

**Minutes of the Joint Meeting
of the Steering and Program Committees**

July 18, 2016, 1:00 – 3:00 PM

**Metro Regional Center (Council Chambers)
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR**

Steering Committee Attendees: Voting Members (Quorum was present: 18 positions represented of 24)

1. Jerry Allen, City of Beaverton Representative
2. Nancy Bush, SC Chair and Clackamas County Representative
3. Fred Charlton, Fire/EMS Representative
4. Bob Cozzie, Public Safety Comms Rep and past SC Chair
5. Ray DiPasquale, Public Works Representative
6. Jason Gates, Law Enforcement Representative
7. Rebecca Geisen, Regional Water Providers Consortium Representative
8. Scott Johnson, Clark County and City of Vancouver Representative (2 positions)
9. Paul Lewis, Public Health Representative
10. Carmen Merlo, immediate past SC Chair and City of Portland Representative
11. Mike Mumaw, SC Vice Chair and Emergency Management Representative
12. Scott Porter, Washington County Representative and past SC Chair
13. Kathryn Richer, Health Systems Representative
14. Harry Saporta, TriMet Representative
15. Cara Sloman, NGO Representative
16. Paul Slyman, METRO Representative
17. Craig Ward, City of Troutdale Representative

PrC Meeting Attendees: Voting Members (Quorum was present: 8 of 13 voting members.)

1. Adrienne Donner, Chair (Newly installed)
2. Cheryl Bledsoe, PDCC Delegate to the PrC
3. Robin Holm, Public Health Work Group Chair
4. John Wheeler, REMTEC/Emergency Management Work Group Chair
5. Sherrie Forsloff, Health System/Hospitals Group (A.K.A., NW Health Preparedness Organization) delegate to the PrC
6. Alexander (Alex) Ubiadas, Jr., Transit Work Group
7. Henry Reimann, Law Enforcement Work Group
8. Lonny Welter, Public Works WG Chair

RDPO/PBEM Staff and Other RDPO Member Attendees:

1. Denise Barrett, RDPO Manager
2. Laura Bruno, RDPO Planning Coordinator
3. Amy Cole, PBEM Grants Compliance Program Coordinator
4. David Gassaway, RMACS Task Force Chair
5. Alice Busch, Multnomah County Emergency Management (Observer)
6. Lisa McOwen, TITAN Fusion Center (Observer)
7. Adrienne Schmidt, Program Assistant, RDPO/PBEM

Meeting Summary

[**Note:** Detailed meeting notes are included at the end of this document (pages 8-18).]

Meeting Objectives: the Program Committee (PrC) posed questions about the draft 2017-2021 RDPO Strategic Outcomes to the Steering Committee (SC). The answers are intended to assist (1) the RDPO Manager in **developing core objectives for each outcome** in Tier 1; and (2) the PrC (with work groups and task forces) in **designing projects/initiatives in alignment with the strategic outcomes and objectives** in Tier 1. The meeting also outlined **next steps to arrive at a final strategic plan and two-year work plan** to present to RDPO Policy Committee for approval (target: November 2016).

Meeting Outcomes and Next Steps

Discussions were facilitated on seven Vision Elements/Outcome Statements from Tier 1 of the prioritized vision elements/outcomes document. Members noted the vision elements include some very specific statements (i.e. project-level) and some more general statements (i.e. goal-level). As a result, certain vision element/outcome statements need to be clarified or fleshed out to become operational. Some suggested separating broader visions statements or outcome statements at a higher level would be helpful (to drive five year+ strategy), then detailing more specific objective statements underneath those vision/outcomes (which may prompt a format change to the vision elements document). Updated statements and objectives should be SMART (specific, measureable, achievable, realistic and time-bound) to enable the PrC to design programming and initiatives which clearly align with the prioritized vision elements of the SC.

Feedback from this meeting will inform revision of the prioritized vision elements, to clarify and make outcome statements consistent (and possibly re-organize the format accordingly). In coming months WG and Task Force deliverables will also help flesh out details of the vision (e.g., the results of the Disability Access and Functional Needs Assessment due in December). And, the THIRA planning process which RDPO leads each year will inform key prioritized vision elements by identifying gaps in the region's Core Capabilities (ongoing August-December).

RDPO staff will lead revision of the vision elements document and drafting SMART objectives for each vision element for future review by both committees. Stakeholders agree while challenging, this process is part of an important effort by RDPO to be more strategic and less project-driven.

Summary of Session Highlights

I. Status of the Draft Strategic Vision and Outcome Statements - Denise Barrett

- To create a dialogue and move toward a strategic plan with broad goals and specific objectives.
- PrC to gain clarity from SC about the Outcomes, in order for objectives to be developed that can then guide the development of projects / initiatives over the next five years.
- Strategic Plan, including Outcomes, to be finalized by October. Presented to Policy Committee in November for approval.
- Annual Program Cycle of RDPO begins in August 2016: the strategic outcomes together with objectives that will be written (in draft form) must guide PrC planning for this year's program cycle.

