



Program Committee Meeting Minutes

May 16, 2016

1:00 – 3:00 PM

Red Cross, 3131 N. Vancouver Ave., Portland, OR

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

1. Adrienne Donner, Vice Chair (chairing on behalf of Merrill Gonterman)
2. Cheryl Bledsoe, PDCC Delegate to the PrC
3. Mike Pullen, PIO Work Group (on behalf of Philip Bransford, Chair)
4. Robin Holm, Public Health Work Group Chair
5. John Wheeler, REMTEC/Emergency Management Work Group Chair
6. Kori Nobel, Marine and Civil Aviation Work Group Chair
7. Sherrie Forsloff, Health System/Hospitals Group (A.K.A., NW Health Preparedness Organization) delegate to the PrC
8. Alexander (Alex) Ubiadas, Jr., Transit Work Group (new TriMet Director of Emergency Management and Safety)

Meeting Attendees: Non-Voting Members

1. Denise Barrett, RDPO Manager
2. Amy Cole, PBEM Grants Compliance Program Coordinator
3. Alice Busch, Multnomah County Management (Observer)
4. Michael Patterson, Health System/Hospitals Alternate Delegate to the PrC
5. Adrienne Schmidt, Program Assistant, RDPO/PBEM

- 1) **Welcomes, Intros and Agenda Review** – Adrienne Donner, Vice Chair (chairing the meeting on behalf of Merrill Gonterman)
 - a) Adrienne welcomed all and asked those present for self-introductions.
 - b) Adrienne then reviewed the meeting agenda; asked for additions, deletions, or clarifications. Accepted as is by the group.
- 2) **Past Meeting Minutes** – Adrienne Donner
 - a) Review of meeting minutes
 - i) Adrienne asked for motion to approve the minutes from the April 18, 2016 PrC meeting.
 - ii) Mike Pullen motioned to approve the minutes; Cheryl Bledsoe seconds. All approve.
- 3) **REMTEC Training Committee** – Todd Felix
 - a) About a year and a half ago, REMTEC created a sub-committee centered around coordinated EOC training in the region and maintaining a training calendar on the RDPO website.
 - b) A lot of training around EOC and Cascadia Rising in the last year.
 - c) Sub-committee met a couple of weeks ago and felt there was a need to make some changes with the initiative.

- d) One idea was to change the focus of the training subcommittee to be more holistic in looking at the RDPO all hazards multi-discipline training needs. Encompass Fire, Police, PIO, and all the other working groups. Expand it into that role and have it fall under the Program Committee. Todd said he has gotten both positive and negative feedback about the idea.
- e) The sub-committee has other directions they are looking at as well, but wanted the Program Committee to look at it and see if it is something they might consider.
- f) REMTEC would no longer be the appropriate body to manage regional training coordination if it encompassed all of the working groups, so they thought the natural position would be with the Program Committee.
- g) Adrienne Donner asked if, for example, Todd would own the EOC trainings and bring them to the meeting to suggest things, and Robin would bring the Public Health ones, and talk as the chairs of those points of contact around the table – i.e., would be the ones who are the conduit for their disciplines.
- h) Todd says that would be up to the Program Committee to decide. He would envision it being like any other topic within the Program Committee – representatives from various working groups bringing any training needs forward. Other directions considered:
 - i) Changing from being like an on-going maintained committee to more of a project based committee. If it does become more project-based and stayed focused on EOC training it would stay at REMTEC.
 - ii) Todd said he believes that the one avenue that would bring it up to the Program Committee would be if it encompassed all of the working groups
 - iii) The Positive side: more collaboration throughout the working groups.
 - iv) The Negative side: it might get so big that it is unmanageable, it would require a serious commitment from all of those involved.
- i) To Mr. Felix's question about the Program Committee taking on a coordinated multi-discipline approach to planning trainings, Adrienne Donner responded that the group has talked about doing more hands on stuff, rather than only meeting to discuss updates. This would be something to own and create some cross-pollination between groups. She says REMTEC is great and has a good representation, but is not complete.
 - i) Adrienne opened the discussion. Committee members shared concerns on the approach being difficult to manage at the PrC level. There would be a big calendar with lots of components to it; lots of classes going on all the time. Who would manage it all?
 - ii) Robin Holm said it would be advisable to develop a regional training and exercise comprehensive plan.
 - iii) Kori Nobel talked about looking at it in phases and categories. There are already several calendars out there. As an EOC manager she said she is looking for very tactical exercises and trainings. "What do you have for check lists and what do you have for procedures?" She advised starting with something simple.
 - iv) Todd said that one of the other possibilities was to move the work of the current training committee to the Regional EOC Managers group, but he wanted to find out what the Program Committee wanted to do first and get their input.
 - v) Kori raised the question how do you keep it a working group so there is output, but be able to share with all different levels, without making it too big to manage?

