

Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
October 11th, 2013, 9 – 11:30 am
 Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers
 600 NE Grand Ave
 Portland, OR 97232



Attendance

Policy Committee:

1. Tony Hyde, Chair; Commissioner, Columbia County
2. Kim H. Tierney, Councilor, City of Vernonia
3. Kathryn Harrington, Councilor, Metro
4. Cate Arnold, Council President, City of Beaverton (via phone)
5. Jerry Allen, Alternate for Cate Arnold/City of Beaverton
6. Larry J. Smith, Councilor, City of Vancouver
7. Steve Novick, Commissioner, City of Portland
8. Jimmy Brown, Alternate for Loretta Smith, Commissioner, Multnomah County
9. Karylenn Echols, Council President, City of Gresham
10. John Ludlow, Chair, Clackamas County

Quorum: 9 of 16 voting members present

Steering Committee:

1. Dave Kirby, Chair/Law Enforcement Representative
2. Scott Porter, Immediate Past Chair/Washington County Representative
3. Nancy Bush, Clackamas County Representative
4. Cheryl Blesdoe, Clark County Representative
5. Mike Greisen, Columbia County Representative
6. Carmen Merlo, City of Portland Representative
7. Joe Rizzi, Multnomah County Representative
8. Dave Ford, At-Large Member (Private Sector Utilities)

Minutes

1) Meeting Opening - Chair Hyde and Kathryn Harrington

a) Welcome & Introductions

- Tony Hyde, RDPO Policy Committee Chair, opened the meeting by welcoming all participants. He gave special thanks to Kathryn Harrington, Metro representative, for arranging the use of the meeting facility and providing some of the refreshments. Chair Hyde also thanked Denise Barrett, RDPO Administrator, and her staff for their work in organizing the meeting.
- Councilor Harrington spoke briefly about Metro's mission and interest in regional disaster preparedness.

Other RDPO Representation:

1. Dave Houghton, Chair, MACS ConOps Task Force
2. Jason Gates, Law Enforcement Representative, MACS ConOps Task Force
3. Mike Edrington, Technical Advisor to the MACS ConOps Task Force
4. Denise Barrett, RDPO Administrator based in Portland Bureau of Emergency Management
5. Adrienne Donner, Program Committee Vice Chair
6. David Gassaway, RDPO Regional Planner based in Washington County
7. Brian Landreth, RDPO Training and Exercise Coordinator based in Clark County
8. Kristen Baird, RDPO Program Communication Specialist based in Multnomah County

Guests:

1. Jay Wilson, Vice-Chair Oregon Seismic Safety Policy Advisory Commission
2. Todd Felix, Gresham Emergency Management
3. Kathleen Gardipee, Policy Advisor, Office of Commissioner Novick
4. Ramona Perrault, Metro Council Policy Coordinator

- Following opening remarks, all participants introduced themselves.

2) **Administrative Matters** - Chair Hyde

- a) Review and approve minutes from the June 14, 2013, meeting and the July 9, 2013, conference call. The motion was made and seconded that the Committee approve the minutes as written. The Committee unanimously approved the June 14, 2013, and July 9, 2013, meeting minutes as written.
- b) Policy Committee Vice Chair nominations. Chair Hyde explained that due to no other nominations having been made in response to two previous calls for Committee Vice Chair, he approached Commissioner Steve Novick just before the meeting to gain his agreement to serve in the role. Commissioner Novick agreed to serve so Commissioner Hyde nominated him for the position. Councilor Harrington seconded the nomination. The committee unanimously approved the selection of Commissioner Novick to serve as the Vice Chair of the Committee.
- c) Acknowledge final Policy Committee SOP. The Committee voted to approve the final SOP at its June meeting subject to some additional edits identified during that meeting. Those edits have been made, so the group unanimously acknowledged and accepted the Policy Committee SOP and Commissioner Hyde signed the document before the group. [Now available on the rdpo.org website.]

3) **The Oregon Resilience Plan Implementation and Japan Post-Disaster Update** - Jay Wilson, Vice Chair of the Oregon Seismic Safety Policy Advisory Commission (OSSPAC).