II. Outcome Statement 1.1 Review- John Wheeler

1.1 Increased coordination between the public, private and non-profit sectors in preparedness, response and recovery.

- Comments that this Outcome is very broad and it is unclear what specific coordination is desired (not actionable as written). Suggestions to break it into some smaller sub-statements (make it more manageable and measurable); PrC asks that deliverables and indicators of success be outlined.
- Discussion about types of relevant coordination included: leveraging private sector for damage assessments; employee preparedness; continuity of operations planning and exercises for service agencies; utilities; evacuations; and resource management.
- Private sector (PS) partnerships have been hard to sustain except where the work has provided benefit to all parties. Focus should be how to interface with PS during response and recovery.
- State should coordinate (via OEM) on higher level private sector engagement for disaster management and response (i.e. fuel planning and getting oil industry to the table.) RDPO can continue to push / support OEM's initiatives with PS actors.
- Local Level coordination is also critical and perhaps where RDPO can add more value (i.e. Utilities need bureau of transportation to clear roads for access to infrastructure, etc.).

- RMACS Task Force integrating private utilities and needs guidance.
- Disability Access and Functional Needs Assessment showing opportunity to engage regionally-based private transportation agencies to meet non-medical transportation needs.
- Health care facilities have a lot of concern and solutions are complex due to regulations (or lack of). Remember human services and public health do a lot of partnering with PS already.
- Comment that public agencies such as school districts are not represented in this discussion (though they are engaged with RDPO through some channels).

III. Outcome Statement 1.2 Review- Denise Barrett

1.2 Established coordination of all-hazards resilience planning, policy making and project implementation across the region.

- Discussions with stakeholders (pre-meeting) indicated change in wording is desired. Suggested edit: “Increased community resilience and reduced vulnerability to disasters (especially for seismic events) across the region through coordinated planning, policy-making and project implementation.”
- Discussion about whether we keep this focused on the Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake or broaden it to all hazards. CSZ is our worst-case scenario, so by focusing on it we cover most natural hazards. But should we include non-natural hazards for resilience as well (i.e. terror attack or active shooter)?
- Suggestion that one way to look at regional resilience would be to do joint research on the urban area, building on what DOGAMI is doing with the Regional Mapping and Enhanced Earthquake Impact Analysis project by adding an economic impacts analysis (i.e. understand job loss, loss of airport, loss of fuel, and the populations most at risk). Help us articulate “the cost of doing nothing.”
- Most of this session discussion devolved to debates about the structure of the strategic plan, the use of vision elements, outcome statements, objectives, and the logical flow down to projects. Those points captured in summary on p.1.

IV. Outcome Statement 1.3 Review- John Wheeler

1.3 Enhanced mass care and mass sheltering capabilities in the region.

- This vision element needs more clarification. Need to identify existing gaps and develop clear objectives to programmatically respond.
- PrC needs specificity from SC so they have clear boundaries and criteria for approving discrete project proposals (broader isn’t better for PrC).
- Historically this has been prioritized, but work done by individual jurisdictions only. Desire is to have explicit regional work.

- Before jumping to training, exercises and equipment/supplies on this element, we need an assessment/planning framework.
- What are the major gaps are in mass care and shelter capabilities regionally?
 - Metro willing and able to respond but it's outside their normal mandate; would require training for staff. Cascadia Rising event highlighted the need to know who/how the Convention and Expo centers would be certified safe, and whether Metro staff can allow access to public (ATC20 certified engineers required to sign off?) into those facilities and into the Metro facility.
 - Current projects proposed by individual jurisdictions to RDPO have not been funded; so do projects need to be regional for this capability?
 - We need to understand the goals for mass care and sheltering in the region; then understand how to achieve: leverage private partnerships? Red Cross?
 - THIRA on this Core Capability for Mass Care and Shelter can help us with gap analysis for the region this year (by Dec 2016).
 - The Disability Access and Functional Needs Assessment (DAFN) will be completed by December and provide clarity on some gaps related to shelter and next steps to address them (i.e. inventorying Red Cross shelters for ADA compliance).
 - The DAFN assessment and THIRA will be done at the same time: so by December we should have clarity on some gaps for mass care and shelter to drive objectives and programming.
- Discussion again on process and organization of the vision: recognition that SC and PrC have subject matter experts and that both sides need to help shape strategy (collaborate). But, meeting time and group size limit ability to talk in depth on each capability. Suggestion for RDPO staff to refine/clarify and better organize the vision elements/outcome document.
- Suggestion to use the federal framework plans so we are mapping Core Capabilities in the same way the THIRA and other plans do (for the RDPO strategy/vision). Response: Already part of the intended approach. A document outlining the probable Core Capabilities that align with the outcome statements was shared.
- Suggestion to create a multi-functional/-disciplinary/-jurisdictional working group to specifically feed into the THIRA process, evaluating our status on POETE for each core capability? (*Note*: this would essentially be the SPR process, not required for UASI).
- The Health and Human Services Working Group focuses mostly on health; can we get a Human Services Working Group going? Yes, just need to identify volunteers to lead and participate. Would Multnomah County lead the effort?

