promising money, especially without talking first with the LEWG. The LEWG recognizes importance of the TFC doing good work for PMR.
 - iv) Next steps: Joe will hold separate conversations with the LEWG, OEM and Dave Kirby to strategize on the approach to take with the TFC.

10) Good of the Order and Meeting Adjourned [Dave Kirby]

- a) With no other business items, the meeting adjourned at 3:24pm.

Key Post-meeting Actions:

- IGA Task Force will incorporate Steering Committee feedback into the next iteration of the RDPO IGA.
- IGA Task Force will develop cost share models based on core funding amounts, with emphasis on tangible deliverables for Year 1 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015).