- a) In his opening remarks, Mr. Wilson explained that he was privileged to have had the opportunity to tour tsunami affected areas of Japan – both shortly after the disaster and more recently during the recovery. Even though Japan was prepared for a high magnitude earthquake the country was not equally prepared for the consequent tsunami in the coastal regions. Due to insufficient preparedness and resilience planning, the recovery will take many years; Japan needs to rely on reactionary countermeasures to prevent future damage to the tsunami affected areas.
- b) As Japan is rebuilding tsunami affected areas, they are identifying ways to become more resilient to future hazards, including relocating whole communities to higher ground. The key lesson for us is to look to the future and create plans and a vision on how to make our region more resilient. Japan has a ten year resiliency plan; it will take Oregon fifty years to reach the desired resilience targets as described in the Oregon Resilience Plan (ORP).
- c) The Pacific Northwest is due for a subduction zone earthquake with the potential magnitude of 9.0. We would be facing massive critical infrastructure damage and a substantial housing shortage. It would take the region years to rebuild and restore systems to pre-earthquake levels. Nobody is talking about resiliency; we need to make a cultural shift.
- d) Senate Bill 33 establishes a task force to implement the ORP. The ORP was prepared entirely through volunteer efforts and is intended to be implemented over a 50-year timeframe. It includes a list of key recommendations centered on:
 - i) undertaking comprehensive assessments of the key structures and systems that underpin Oregon's economy;
 - ii) launching a sustained program of capital investment in Oregon's public structures (e.g., fully funding Oregon's seismic grant program for schools and emergency facilities);
 - iii) crafting a package of incentives to engage the private sector in efforts to advance seismic resilience; and

- iv) updating Oregon's public policies (e.g., revising individual preparedness communications to specify preparation from the old standard of 72 hours to a minimum of two weeks, and possibly longer).
- e) Looking ahead: Propose to work with the Oregon Legislature to keep the 50-year goal alive (i.e., make resiliency a central issue for policymakers for the long term). Expand the planning efforts: community-level planning; joint regional planning with Washington State; civic infrastructure.
 - i) Commissioner Novick asked: Which Oregon legislators are most focused on this issue? Mr. Wilson shared the following names: Tobias Read, Brian Clem, Arnie Roblan, Brian Boquist, Peter Courtney, and Deborah Boone. He said he was compiling a longer list and will share that with the RDPO when it is ready.
 - ii) Commissioner Hyde asked: Have you seen James Roddey's earthquake presentation? Can we get him to make one of his convincing presentations to the house and senate? Mr. Wilson responded that James lives in Florida now, but something could be arranged.
 - iii) Question from Councilor Smith: Where is the State of Washington with a plan like this? Mr. Wilson responded: They started before us, but have struggled to get traction due to a lack of a designated task force. I do know that elected officials are taking interest in the topic.
 - iv) Commissioner Novick concluded: I do not see why we cannot ask the [Oregon] Governor for a short meeting on this. [Committee members agreed. Point for follow-up.]

4) The Regional Multi-Agency Coordination System (MACS) Concept of Operations (ConOps) Project -

Dave Houghton, Chair of the MACS ConOps Task Force

- a) Dave Houghton presented an overview of the Portland metropolitan region MACS Concept of Operations project. He reviewed the regional situation, MACS structure, MAC system value, and project status.
- b) Regional Situation
 - i) We are blessed to be in a fairly benign area, but we do have hazards and significant earthquake risk.
 - ii) The region currently has interdependent and interconnected systems (communications/IT, fuel & energy, health care, etc.) and independent discipline-specific response (fire, law enforcement, transportation, public works, etc.)
 - iii) Current regional gaps include: no agreed upon criteria or system for multi-jurisdictional, multi-disciplinary decisions or scarce resource allocation; state determines who gets the scarce resources; common media market creates need for regionally coordinated policy and public messaging.
 - iv) We are looking to create the MAC System to address the current gaps and to support response in a sustained fashion.
- c) MAC Structure:

Some features of the system will include:

 - i) Multi-disciplinary, multi-jurisdictional decision making based on incident
 - ii) Pre-determined decision making criteria used for consensus
 - iii) Scalable to the situation
 - iv) Location dependent on need
 - v) Policy alignment to help alleviate resource shortages
- d) MAC System Value:
 - i) Enhances existing processes
 - ii) Brings agencies and disciplines together to resolve interdependent issues
 - iii) Moves scarce resource allocation decisions from the state(s) to our region
 - iv) Coordinates policy development

- v) Coordinates public messaging
- e) Project Status:
 - i) The geographical scope includes the five counties of the UASI region and the states of Oregon and Washington.
 - ii) Have conducted numerous discussions with a wide range of stakeholders including law enforcement, fire, private utilities, as well as other regional MAC Groups.
 - iii) Stakeholder input and research on other MAC systems around the country has been incorporated into the draft plan.
 - iv) Plan will be shared with the Policy Committee for support in the first half of 2014. (Target approval timeframe: May 2014.)
 - v) Policy Committee members shared positive comments of support for the MACS ConOps development.