V. Outcome Statements 1.4-1.6 Review- Adrienne Donner and Denise Barrett

1.4 Increased inter-agency and inter-disciplinary information-sharing across region

1.5 Public Safety Answering Points in the region will be transitioning to NextGen 911 technology

1.6 Enhanced operable & interoperable communications for first responders throughout region

- The PrC suggested 1.5 and 1.6 could be specific objectives, falling under 1.4.
- SC disagrees and suggests that 1.4 is really about intelligence information (i.e. FUSION Center); information sharing is different than interoperable communications. Suggests to change 1.6 from “first responders” to “emergency response” and add something about “back-up communications.” Also, should make 1.5 broader, not just about NextGen technology.
- 9-1-1 is separating voice and data; for RDPO purposes, could separate plans for the two. However, most data still falls under “NextGen Technology” and all part of national level data integration (the feds are lumping all as “information sharing”).
- There seems to be a big gap in Tier 1 with regards to Public Information sharing. RDPO should look to add a vision statement about timely communication with the public using wireless communication (capitalize on everyone having a handheld device) and something about crowd sourcing data as well (both giving and receiving information from public).

VI. Outcome Statement 1.7 Review- Adrienne Donner

1.7 The RDPO management structure, including staffing is enhanced, stable and sustainable.

- Needs some specificity: goal is to be less dependent on UASI funds to sustain RDPO.
- Project work will continue to rely on grant funding (UASI or other); but increasing staff with permanent funding is recommended. Expecting WG and TF members to lead projects when they have other full time jobs is not advisable; better to increase RDPO bandwidth to manage projects.
- Turnover among RDPO staff (on limited duration contracts) also detrimental to project advancements.
- If the SC and PrC agree they want to permanently fund more staff- is that a formal recommendation made to Policy Committee? Yes.

VII. Outcome Statement 2.1 Review- Denise Barrett

2.1 All capabilities we identify for investment, as well as others that have been built or invested in over the years will have been maintained and/or enhanced (as needed).

- We could benefit from tracking this more closely; in particular, with law enforcement and fire could be good to take stock of what capabilities are now.
- Seems to be an area where a lot of equipment is purchased without a clear sense of overall purpose; each item purchased should align with a regional goal or objective.
- Also need to clarify what items will be replaced with UASI funds and which will need to be maintained by the agencies (you buy, you maintain, you replace).

Detailed transcript of meeting minutes, including Good of the Order items are found below (following 11 pages).

Detailed Meeting Minutes/Transcript

- 1) **Welcomes, Introductions, and Agenda Review** – Nancy Bush and Denise Barrett
 - a) Nancy Bush starts off the meeting by welcoming the two committees to the joint meeting.
 - b) Denise Barrett asks the group for introductions, including name and agency, current role in the RDPO committees, and past or future vacation getaways
 - c) No changes to the agenda
- 2) **Past Meeting Minutes** – Nancy Bush and Adrienne Donner
 - a) Nancy asks the Steering Committee to go over the changes made to the minutes from their last meeting, and asks for a motion to accept.
 - i) Kathryn Richer moves to accept, Rebecca Geisen seconds.
 - b) Adrienne asks the Program Committee for a motion to approve their minutes.
 - i) Alex Ubiadas moves to accept, Lonny Welter seconds.
- 3) **Status of the Draft Strategic Vision/Outcome Statements** – Denise Barrett
 - a) Denise explains the purpose of the day’s meeting, which is about creating a dialog and keeping the strategic planning process moving forward; to have a document that has broad goals and specific objectives. The content of this meeting will help to reach that goal.
 - b) The Program Committee (PrC) wants the opportunity to ask some clarifying questions to the Steering Committee (SC). They hope to fully understand where the Steering Committee wants them to take the outcomes, to operationalize them into projects and other kinds of initiatives over the next 5 years.
 - c) Denise, Adrienne, and John Wheeler will be facilitating several sessions, going over the top tier outcomes as well as the questions the Program Committee have produced.
 - d) Beginning in a month is the annual program cycle of the RDPO, and although the outcomes will not be final until October, the PrC can look at the draft outcomes to think about what is needed.
 - e) Before starting the discussion, Denise goes over some ground rules:
 - Believe in the wisdom of the whole group
 - One voice at a time (raise hand or stand name tag)
 - Use microphones so all can hear
 - Cell phones on vibrate
 - “In case of emergency” instructions
- 4) **Tier 1, Outcome Statement 1 Review** – John Wheeler
 - 1.1 *Increased coordination between the public, private and non-profit sectors in preparedness, response and recovery.*
 - a) Unlike some of the other outcomes, this is a fairly general statement. One of the challenges the Program Committee had with implementing it, was needing to know specifically what they are after. Just saying in a vision statement that they want “increased coordination between public, private and non-profit sectors in preparedness response and recovery” is not actionable in itself. The Program Committee believes there needs to be some level of specific direction in terms of projects.
 - b) John moves the Questions/Comments for the Steering Committee column.

