



Agenda

City of Portland Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan Update 6th Steering Committee Meeting

Wednesday, January 20, 2016, 4:00 to 6:30 PM
Wy'East Conference Room, Level L1, 501 N Dixon St., Portland, OR 97227
Call in Number: 800-523-8437 Code: 707-186-3750



4:00pm – 4:20pm Jeremy O'Leary, <i>Chairperson</i> and Kristen Gelino, <i>Planning Team</i> Handout – SC#5 Summary and Draft Table of Contents	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Round-table introductions• Establish quorum• Review the agenda• Public comment• Review the action items and approve December meeting summary• Administrative updates• Draft table of contents
4:20pm – 5:00pm Jeremy O'Leary, <i>Chairperson</i> and Kristen Gelino, <i>Planning Team</i> Handout #1 – Draft Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives	OBJECTIVES DEVELOPMENT <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Present the Planning Team recommendation• Discuss and confirm objectives <p>Why this matters: Broader than actions, but more specific than goals, objectives are specific enough to help determine whether a proposed project or program would advance the values expressed in the goals. Objectives may also be thought of as 'policies.' In our planning process, objectives will be used to define and prioritize actions.</p> <p>Feedback requested: Feedback on objectives that are confusing or unclear and any gaps.</p> <p>Example: I think we need to have an objective that specifically addresses... Objective 1 and 4 are saying the same thing and 4 is stated more clearly.</p>
5:00pm – 5:20pm Kristen Gelino, <i>Planning Team</i> Handout #2 – Overview of terminology and next steps in action development	ACTION ITEM DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Planning team will describe action plan development and introduce our next steps in moving towards <p>Why this matters: Actions are specific projects and activities that help us achieve our goals. The action plan forms the heart of the mitigation strategy (and the plan) and should be developed from the results of the risk assessment. Actions are what we hope to implement in the next five years in order to reduce risk to natural hazards.</p> <p>Feedback requested: Any question or clarification that is needed on action development. We recommend that you keep our vision, mission, goals and objectives in mind during this discussion.</p> <p>Example: How will our input be utilized in action development?</p>
5:20pm – 5:30pm	BREAK
5:30pm – 6:20pm Jeremy O'Leary, <i>Chairperson</i> ; Danielle Butsick and Kristen Gelino, <i>Planning Team</i> Handout #3 – Draft 2010 Progress Report and Handout #4 – Plan implementation and maintenance overview	PROGRESS REPORT AND PLAN MAINTENANCE <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Present and discuss the 2010 Progress Report• Introduce and discuss plan implementation and maintenance <p>Why this matters: Actions are the way in which we achieve our goals, so it is important to reflect on where we have made progress over the performance period of the prior plan. If we did not make progress, why not? Plan maintenance is the process established to track the plan's implementation progress and to inform the plan update.</p> <p>Feedback requested: Comments and questions on the 2010 Progress Report. Ideas for strategies for plan maintenance.</p> <p>Example: I would like to see a hazard mitigation working group that is charged with... or I think the public should continue to be involved in the planning process by...</p>

6:20pm – 6:30pm

Jessica London,
Chairperson and Kristen
Gelino and Danielle
Butsick, *Planning Team*

PUBLIC COMMENT AND NEXT STEPS

- Public comment
- Planning process update
- Review action items identified in the meeting

6:30pm

ADJOURN



MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: January 20, 2016

Subject: Steering Committee Meeting No. 6

Project Name: City of Portland 2016 Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

In Attendance: **Steering Committee:** Casey Milne, Danielle Brooks, Darise Weller, Dean Stearman, Glen Collins, Jeff Soulages, Jeremy O’Leary, Jennifer Levy, Jessica London, Jim Mattison, Jonna Papaefthimiou, John Steup, Kathryn Hartinger, Kathy Roth, Karen Tam, Laurent Picard, Maggie Skenderian, Micah Meskel (for Bob Sallinger), Molly Emmons, Nickole Cheron, Sherrie Forsloff, Simeon Mamaril, Rich Grant, Rob Lee, and Solamon Ibe