5) RDPO Strategic Plan: 2014-2016 Proposed Priorities, Outcomes, and Benefits - Scott Porter & Denise Barrett

- a) Scott Porter reviewed the RDPO strategic planning process to date:
 - i) November 2012 – February 2013: Discipline Work Groups conducted their own strategic planning meetings to assess gaps and identify regional priorities building on the 2011 Portland Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy.
 - ii) February – April 2013: Three Program Committee sessions were devoted to reviewing the proposals of the work groups and synthesizing the output into several key regional priority areas and initiatives.
 - iii) In May and September 2013: The Program and Steering Committees held joint strategic planning workshops, completing:
 - (1) RDPO mission, vision, and guiding principal statements
 - (2) Analysis of how RDPO capabilities align with national trends
 - (3) Analysis of emerging new threats and risks including social, economic, political, and technological trends
 - (4) Prioritization criteria for new proposed RDPO work
 - (5) A list of proposed priorities for 2014-2016
- b) Mr. Porter led a review of the proposed priorities, <RDPO Proposed Strategic Goals and Priorities 2014-2016>
 - i) Document is a representation of 13 regional goals and 17 priority objectives for RDPO.
 - ii) Several of the priorities represent work already underway in the region that needs to be completed in the next three years. Mr. Porter acknowledged that much of the work building capabilities and preparing for disasters is long-term and iterative. RDPO initiatives currently underway that need to be completed include:
 - (1) Formalizing and sustaining the RDPO to enhance and sustain the region's capability to engage the whole community in all hazards disaster preparedness
 - (2) Completing formal agreement and securing funding from key RDPO partners as well as exploring other sources
 - (3) Advancing a strong system of preparedness planning using the National Preparedness System tools (example: THIRA).
 - (4) Developing/Establishing the Regional MAC System to improve regional capacity and readiness for coordinated multi-discipline agency response and recovery. Mr. Porter noted that the current MACS project focuses on completing the Concept of Operations and incorporating single discipline MAC Groups into the system. Standing up and training the MAC Group, exercising the plan, updating/aligning existing plans with the

Regional MAC ConOps, and conducting regional stakeholder orientations on the MACS would be some of the follow-on activities.

- (5) Strengthening intelligence and information-sharing capability by improving the TITAN Fusion Center. Mr. Porter explained that the Law Enforcement Work group is making special efforts now to enhance the Center's capacity to perform its mission in addition to providing the Portland Urban Area with its risk profile, a factor determining UASI funding.
- iii) Other priorities already underway that need to be completed:
 - (1) Establishing a regional disaster preparedness messaging and outreach program.
 - (2) Advancing the Disaster Debris Management Planning effort in the region.
 - (3) Enhancing situation assessment capability in the region.
 - (4) Enhancing regional medical surge planning. Mr. Porter noted that this is being driven by another regional organization, the Northwest Oregon Health Preparedness Organization (HPO), but is reflected in the RDPO strategic plan to emphasize its regional importance.
 - (5) Strengthening the governance and coordination of the alert and early warning systems in region.
- iv) Proposed priorities for regional new areas of work: Mr. Porter noted that these have been subdivided into two tiers: Priority 1 and 2. He highlighted some of these priorities.
 - (1) Developing a regional Mass Care and Sheltering Plan to ensure coordinated delivery of life-sustaining services; mass care services including pet recovery, counseling, and reunification. Mr. Porter noted that Multnomah County has commenced its own planning process in these areas, which should eventually tie in to the regional effort.
 - (2) Developing a regional concept of operations for managing spontaneous volunteers and donations.
 - (3) Developing a plan/agreements for the employment of stranded workers.
 - (4) Damage assessment planning.
 - (5) Fuel contingency plan: Mr. Porter mentioned that his County (Washington) is taking this on right now, which can help serve an eventual regional effort.
- v) Karylinn Echols asked: How do you identify and include vulnerable populations within the proposed "coordination of the regional alert systems" outlined in your list of other priorities? Is there an alert system that registers vulnerability needs and status? In her capacity as the Director of the Portland Bureau of Emergency Management, Carmen Merlo replied: In the City of Portland and Multnomah County there is a system for registering people with specific disability-related assistance needs. Information is compiled and stored in the 911 system. Sign-up is through Public Alerts.
(Click to see registry discussed online - <https://www.publicalerts.org/signup>)
- vi) Chair Hyde motioned to approve RDPO Proposed Strategic Goals and Priorities 2014-2016; Commissioner Ludlow seconded the motion. The Committee unanimously approved the RDPO Proposed Strategic Goals and Priorities 2014-2016.