- i) He starts by giving some examples of types of projects that are commonly talked about in terms of public/private partnerships (e.g., evacuation and re-entry, employee preparedness, resource management, etc.); he would also add utilities to that list.
- c) His first discussion question: Are there thoughts in the group about what is meant by “public/private partnership” and which sub-topics are seen as priorities or good opportunities to build these public/private partnerships?
 - i) Alice Busch says that she would add continuity of operations planning and exercises for service agencies.
 - ii) Mike Mumaw says the one gap that he saw, which he thinks would fit in well, is the leveraging of the private sector for damage assessments. It has been touched on at other meetings, but there are not enough resources within RDPO to take it on. The state at one point tried a clearing house, but he believes they constrained it too much. He would like to see this topic addressed because it is a larger gap than some of the others that have been discussed.
 - iii) Paul Lewis states this is a broad topic. He brings up a topic that he has yet to hear discussed at the Steering Committee: there are some very large public entities at risk of loss of land, or buildings, such as school districts. He hasn’t seen these groups at the table, but knows they can count on them for exercises and in real events, so partnerships should be solidified.
 - (1) John says school districts usually are not directly represented, but they do interact a lot.
 - iv) Scott Porter mentions local government has made many attempts over the past 20 years, in terms of public/private partnership, most of which hasn’t been sustainable because local government has not been able to articulate and provide benefits from the work. The big questions are how to interface with them during a response, how to interface after they give information, and how to share information and benefit one another in response and recovery. It has never been fully addressed, and a lot of it needs to happen at the state level, particularly for those private sector entities working across multiple counties. State level would be better able to build an interface during a response. He believes one of RDPO’s highest priorities needs to be to encourage and keep pressure on OEM to develop and sustain partnerships with private sector organizations that are critical to response and recovery efforts.
 - (1) John agrees in terms of general resource information sharing during incident response; there is not a defined and organized pathway to coordinate with private sector. Frequent interaction with OEM’s program and the Fusion Center would be a good step.
 - (2) Carmen disagrees about having coordination at the state level; she believes coordination needs to be more at a local level. She says this because when you ask a private sector what they really need from government, they need information and utilities and government services. For example; if PGE and NW Natural need to access facilities, they may need PBOT to clear roads for them. She agrees with Mike on the damage assessment process; it is critical.
 - v) David Gassaway says that at the regional level the RMACS task force has integrated private utilities into their conversations and one of the things they are looking for is guidance in where to focus their resources and restoration efforts. They have integrated some into their regional MAC process and information gathering.

- vi) Scott Porter suggests that the higher level problems be solved at a higher level. He believes there are a lot of local things RDPO representatives can tackle when they make those relationships locally, to have coordination. The list of items in the right column (Questions/Comments) are several things that are right for working on. Recovery planning will be worked on, which by necessity will hopefully bring private sector to the table, and as a higher priority problem by necessity should also bring non-profits to the table. He thinks the transportation for access and functional needs is another topic. The need for non-emergency medical transportation (in a response) could be worked on, mostly because the transporters are regionally based and there are many smaller agencies working under contract.
- vii) Kathryn Richer says long-term health care facility planning has long been a concern in the health care system. A lot of existing plans are to bring wounded to the hospitals, and the hospitals are concerned about being overwhelmed during a large-scale event. It is very complex due to the variety of regulatory agencies (or the lack thereof), organizational structures, and for getting buy-in when they really don't have to do it.
- viii) Adrienne Donner says to remember the partners that they already have, but may not think about: Human Services and Public Health do a lot of partnering with the private sector.
- ix) Scott Porter: continuing to develop the fuel planning, and getting to an ultimate solution because the state is going to be the ones able to get the oil industry to the table. Another is dialysis facilities.
- x) Mike Mumaw would like to see more time to better quantify the original vision element, break it down further / or just into more measurable chunks. Right now it is broader than anything RDPO will be able to tackle. The committees need to do something to subdivide and make it more manageable.
- xi) John hopes to get to the point where they identify deliverables and indicators of success. He asks, given the fact that this is 1.1 top of the priorities, where do they want to focus their attention? And, what is within the regional wheelhouse that can be accomplished?
- xii) Denise reminds the group that if they look in the middle column of their Vision/Outcome handouts, they can see all the work that is already being done. She says that from the outcome down to the objective level, feedback from today will inform those wheelhouses, to better express what outcomes are expected to look like.

5) **Tier 1, Outcome Statement 2 Review** – Denise Barrett

1.2 Established coordination of all-hazards resilience planning, policy making and project implementation across the region.

- a) When the Steering Committee first came up with this outcome they said that it would be largely seismic-related work inspired by the Oregon Resilience Plan.
- b) Oregon Resilience Plan Definition: "Oregon citizens will not only be protected from life-threatening physical harm, but because of risk reduction measures and pre-disaster planning, communities will recover more quickly and with less continuing vulnerability following a Cascadia subduction zone earthquake and tsunami."
 - i) The Resilience Plan got as far as it could with the Task Force, but it says at the end that there is still more work to be done. Its current foci are: impact mapping vulnerability assessments; business government continuity; seismic strengthening of the built environment; and some community preparedness around messaging.

