



**Agenda**  
**City of Portland Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan Update**  
**9th Steering Committee Meeting**  
Wednesday, April 20, 2016, 4:00 to 8:00 PM  
Wy'East Conference Room, Level L1, 501 N Dixon St., Portland, OR 97227  
Call in Number: 800-523-8437 Code: 707-186-3750



<b>4:00pm – 4:20pm</b>	<b>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</b>
Danielle Butsick, <i>acting Chairperson</i> and Kristen Gelino, <i>Planning Team</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Round-table introductions</li><li>• Establish quorum</li><li>• Review the agenda</li><li>• Public comment</li><li>• Review the action items and approve March meeting summary</li><li>• Administrative updates</li><li>• Review of meeting tools</li></ul>
<b>Handout – SC#8 Summary</b>	
<b>4:20pm – 4:55pm</b>	<b>CRITICAL ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE (CEI) HUB REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
Danielle Butsick, <i>Planning Team</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Present the recommendations from the CEI Hub report</li><li>• Discuss the recommendations and answer questions about the report</li></ul>
<b>Handout#1 – CEI Hub Recommendations</b>	<p><b>Why this matters:</b> The CEI Hub will be included as an appendix in the plan document. The planning team would like the steering committee to review the recommendations for consideration as actions in the larger hazard mitigation plan.</p> <p><b>Feedback requested:</b> Questions and comments on the recommendations and/or planning process.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “Can you explain a bit more about how this recommendation came about?” or, “I think Recommendation 4 would be enhanced if it included...”</p>
<b>4:55pm – 5:45pm</b>	<b>PLANNING PROCESS UPDATE AND PRIORITIZATION STRATEGY</b>
Kristen Gelino and Danielle Butsick, <i>Planning Team</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Present the planning team recommendation for the prioritization strategy</li><li>• Discuss the strategy and provide recommendations for improvement</li></ul>
<b>Handout #2 – Draft Prioritization Strategy</b>	<p><b>Why this matters:</b> The plan must include a description of how the actions have been prioritized. This prioritization must include an emphasis on benefit-cost review.</p> <p><b>Feedback requested:</b> Concerns or suggestions about the recommended prioritization strategy.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “I think the strategy could be enhanced by ...” or, “I don’t understand what you mean by ... could you give an example?”</p>
<b>5:35pm – 5:50pm</b>	<b>BREAK</b>
<b>5:50pm – 6:10pm</b>	<b>BREAK-OUT INSTRUCTIONS AND VOTE BY DOTS</b>
<b>Handout #3 – Break out Instructions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The planning team will review instructions for the breakout sessions</li><li>• Steering committee members will “vote by dots” according to instructions</li></ul>
	<p><b>Why this matters:</b> Steering committee recommendations for actions will be given to the Bureaus.</p> <p><b>Feedback requested:</b> Vote on the actions that you think are most important for inclusion.</p>
<b>6:10pm – 6:35pm</b>	<b>SMALL GROUP ACTION-REFINING – SESSION 1</b>
Break out groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review and refine “top-rated” actions</li><li>• Review for equity concerns, identify potential partners, identify potential performance metrics</li></ul>
	<p><b>Why this matters:</b> This process will result in recommendations for mitigation action items that will be included and highlighted in the mitigation best practices catalog.</p>

**Feedback requested:** Revisions to action wording, ideas for enhancing equity potential, potential partners and suggested performance metrics.

**Example:** “Portlanders for Mitigation would be a good partner on this action.” Or “ This action could be refined so that...”

<b>6:35pm – 6:45pm</b>	<b>BREAK</b>
<b>6:45pm – 7:15pm</b> Break out groups	<b>SMALL GROUP ACTION-REFINING – SESSION 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Continue action-refining</li></ul>
<b>7:15pm – 7:25pm</b>	<b>BREAK</b>
<b>7:25pm – 7:55pm</b> Break out groups	<b>SMALL GROUP ACTION-REFINING – SESSION 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Continue action-refining</li></ul>
<b>7:55pm – 8:00pm</b> Danielle Butsick and Kristen Gelino, <i>Planning Team</i>	<b>PUBLIC COMMENT AND NEXT STEPS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Public comment</li><li>• Review action items identified in the meeting</li></ul>
<b>8:00pm</b>	<b>ADJOURN</b>