***Phone**

Planning Team: Danielle Butsick, Stephen Veith and Kristen Gelino

Non-voting Attendees and Members of the Public: Alex Roth, Allison Boyd and Ed Gibson

Steering Committee Members (or alternate) Not Present: Darlene Urban Garrett, Dean Alby, Jeff Geisler, Mary Ellen Collentine, Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro, Ronault LS Catalani, and Vicente Harrison

Summary Prepared by: Kristen Gelino and Stephen Veith – 01/31/2016

Project No.: 103S3954

Quorum – Yes or No Yes (25 voting members present)

Item	Action
------	--------

Welcome and Introductions

- Jeremy O’Leary, acting chairperson for the December meeting, opened the meeting and facilitated round-table group introductions for all persons present and on the phone.
 - At the time the meeting opened, the committee had not reached a quorum. A quorum was reached shortly after the welcome and introduction section of the agenda.
 - Mr. O’Leary and Kristen Gelino reviewed the meeting agenda and no modifications were made.
 - Handouts provided included: Agenda, December Meeting Summary (SC#5), Draft Vision, Mission, Goals and Objectives (HO#1), Overview of Terminology and Next Steps in Action Development (HO#2), Draft 2010 Progress Report (HO#3) and Plan Implementation and Maintenance Overview (HO#4).
 - Mr. O’Leary asked if any member of the public wished to address the committee. No members of the public were present who wished to provide comment.
-



Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The December meeting summary was reviewed by the committee and no comments were made; however, the summary was not approved because a quorum had not been reached. - Danielle Butsick provided a few administrative updates to the committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Index cards had been provided to the committee as part of this month's meeting packet. The planning team wanted to ensure that all comments were being captured from all committee members. Committee members should feel free to submit any questions or lingering comments that had not been addressed during the discussion to the planning team. - Ms. Butsick indicated that she had followed up with Multnomah County staff on the City of Maywood Park's participation in the County hazard mitigation plan. She introduced Allison Boyd who was in attendance and had reached out to the City regarding their participation. Maywood Park will be covered by the risk assessment that the County is conducting as part of their planning process. - Ms. Butsick thanked the committee for their input and insight on the development of the public survey. She indicated that a draft of the survey was in development and that she had met with several individuals one-on-one to provide feedback. She indicated that if anyone else wished to provide feedback and comment, they should reach out to her directly. She noted that the planning team hoped to have a live survey in early February. 	<p>The December meeting summary will be reviewed and approved at the February steering committee meeting.</p>

Objectives Development

Ms. Gelino introduced the draft mission, vision, goals and objectives handout. She indicated that the planning team had decided to give the committee a break on homework assignments and had, instead, drafted a set of objectives that meet multiple goals for the committee's review using other community objectives and mitigation best practices. Ms. Gelino reviewed the draft mission, vision and goals that had been selected previously by the committee and reviewed the definition of objective for this planning process:

Broader than actions, but more specific than goals, objectives are specific enough to help determine whether a proposed project or program would advance the values expressed in the goals. Objectives may also be thought of as 'policies.' In our planning process objectives will be used to define and prioritize actions.

A committee member indicated that the committee should be careful with using the word value after the decision to not develop value statements for the plan. This was noted by the planning team and they indicated that they would



Item	Action
------	--------

revise the definition to capture steering committee sentiments. Further discussion ended with a recommendation to revise the definition of objectives to refer to the values expressed in the vision and mission, rather than goals.

The planning team will revise the definition of objective as requested.

Ms. Gelino then asked all committee members to read through the draft objectives. She indicated that committee members should look for gaps and for objectives that are confusing in their wording. Ms. Gelino reminded the committee that objectives would be used to frame action item development. As an example, Ms. Gelino read the first draft objective “strengthen development codes and update land use designations to facilitate effective disaster risk reduction,” and indicated that an example of an action to come out of this might be reviewing on-site storm water retention policies to ensure that such regulations were not exasperating the potential for landslides in identified landslide hazard areas.