- ii) In the future, the Resilience Plan would like to work on community level planning; human resilience; civic infrastructure and joint planning with Washington State.
- c) Denise asks the group how they define resilience: is it similar to the Oregon Resilience Plan? Which of the aspects do they want to focus on?
 - i) RDPO does not have the resources to rebuild and retrofit the built environment, but in the second column of the handout there are some exciting projects already underway.
 - ii) Mike M asks to revisit the suggested revision for 1.2; Denise explains that after the feedback she received, people felt that it could be stated a little differently.
 - (1) 1.2 Increased community resilience and reduced vulnerability to disasters (especially for seismic events) across the region through coordinated planning, policy-making and project implementation.
 - iii) Mike likes the expanded version, but would appreciate hearing from the Program Committee if it is something that meets their needs and is doable, or is it too broad?
 - (1) Adrienne Donner says that one of the conversations that was had while going through the document was that a lot of the vision elements are broad, and the PrC envisions objectives that are smarter to fall under the vision elements. So, part of what they are asking the Steering Committee today is: where and how to focus the SMART objectives?
 - iv) Scott Porter refers back to the Resilience Plan definition from the previous slide and wants to make sure that all aspects are covered and not just natural hazards (i.e. terrorist attack, active shooter). He notes that some Tier 1 vision elements are really broad and others are very specific and more like an objective. He thinks they need to get some consistency in their vision statements vs strategic goals. Then, the committees can have objectives within those strategic goals/vision elements that start driving where they can come up with projects that align more closely with the objectives.
 - (1) Denise asks what he would like to see here in terms of the parameter of objectives.
 - (2) Scott would rather have broad vision statements and things that are driving them organizationally towards where they see themselves going. They should develop some objectives they want to tackle for the 2017 -2021 time-frame, then projects can build into those objectives.
 - (3) Denise asks if he would like to broaden it by removing “seismic”, Scott agrees and feels that it would be better if they could tweak it to make all hazards.
 - (4) Mike feels that this would cause a format change where the first column strictly becomes vision elements without outcomes. These are vision statements for 2017-2021, but vision elements are longer than a three year period, so what timeframe are they looking at? If they are going to do vision elements truly as vision elements, they need to get rid of the specifics tasks and add another column where they can talk about specific goals based on that vision element.
 - (5) Denise explains that they aren’t looking for projects right now, they are looking for refinement of objectives that lead toward projects. She wants the Steering Committee to give more parameters to the Program Committee so that they can write the objectives and develop projects.
 - (6) Mike suggests they flag the items in the first column that are truly visionary elements, and the ones that remain un-flagged can slide under others (as objective statements, to fall under the vision elements). But he is struggling to see how they will say what is and is not a vision element.
 - (7) Carmen mentions one thing that really interests her is joint research on the urban area. She often gets asked about the ‘cost of doing nothing’, and building on the work that

DOGAMI is doing with their economic analyses and hazard overlays, would be great to help understand (regionally) job loss, loss of airport, loss of fuel, population at risk.

- (8) The question “How many visions do you need?” came up. Denise suggests not to use that term, and instead say ‘outcomes’ are the high level goals that don’t have to be measurable; then the objectives under them do need to be. Look at them as outcomes: we want to look more specifically at what the Steering Committee means in these outcome statements to clearly identify the parameters within which they want the Program Committee to work.

6) **Tier 1, Outcome Statement 3 Review-** John Wheeler

1.3 Enhanced mass care and mass sheltering capabilities in the region

- a) This is something that has been on the strategic plan for a while, but regionally nothing has been done explicitly, though individual jurisdictions have. It has been moved up the list from 1.4 to 1.3.
- b) The question is what are the Program Committee and the Steering Committee assumptions about the gaps in this area? John thinks the third question is key: Do we see the greatest gap in plans, training, exercises, organization, or equipment?
- i) Paul Slyman speaks for Metro because they played this objective hard during Cascadia Rising with the Convention and Expo centers, and they didn’t know if they were authorized to deem a building safe for just their personnel, or safe for all others as well. Their emergency plans are: emergency egress, then muster safely outside until someone has deemed the building safe to enter. None of the engineers in METRO are structural engineers, and what they learned from ATC20 training is that they can allow Metro employees back in, but unclear about the general public. METRO has massive public assets that could be used for care and shelter but have never really pushed it hard enough to find out where the equipment might come from. Damage assessment would be key; the Convention Center and the Expo Center are completely different buildings in terms of their resilience, based on how long ago they were constructed. He also wants to learn what METRO staff need to know about how to run a mass shelter. He thinks there is a lot of work to do; they are a willing regional government but don’t do emergency or disaster preparedness as their day job, so they need guidance.
- (1) Ray thinks it also speaks to the previous conversation about the differentiation of the vision element and outcome. At some point it is going to require some kind of program to define what the goals are. We don’t always have a good identification on some of the issues, especially the seismic. From discussions he has been involved in, the vision statements / outcomes are going to require some program work as well as some creative discussion about getting from point A to point B.
- (2) John: even before getting into the planning and exercising, we need to talk about a program and an assessment.
- c) Alice says that as the jurisdiction that submitted a grant funding request to address this enhanced mass care and shelter, their question from the Program Committee level to the Steering Committee is: if you don’t like the proposed projects, what projects are you looking for?