# MEETING SUMMARY

---

**Date of Meeting:** April 20, 2016

**Subject:** Steering Committee Meeting No. 9

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

**In Attendance:** **Steering Committee:** Brian Hoop (for Nickole Cheron), Casey Milne, Danielle Brooks, Darlene Urban Garrett, Darise Weller, Don Russ (for Laurent Picard), Jeff Soulages, Jeremy O’Leary, Jennifer Levy, Jim Mattison, Jonna Papaefthimiou, Margaret Puckette (for Jeff Geisler), John Steup, Kathryn Hartinger, Maggie Skenderian, Micah Meskel (for Bob Sallinger), Mary Ellen Collentine, Molly Emmons, Rich Grant, and Rob Lee

**\*Phone**

**Planning Team:** Danielle Butsick, Stephen Veith and Kristen Gelino

**Non-voting Attendees and Members of the Public:** Barbara Quinn, Don Pettit, Emma Stoker, Kiel Moses and Jennifer Belknap-Williamson

**Steering Committee Members (or alternate) Not Present:** Dean Alby, Dean Stearman, Glen Collins, Jessica London, Karen Tam, Kathy Roth, Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro, Ronault LS Catalani, Sherrie Forsloff, Simeon Mamaril, Solamon Ibe and Vicente Harrison

**Summary Prepared by:** Kristen Gelino– 05/23/2016

**Project No.:** 103S3954

**Quorum – Yes or No** Yes (20 voting members present)

---

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

**Welcome and Introductions**

- Danielle Butsick, acting chairperson for the April meeting, opened the meeting and facilitated round-table group introductions for all persons present. Ms. Butsick indicated that she was filling the role of chairperson because two of the co-chairs had prior commitments and were unable to attend and one co-chair had a prior commitment that would result in a late arrival to the meeting.
  - It was noted that a quorum of steering committee members was not present.
  - Ms. Butsick indicated that the agenda included in the meeting materials packet was slightly different than the agenda that had been distributed to the committee via email. She noted that the topics were still the same, but the order was revised to accommodate a planning team member’s schedule. The meeting agenda was reviewed and no additional modifications were made.
  - Handouts provided included: Agenda, March Meeting Summary (SC#8), Draft CEI Hub Recommendations (HO#1), Draft Prioritization Strategy (HO#2), and Break-out Instructions (HO#3)
-



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

- Several questions were asked by steering committee members regarding the handouts and action item voting:
  - Clarification was asked for on whether or not the action items should be grouped before voting as many seemed like they could be combined or were similar in nature. Ms. Butsick clarified that the planning team’s objective was to make the action items as specific as possible and that further grouping may broaden the actions. She indicated that the planning team had already grouped actions that were extremely similar as indicated in the documentation provided to the steering committee for review prior to the development of the final meeting materials.
  - Clarification was requested regarding the prioritization of long-term actions and how these actions could be high priority actions. Kristen Gelino indicated that she would like to hold off the discussion until the priority discussion portion of the agenda. *Note: this was not addressed at the meeting, but clarified with the member at a later date. High priority actions are those that once completed have an immediate impact, which many characterize many long-term actions such as long range planning efforts.*
  - It was clarified that the full list of steering committee recommended actions would be captured in the plan document and that they would be available for reference and consideration during the plan implementation and maintenance process. A review of the recommended actions could be written into the plan implementation and maintenance strategy.
  - It was noted that some of the potential action items were things that City Bureaus or Offices were already doing. The planning team clarified that continuing existing programs can be listed as actions. Ms. Gelino noted that a capability assessment is a part of the planning document and that any items that the Bureaus are already doing can be highlighted in this section of the plan as well as included as actions. A committee member also noted that listing existing programs in the action plan is a good way to highlight the importance of these programs in times when funding may be limited.
- It was noted that a quorum had been achieved.
- The March meeting summary was reviewed by the committee and approved by consensus.

The planning team will incorporate a review of recommended actions into the plan implementation and maintenance strategy.