After reviewing the objectives several concerns and comments were brought up by committee members:

- Equity should be incorporated into each goal through an objective under each goal
- The layout of the objectives and their relationship to the goals is not user friendly and is confusing
- It is not clear how objectives will be measured (Note: the planning team clarified that actions in this planning process are used to show progress on meeting goals and objectives)
- It is unclear which objectives some action items from the 2010 plan would support (Note: the planning team indicated that this may indicate gaps in the draft objectives, although, the action items will be reworked during this update so these objectives are to apply to the 2016 actions rather than the 2010 actions)
- Objectives should be more specific with less planning language
- Draft objective number five could use more detail
- Objectives should be specific to each goal
- Objectives are unnecessary and should not be used in this planning process
- The goals and objectives are less important as long as the action items are clear.

After much discussion the committee agreed to move forward with the draft objectives and to revise them if needed later in the planning process.

Action Item Development Overview

Ms. Gelino provided an overview presentation on action item development. She indicated that handout #2 provided some of the information that she was presenting and was a companion document to the presentation. Ms. Gelino



Item	Action
------	--------

reviewed key terms, introduced ways to reduce risk, introduced types of mitigation actions and discussed next steps. During the course of the presentation Maggie Skenderian from the Portland Bureau of Environmental Services provided some background information on the role of natural resources in hazard mitigation. Additional work on action item development will occur over the next several months.

Progress Report and Plan Maintenance

Ms. Butsick introduced the draft 2010 progress report. She indicated that this report provides the status of the action items identified in the 2010 plan. She noted that finding information on the status of these actions was challenging because there were over 100 identified actions, some of the actions items were unclear, and some did not have clearly responsible agencies assigned to their implementation. That being said, Ms. Butsick indicated that progress on actions had in fact been made. 82 percent of the identified actions in the 2010 plan had at least been started, if not completed. She indicated that the goal for the 2016 plan is to have a more formalized system for plan implementation and maintenance. The committee then discussed recommendations for the plan implementation and maintenance strategy and the following suggestions were made:

- Each identified action should have a clearly identified lead agency that is responsible for the action item’s implementation
- Reporting on actions should be at least annual and more frequent if possible
- The bureaus should come together to review and discuss actions before annual grant cycles
- Resident involvement should continue during plan implementation and in monitoring progress
- Updates on action implementation should be bureau-wide and should be made available to the public
- There should be an easy mechanism for public feedback on implementation reporting
- Information on progress reporting should be made available at public outreach events and should include data points and measurable progress
- The project website should continue to be maintained and information on progress reporting should be posted
- Presentations should be made to the neighborhood coalitions each year



Item	Action
------	--------

- Progress reporting should be integrated into bureau reporting mechanisms
- Avenues for reaching college students/environmental students should be identified
- Additional follow up work on the survey could be conducted if certain groups are missed in the initial efforts.

Public Comment and Next Steps

- No members of the public present wished to make public comment.
- Ms. Gelino and Ms. Butsick provided a brief status update on other aspects of the project. They noted that they had just come from a meeting with the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries where they had heard information on a current project regarding landslide hazard areas and had received recommendations for action items. They also noted that the planning team was working to schedule the next Critical Energy Infrastructure stakeholder meeting and the committee would be informed when the date and time are confirmed. Jonna Papaefthimiou provided an update on the recent storm and flooding events experienced by the region. She indicated that there were millions of dollars of damages reported and that a presidential disaster declaration was expected. Ms. Papaefthimiou noted that this would open up grant opportunities for mitigation project. She reminded the committee that there is a planning requirement to receive these funds, so the committee has a strong incentive to work to get the plan completed on schedule. Ms. Gelino further clarified that in addition to the requirement to have an approved hazard mitigation plan to receive funding, there is also generally a requirement that projects for which funds are sought be identified in the plan. She indicated that this is part of the reason that the planning team recommended the particular structure for the objectives. It was also clarified that a mechanism for adding action items would be included in the plan implementation and maintenance strategy.
- The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 PM. The next steering committee meeting is:

February 17, 2016 at 4:00 PM
Portland Public Schools Blanchard Education Service Center
Wy'East Conference Room, Level L1
501 N Dixon St.
Portland, OR 97227
Call in number: 1-800-523-8437 code: 707-186-3750