- i) Cara Sloman agrees that they need more specificity around what the goal is, because it is vastly different with the Cascadia event vs. the other 99% of the time, as to what capability they want locally within the region.
 - ii) David adds to Alice's statement by asking what the goal is: 60%, 70%, or 80%. And, what are the strategies for going after that goal? Public/Private partnerships? Red Cross? What is the gap and what can be leveraged locally? Work on the strategies and decide how much supplies and equipment will be necessary.
- d) Denise says that THIRA is prioritizing a gap analysis of the mass shelter core capability. Laura will be in charge of that, and will be reaching out to people who can provide her with information. Denise suggests they keep the outcome statement as currently listed, and the next process will be to finish THIRA gap analysis to then have a greater discussion.
- i) Mike Mumaw brings up the FEMA action and goal document and requests RDPO use the same format for the region: i.e. Identify vision areas, then map them to the core capabilities. And, as a region decide which are most critical. He worries otherwise the structure is an attempt to justify the projects already in the works, rather than looking first at strategic priorities, then aligning projects. The core values, capabilities and mission areas make a good regional starting point, and then the THIRA information can easily flow into it.
 - ii) John feels that is a good methodology, but doesn't agree that the exercise today is about justifying or continuing with the projects they have. For example, with mass care and shelter they will be starting at zero (nothing done to date). Also, the THIRA process should already support what Mike talked about.
 - iii) Scott Porter thinks with the 2017-2021 strategic planning process they are trying to move away from what they did in the past: which was project-driven and added goals that everything could fit into. This is part of an awkward process; but it is getting RDPO to where we need to be: planning more strategically.
 - iv) Cheryl speaks for the Program Committee stating that what they need from the Steering Committee is more specifics about what the end goal gets them. Making things broader doesn't necessarily make things easier. The more specificity, the more they can look at projects and decide whether they are in or out. It is very difficult for the PrC to exclude projects, all projects come to them with good will and intent, and it is hard for the PrC to create clear criteria with everything in the strategy/outcomes so broad.
 - (1) Scott Porter adds that the Program Committee needs to help inform the SC on strategy.
 - (2) Cheryl says the difficulty is that at the meetings, they get one or two voices from the various disciplines, for two hours with 13 people sitting around a table. It's not really a venue where they can all educate one another on the intricacies of the various things the disciplines are facing on a daily basis.
- e) Kathryn Richer: as a process check-in, she is going back to the original desired outcome, which is to understand the intention of each strategic outcome and clarify parameters for setting the objectives, and designing the projects. This is what the Program Committee laid out for the Steering Committee to consider today.
- (1) John agrees with her and proposes that Denise (with some help) goes back to re-evaluate what should be a 'vision statement', an 'outcome', an 'objective', etc. and organize their future discussions by working from the left column to establish parameters and priorities.

- f) From what John heard, he believes there is a strategic planning assessment and organizational solution that needs to happen. He suggests putting together some type of multi-functional, multi-disciplinary, multi-jurisdictional work group who could have discussions about capabilities, where they want to be, what is the vision, etc. Does RDPO want a certain planning scenario to feed into the THIRA as well? Then they could talk in terms of planning, organizing, exercise training, and equipment (POETE).
 - i) Scott Porter adds that at the end of the calendar year they will have findings of the Disability Access and Functional Needs assessment which will state that there are some gaps in shelter for those communities. It will give a specific list of needed actions, some may be low hanging fruit, and others more complicated. He thinks RDPO may be able to get a project or two out of the assessment recommendations. One would be to look at all of the shelters in the Red Cross inventory and do an assessment of their ADA compliance, then prioritize facilities based on their accessibility. If the region did need to shelter the ADA community, we would know which facilities are best. The report will not be available until the end of the calendar year, but we will have a good idea in November what the content is.
 - (1) John thinks the end of the calendar year is a good deadline because that is the deadline for THIRA. If the Access and Functional Needs assessment can combine with or support THIRA, we can all get together to discuss the next steps when it comes to mass care and shelter.
 - g) Alice says that three years ago they had a recommendation to start a working group for Human Services. There is currently a Health and Human Services Working Group, but the way it is funded it functions as pretty much a Health group. This makes it hard to focus on human services. There is now a renewed request to start a Human Services working group. She appreciates comments from the Steering Committee that if they have a working group as subject matter experts stating priorities, the SC would listen as far as voting for funding.
 - h) Alice asks for clarification regarding 1.3 and what they are going to do with it. Denise says it will still be a focus, but they have to have a more robust assessment process and really recognize the gaps before decisions are made.
 - i) Alice asks if they can get a human services working group formed and Denise tells her that if there are volunteers who want to form around it, RDPO will do whatever they can to support it.
 - j) Jerry Allen says that he is very visual so he tries to create 3D pictures in his mind of what each function looks like to get comfortable with it. He has never seen a function work like that so he can't envision it. Getting the public involved is difficult and it's hard to get consistent communication with the right information from city to city. And there is so much misinformation brought on by social media that has to be filtered out. So, he has found it a challenge to visualize 1.3 successfully.
- 7) **Tier 1, Outcome Statement 4 – 6 Review** – Adrienne Donner and Denise Barrett
- a) 1.4 the Program Committee discussed this and decided that 1.5 and 1.6 looked more like specific objective that could fall under the outcome of information sharing and if those became objectives maybe other objectives that could also fall under 1.4 as well. She believes that the TITAN Fusion Center could be tucked under information sharing.
 - b) Bob Cozzie asks how they are defining information sharing because part of how he defines the objectives and outcome is by looking at the funded projects, and he is having a hard time understanding how Regional Enterprise Service Bus falls under information sharing.