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

- Ms. Butsick asked if any member of the public wished to address the committee. No members of the public were present who wished to provide comment.
- Ms. Butsick provided a few administrative updates to the committee:
  - The CEI Hub report is in draft form and the steering committee will be discussing the recommendations of the report later this afternoon.
  - The NHMP survey has received about 3,000 responses. The survey is now closed and the planning team is working on summarizing the results.
  - A Bureau workshop on selecting actions is scheduled for May 11<sup>th</sup>. It was clarified that this will largely be a procedural meeting where Bureaus will be given instructions on how to appropriately fill out the necessary tables. Action selection and equity screening will take place internally in each bureau. It was noted by a steering committee member that because only bureaus were invited to this workshop, a key player, public health, may be missing.
  - One planning for real meeting has been held. There were approximately 15 people in attendance. The remainder of the meetings are scheduled or are in the process of being scheduled. A steering committee member asked if there was the potential for a meeting to be scheduled in the St. Johns neighborhood. Ms. Butsick indicated that the planning team was unable to schedule a meeting in each neighborhood, but meetings were scheduled in the risk reporting areas. She requested that the steering committee member follow up with her after the meeting. *Note: A presentation discussing the NHMP update has been scheduled for June 14<sup>th</sup> at the St. Johns Neighborhood Association meeting.*

**Planning Process Update and Prioritization Strategy**

Ms. Gelino introduced the planning process update and prioritization strategy discussion. She indicated that the plan development process was more than halfway complete at this point, but there were still some major items to complete before the plan is reviewed and adopted and then implemented. Ms. Gelino indicated that the planning team’s goal is to have a draft of the plan document ready for review and comment by mid-July. After public review, the plan will be revised based on comments and ready for agency review by September 1<sup>st</sup>. Ms. Gelino stressed that the September 1<sup>st</sup> goal was critical to meeting the early January adoption requirement as the agency review by the State and FEMA can take several months.



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

Ms. Gelino then introduced handout #2 and indicated that the planning team had developed the action plan based on established best practices and comments from the steering committee that had been noted throughout the planning process. Ms. Gelino briefly reviewed the flow chart at the beginning of the document and summarized the recommended action plan prioritization process. She indicated that an equity screening tool had been developed based on the information that was presented regarding the Climate Action Plan best practices discussed at the March meeting and the equity training sessions held early in the process. Several questions, comments and requests for clarification were brought up by committee members and discussed including the following:

- Each bureau will be asked to apply the equity screening process to each action that they intend to select for implementation.
- Data is needed in order make decisions about equity and equity concerns should be brought into every level of plan development and action implementation.
- The current process may not be perfect, but it is a long way from the last plan. Shortfalls should continue to be noted so that the process can continue to be improved.
- The steering committee should devote some of the time at the last meeting to discussing lessons learned from the planning process. Discussing lessons learned should also be included in plan implementation and maintenance.
- The actions are bridged with the risk assessment through the identification of issue statements.
- If there are negative impacts identified as part of the equity screening process, the action should be revisited so that externalities can be addressed. If such externalities would require more study or have a significant potential for displacement they need to be further reviewed before implementation. After discussion the committee recommended that an additional action be added for Bureaus to look at negative externalities and protect displaced populations before action implementation. Appropriate language should also be included in the plan implementation and maintenance strategy.

The planning team will add an action for consideration as indicated.

The planning team will include equity impact information in the plan implementation and maintenance strategy.

There were no major concerns brought up by committee members about the plan prioritization process. Some additional questions and need for clarification about the action plan matrix tables were addressed including the following:

- There are appropriate places in the action plan to identify lead agencies, departments or bureaus as well as potential partners.
- There is space for the identification of actions that came from other plans in the “action source” field.