- vi) Adrienne said maybe it is just insuring that tie-ins continue so that when new people come to the table they are aware of what is going on.
- vii) Todd asked the committee if they would like to consider making it a part of the Program Committee or not. If not they will keep it at the REMTEC level and make some changes at that level.
- viii) Cheryl said that as a non-emergency management manager, she hoped that the Training Committee would stay at REMTEC and focus on emergency management related training (i.e., ICS-, CMS- and EOC- specific areas), because that's where her discipline intersects. Her discipline has a lot of training centralized through DPSST. She explained that she could bring all of the trainings over to a centralized calendar, but it would result in an unwieldy spreadsheet.
- ix) Adrienne agreed that many disciplines have a core set of trainings specific to their needs, but all disciplines need ICS and EOC training. She has regional trainings that she does which are general, but she knows where to find who she needs. It is the EOC and ICS and a few other core ones which tie all the groups together. In the end, it may make more sense keeping the Training Sub-Committee at REMTEC or move it to the EOC managers group.
- x) Denise added that they could have a standing item on the agenda for sharing on trainings, but she personally believes it may become unwieldy if it gets beyond what they are currently doing.
- xi) Mike Pullen shared his agreement with the suggested direction. He said the PIO Work Group would be open to strengthening its interconnections with other disciplines but does not need any help coordinating PIO trainings, as the group does a great job on their own.
- xii) Todd shared that he agrees with the PrC that it does not make sense to move the training sub-committee to the PrC; however, it was his job to bring the questions forward.
- xiii) Cheryl said there might be a role in building stronger relationships with some of the State organizations that are trying to put on emergency response trainings. She sat at the table for the Traffic Incident Management meeting last week and they shared that they are struggling to find people to attend their meetings about how to handle traffic crashes on major high ways. Some of the feedback from that table was about the difficulty in getting first responder trainings to attend. It was recommended that they connect with either RDPO or REMTEC because it would have some application to emergency responders generally, just more difficult to get emergency responders into those classes.
- xiv) With no more comments from the group, Adrienne thanked Todd for presenting the topic and stimulating an important discussion.

4) **Strategic Planning** – Denise Barrett

- a) Denise began the session by telling the group that July 18th will be a joint meeting between the Steering Committee and the Program Committee to advance the current strategic planning cycle.
- b) She said that her goal for the today is to give an update on the intention of how the outcomes are going to evolve and talk through the Program Committee's expectation for how they would like to participate in the joint meeting. What do they need to accomplish in the meeting?
- c) She then referred to the document she sent out to the group, which contains the Steering Committee's draft outcomes. Denise explained that the outcomes were first developed last fall.

It took the Steering Committee a while to agree on them due to winter storms causing meeting cancellation and a need to ensure all Steering Committee members had a chance to voice their ideas.