- i) It enhances the ability to share information
 - c) Denise tells the Steering Committee that these are their outcomes, and if they want to change them they can.
 - d) Scott Porter doesn't think 1.5 and 1.6 fit under information sharing. He believes information sharing goes back to Intel and has more to do with the Fusion Center and transformation of that kind of information. He believes information sharing is different from interoperable communications. He would modify 1.6, leaving it as a standalone outcome but change "first responder" to "emergency response" to make it broader. He believes it should also mention back up communications. *Enhanced operable and interoperable communications for primary and back-up communications for emergency response.* Going back to 1.5, he feels that is pretty specific to NextGen integration and feels like it needs to be broader and focus on more than just NextGen.
 - e) Cheryl says that what she sees happening at 9-1-1 is really a separation between data and voice, so SC could separate 1.5 and 1.6 among voice level communication and data based communication. Unfortunately most of data falls under the definition of NextGen 9-1-1 at this point because 9 out of 10 types of data are being looked at a national level to incorporate into a 9-1-1 system. The integration of all that data is separate and there are NextGen voice elements as well, but she believes to make it clean for a vision strategy, she would have a vision for voice and a vision for data. Clean up the language to be more inclusive of other types of supporting disciplines.
 - i) Scott Porter asks Cheryl if she sees a clear difference between 1.5 and 1.6 compared to information sharing.
 - ii) Cheryl does see a difference, she says the feds are lumping it all under information sharing at this point but there is a lot of next vision statements happening around the term "Fusion Center" because there is a lot of definition and redefinition around what that is going to mean.
 - f) Paul Lewis is seeing a huge gap in tier one with public information, because almost everyone has battery operated devices with them at all times and he doesn't see anything about communicating with the public. They should be taking advantage of that and thinks that should be a vision statement, i.e., timely communication to the public by using wireless communication.
 - i) Cheryl adds that it wouldn't be just pushing information to the public, but crown sourcing and receiving information from the public would also be important.
- 8) **Tier 1, Outcome Statement 7 Review** – Adrienne Donner
- a) 1.7 looks at the RDPO management structure, including staffing, and wanting it to be enhanced, stable and sustainable. So the Program Committee came up with a number of questions looking at how they can approach this outcome and looking at what it means from all of the Steering Committee folks. She thinks it's a great outcome but needs some specificity; are they looking at becoming less dependent on UASI funds, or looking at other reliable sources.
 - i) Carmen mentions she thinks the project work couldn't happen without the grant funding, but she supports the idea of increasing staff with permanent funding rather than grant funding. It is hard to expect people with full time jobs to also serve as project managers.
 - ii) Adrienne adds that with the limited staff, and limited duration there's a lot of turnover, which is detrimental to a project that is underway or about to be.

- iii) Kathryn says that it seems like the staffing is commensurate with what the Steering Committee and Program Committee consider priorities and what they are willing to fund in order to help. It takes someone to lead a project.
 - iv) Rebecca asks if the group were to say they wanted more sustainable funding for staff, if that would that be a recommendation for the Policy Committee.
 - (1) Denise says yes
 - b) Denise does a quick recap, confirms that they will go back and synthesize the input from today and reorganize some information, and draft some smart objectives that better fit into an additional column. They will also highlight THIRA this year because Laura just started a week ago and they are working on what the strategy will be for this year to move from the list of required assets they need to be able to perform under the various Core Capabilities. They had some gap information last year, but it was mostly antidotal. This year they will select 8 to 10 core capabilities and include some that are related to the strategic plan. By the end of the year, Laura will have that data through the process of engagement she will be using. They will have to take some steps back and see where they are in terms of what the Steering Committee wants so the Program Committee knows where to go with things.
 - c) The final topic Denise wants to discuss is vision statement 2.1, which she feels is important because the Steering Committee can give the work groups some direction. This involves the work groups who own capabilities, assets or have been investing in various teams. Denise feels they need more engagement around the discipline groups to be able to help know what the status of capabilities are that they have been building over the years. Law enforcement and fire are two examples of where it would be great to take stock of what capabilities look like now.
 - i) Rebecca says that this seems to be a place where they put a lot of funding for equipment without a real sense of overall purpose, but she knows the water agencies can order these things in abundance because they are useful and serve a lot of people. But is there a set goal the region has? If they are transitioning into a strategic way to assess how they are going to spend their money, this category seems to still be the catch-all. In reading the vision outlines that it has different parameters.
 - ii) Adrienne adds that they also need to set parameters about what kind of stuff they can replace because some things fall into the “you buy it, you maintain it, you replace it” category and some don’t. She believes some clarity around that would be important moving forward to avoid that same argument every cycle.
- 9) **Good of the Order** – Nancy Bush and Denise Barrett
- a) **Scott Porter** – Update on the Access and Functional Needs Project: phase one has been completed with Clackamas and Washington County assessments, phase two just kicked off last week with Clark County, Multnomah County and the city of Portland. There is an online survey that is out right now for the stakeholders in those three jurisdictions to take and then will roll to in-person interviews for some of the stakeholders in September. A little later in the year, they will get the reports for those three jurisdictions. In the end, each jurisdiction will have a separate report and they will be appended to an overall regional report that will make some regional recommendations.
 - b) **Paul Slyman** – With the fiscal year just starting, they now have funding to do some assessment of debris that would be generated and where it would be generated as a result of a massive