6) RDPO Formal Agreement & Resource Development Effort - Dave Kirby

- a) Dave Kirby provided an update on RDPO funding, including:
 - i) 2013 SHSP Grant application was unsuccessful.
 - ii) UASI funds will run out in May 2014. A regional team led by Carmen Merlo will draft a letter requesting a five-month extension of our UASI FY'12 grant, which Oregon Emergency Management will submit on our behalf. RDPO partners are just starting to spend that grant. As such, we need a few more months of grant implementation to pass to be in a better position to prepare that letter.

- iii) RDPO will continue to search for funds outside the region, from federal and state sources, and possibly private sector partners. It is vital that partners who envisioned the RDPO identify, define and demonstrate their commitment to and support for the organization's work as we move forward.
- b) Dave Kirby drew the Committee's attention to the document <RDPO Formal Agreement Development Project Overview>, which outlines the process and timeline for developing the formal agreement.
- c) He then shared several points about the vision and purpose of the RDPO and the value of sustaining its work. Some key points regarding the pursuit of the RDPO's sustainability:
 - i) Highly likely we will have no grant funds to dictate the future of the RDPO or support its future vision, at least for now.
 - ii) Need to build a flexible model of sustainability.
- d) Some options:
 - i) Go with a model that has only "opportunity costs" – one like REMG that attempts to complete the work with our committees, work groups and task forces alone. The risk would be in not being able to find a champion for each of the priorities in our strategic plan. With this approach to sustaining the RDPO, we can expect some initiatives to be completed, some delayed or not finished at all, and even some not started. In this model, the RDPO's management, as well as its resource development, will rely on its members, which may be a lot to ask, especially as all have full-time day jobs;
 - ii) We can pursue a variety of options that utilize partner contributions to build a core capacity and/or a core fund base within the RDPO to ensure we have resources available to hire staff and/or contractors to support the organization's work. With at least a core capacity funded, and/or a core fund in place, we can demonstrate a greater level of commitment and solidify our organizational foundation, which can then help us pursue federal or state grant funding, or even private sector resources, to complete other planned work.
- e) Dave Kirby concluded his statement by confirming that the Steering Committee and regional staff are working diligently to develop options for sustaining the regional efforts and developing the formal agreement. He asked the Committee for their thoughts and counsel on the scope and construct of the formal agreement, as well as initial concepts for funding some of the costs of the organization's work through partner contributions.
- f) The Policy Committee's consensus was that they need more details before being able to provide such guidance and direction. Chair Hyde, confirmed that the topic of RDPO sustainability and partner share costs will be the focus of the next Policy Committee meeting.
- g) Multiple members of committee pointed out that the next meeting should be scheduled with respect to budget planning, beginning January 2014. Multiple Committee members agree with the addition of advanced materials need to be prepared as soon as possible for committee members to initiate talks with elected officials; private sector, stakeholders etc. to invite to next meeting and/or bring commentary on budget. Denise Barrett confirms she will send a Doodle poll to identify a Friday in January or early February 2014 for a PC special session.

7) Good of the Order & Adjourn: No added announcements. Chair Hyde adjourned meeting 11:14.

Action Items:

- Schedule next Policy Committee meeting in January or early February 2014 to discuss sustainability and alternate models for RDPO funding.
- Prepare and circulate draft RDPO sustainability options and related draft formal agreement materials to members to share with stakeholders well in advance of the next PC meeting.
- Follow-up with James Roddey to see if he is available for short presentation to members of Oregon House and Senate.
- Schedule short meeting with Governor regarding reducing risk in region from Cascadia earthquake and tsunami based on Oregon Resilience Plan.