**Critical Energy Infrastructure (CEI) Hub Report Recommendations**



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

Ms. Butsick introduced handout #1 and provided a brief status update on the CEI Hub report development process. She indicated that the handout provided to the committee included the recommendations of the report that were developed through stakeholder engagement, a review of other studies and a risk assessment. She indicated that the full document had been sent out to stakeholders involved in the process for review and comment. Ms. Butsick indicated that she was looking for feedback from the steering committee on the recommendations. The draft report contains nine disaster resilience recommendations as outlined below. Comments on the recommendations are summarized below:

- CEI Hub Disaster Resiliency Workgroup
  - Ensure that small businesses and a natural resource group are included as stakeholders.
- Update/enhance CEI Hub Risk Assessment
  - The assessment conducted for this study was very basic, and this recommendation is striving to increase the robustness of a future analysis.
- Regulatory Amendment
  - It should be clarified that there are two resolutions addressing this issue.
  - The expansion number in the draft report is simply an example, not a recommendation.
  - It may be wise to use a carrot and a stick approach.
  - The resolutions may have had unintended consequences and this approach would offer an opportunity to correct some of those issues.
  - Oil spills would be very bad.
  - Residents in the areas surrounding the Hub would not be in favor of any expansion.
  - It can be quite costly to make appropriate retrofits for facilities in liquefaction areas and it is really an architectural feasibility question. A look at acceptable technologies would be needed.
  - Why is there no recommendation that the infrastructure be relocated? This was a recommendation in previous studies. Anecdotally, it seems as if ships docking at the Hub are rare and so the location on navigable waterways may no longer be as important.
  - The language in the last paragraph on page 5-2 should be revised for clarity.



Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emergency Response/Recovery Regulatory Waivers               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It would not be up to the owners/operators to declare such an emergency.</li> <li>- It should be made clear that the workgroup recommendation (CEI Hub Disaster Resiliency Workgroup) plays a role in implementing all other recommendations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Planning</li> <li>- Backup Power               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The report currently refers to BPA, but it should refer to PGE.</li> <li>- This recommendation is not targeted only at diesel generators, it could also be off-grid solar or other technologies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Training and Exercise</li> <li>- Facility Retrofits               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider a tax on un-retrofitted structures or assuredness bonds.</li> <li>- Consider highlighting insurance and liability issues as these facilities are likely self-insured.</li> <li>- Does this recommendation include retrofits outside of the CEI Hub? There may be facilities located in other high liquefaction potential areas.</li> <li>- Any regulatory changes would have to consider whether they would be geographically targeted (i.e. only in the CEI hub?), and if so what the geographic extent would be. Regulations or incentives could also be extended to facility owner/operators outside of the CEI hub. The Resiliency Workgroup would likely make recommendations about any potential regulatory changes, but decisions would be made by regulatory bodies.</li> <li>- Cathedral Park and the St. Johns Neighborhood Association should be included as stakeholders and referenced in the document.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Land Use Repurposing               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are issues with establishing a buffer as the event would likely trigger a chain reaction greatly expanding the areas likely to be impacted.</li> <li>- The specific recommendations for land use repurposing should be minimized and the recommendation should be reframed and retitled to focus on developing a buffer zone as a first step. Options for repurposing such as down-zoning or buy-outs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The planning team will distribute a revised version of the recommendations to the steering committee for comment.</p>



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

- could be mentioned as options to consider, but should not be described as recommendations.
- Linnton representatives would not be in favor of a buyout program or any recommendation that calls Linnton out as especially hazardous. This would be extremely damaging for property values.
- Reference to the Johnson Creek Willing Seller Program should be removed.

After discussion, Ms. Butsick indicated that the steering committee's recommendations would be captured and taken into consideration in the upcoming revisions to the draft. She indicated that a revised draft would be distributed for comment.

**Break-out Instructions and Vote by Dots**

Ms. Butsick and Ms. Gelino reviewed the instructions for the vote by dots exercise and small group action refining. Steering committee members then voted using the dots provided.

**Small Group Action Refining Sessions**

Two small group action refining sessions were conducted. Committee members discussed revisions to the top-rated actions for the hazards of concern. Notes were taken by members of the planning team.

*Note: Suggested revisions and notes are not included in this summary, due to the length of the document in which they were compiled. These notes were distributed to the committee for comment and are available upon request.*

**Public Comment and Next Steps**

- This portion of the agenda was not completed due to the length of the meeting.
- The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 PM. The next steering committee meeting is:

**June 15 , 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**



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

**Call in number: 1-800-523-8437 code: 707-186-3750**

**Note:** There will not be a May steering committee meeting.