earthquake and their research center will be doing that for them so they can plan for debris management. He needs some help understanding what the overall outcomes and after action reports from Cascadia Rising were because they put a significant amount of effort into that and they are not really an emergency preparedness government so it would be helpful for him to know what the state, or at least this region learned because they only know what metro learned. Nancy, that's a good point we need to talk about how we will share that information. She will talk to Denise about it and get back to him.

- c) **Cara Sloman** – They have a Prepare Out Loud for businesses event on Wednesday morning; they have about 100 people signed up so far.
- d) **Adrienne Donner** – To add to the discussion about public/private partnerships, the current registry is still going. They have gotten some national interest recently because they have done a couple of webinars and included specific partners, Meals on Wheels being one of them. Nationally, federal guidance just came out that was developed by a number of local folks so that has been pretty exciting. She will be presenting in Salt Lake City next month.
- e) **Denise Barrett** – The next meeting is August 1 at the Port of Portland where the Levee Ready Columbia people will be doing a presentation. The 29th of July is the Policy Committee meeting at Metro, which will have Tripp Robinson presenting on the Earthquake Early Warning System for the West Coast. Denise is currently working on the agenda.
- f) **Lisa McOwen** – Has been working with the Coast Guard on developing their SOP for radiological nuclear device detection. TITAN Fusion Center is going to be in the loop for getting notification if the Coast Guard discovers any.
- g) **Henry Reimann** – LEWG is working on the shipboard exercise; invites anyone who would like to play to talk with him.
- h) **David Gassaway** - The RMACS task force is just completing their two year work plan, which will include addressing coordination issues between the region and the state. They will be updating their regional concept of operations plan. Recently, they have encountered some gaps in the task force as Merrill Gonterman has retired, so they are looking to fill a fire rep. vacancy. They have also redefined their public works representation to include water, waste water and transportation.
- i) **Robin Holm** – Is really excited about the Stranded Worker IGA, an unfunded project that she has been working on which allows workers who cannot get to work to go and work in another agency EOC. It is in its final review stages with attorneys looking it over, but it is getting good feedback and looks like it will be a go.
- j) **Kathryn Richer** – Has some federal Hospital Preparedness Program project officers coming to visit Oregon in August to spend an afternoon in Region 1, where they are going to get tours of the trauma pediatric hospital and get prepped on the upcoming pediatric surge work, as well as the trauma surge plans that are in place and under development statewide. They will also tour the regional hospital.
- k) **Cheryl Bledsoe** – This past Friday, the 9-1-1 community soft launched text to 9-1-1. It is still not public information although it is being monitored 24/7. There will be a press conference August 23 at CRESA which will be the kick start to the large scale media campaign they will be embarking on with UASI funds and RDPO funds in order to broadcast that capability. They are working significantly with the deaf community in both Oregon and Washington to roll out that capability and will also be developing six different PSAs around the scenarios related to text 9-1-

1. If you are in the RDPO footprint, as well as Clatsop County and North Marion County you can text 9-1-1. Oregon State is going to study this as a pilot project for about six months and then roll it out in other jurisdictions across Oregon. The goal is to have it fully implemented statewide within a year to 24 months.

- l) **Bob Cozzie** – Actually got to handle a text to 9-1-1 call that ended in an arrest. Also, they had a really lengthy discussion about radio encryption at the PDCC meeting. They discussed radio encryption with the new radio system in Portland, the radio system being replaced in Clark County, and now the radio systems being replaced in Washington and Clackamas counties. All of the agencies with radio systems are looking at what they want to do in terms of their privacy, and not being heard by the media or anyone listening in on a scanner. In those particular counties, there has been different discussions and agreements within the counties on how they would like to encrypt their radio systems. The problem with encryption is there is a regional system that has really good interoperability, so they need to move outside of their silos and determine how the region can work through this. They have discussed it at the PDCC level and found out there are different desires for various reasons, for example: police wants to encrypt but fire doesn't. There are some things that may be coming to work groups for discussions.
- m) **Ray** – Thanks Amy Cole; says she is the perfect example of why the RDPO staff is so important in helping them shepherd some of the projects through and getting them to the purchasing aspect of projects they have. Without her work, things would happen much less efficiently.
- n) **Nancy Bush** – Mentions their name change to Clackamas County Disaster Management. There will be a media release out this week, followed by some branding changes in the next few months. It will not be changed until FY 17- 18. Also, the city of Damascus is no more; it has been dis-incorporated. Nancy also thanks Amy for her help.

10) **Adjourn**

- a) Nancy Bush calls the meeting to an end at 2:53 pm.