- d) She said that the Steering Committee voted on the set of outcomes that are now before the PrC. She said the Policy Committee reviewed this document at its April 29, 2016 meeting; some of the comments in the document are theirs. She did not work with them on consensus yet; the PrC will be re-engaged in the fall to vote on the final document.
- e) Denise said she has also had the pleasure of engaging work groups, such as REMTEC, the Resource Management Standing Committee of REMTEC, the Law Enforcement Work Group, and the Public health Work Group to gain their input, which has been helpful. Open to all groups providing feedback, which can help strengthen this document.
- f) Denise said that she would like to devote a large portion of the June 20th PrC meeting to gaining solid and finalized feedback on all of the outcomes. Would like to have an initial talk now with the PrC about how to proceed in July's joint meeting. The purpose of that meeting is to get questions answered that will help work groups operationalize them.
- g) Denise said that she would like some input now on how to structure the July 18th meeting so that the PrC gains the most out of its time with the SC (and vice versa). Would like the Program Committee to lead. Denise proposed that part of the meeting on July 18th be dedicated to some small group work to review a set of the outcomes, especially those that need the most unpacking or clarification. Then bring the groups back together to discuss. Because the meeting is only two hours, we need to be focused on the outcomes people feel they need more clarity from the Steering Committee, or that they feel are not being pushed far enough.
- h) Denise would like to write an agenda based on how they would like to see the meeting run with the concept of small group work and plenary sessions to get the strategic objectives in a place where work groups can plan around them and develop and design projects.
- i) She said she will take the vision elements and refine them to create a before and after to keep track of where they came from. So far she believes she has got some solid feedback and hopes to get more to be able to merge, consolidate, refine, and be able to explain more about these particular outcomes.
- j) Denise then asked the PrC for some feedback about what they have just heard.
 - i) Adrienne Donner said that one of the things to really look at when everyone is brought together is to focus on the elements that are cross-cutting, because often times those are the ones that are often broad, less detailed. The ones she feel need to be focused on during the time the two groups have together are the ones that effect most people or can be effected by most groups and that may need some definition. Then decide what they want to tackle because most have multiple directions they could go in.
 - ii) Denise replied with full agreement. She shared that when she did the prioritization process a few years ago it was about the bigger goals, and then there were sub-objectives, and sometimes the sub-objectives looked like projects but they were centered on a particular area of work within a larger context.
 - iii) Denise added that Chris Walsh of Washington County Emergency Management responded to her request for input on the current draft outcomes. He brought up 2.4, "seamless and integrated response" and suggested adding the following: "with a focus on resource ordering and procurement, equipment inventory management, and strengthening regional

- logistics capabilities.” This could be somewhere to go with the discussion at the July meeting.
- iv) Regarding what Adrienne said about centering the July 18th meeting on the cross-cutting outcomes, Denise said she agreed and mentioned there is also more learning to be done too to unpack some of the ones that are more effecting on the 911 PSAP side. Originally Cheryl and Denise had drafted outcome statement 2.5 together and then Scott Porter said that there should also be something on overall radio interoperability, so they made 2.6. Chris Walsh believed that with all the bond measures and all the money going towards the big forklift of shifting to the 800 megahertz systems, why not focus on where the RDPO and its little money could make a difference and that could be on back up communications capabilities.
 - v) Adrienne said she doesn’t want to lose the more specific ones either. She said she wonders if the outcomes that are mostly owned by one group could be discussed by that group leading up to the joint meeting, and then they could report out to the rest. So that come July, the groups can look at the whole picture but not have to tackle anything that is really specific to one group, and where most people around the table wouldn’t know a lot about.
 - vi) Denise said she will try to do some outreach to specific groups.
 - vii) Cheryl asked if the end goal is to validate the current goals or to prioritize them or to find what is missing, because she doesn’t feel two hours is enough to accomplish all three.
 - (1) Denise said she thinks they should look at the top tier and get some dialogue going across the table and validate them as well as test them for how they translate into projects and initiatives and come out of the meeting giving her the ability to bring them to a final state.
 - viii) John Wheeler asked if the intent is for the Program and Steering Committee to figure out a way to operationalize the vision and outcome statements.
 - (1) Denise responded that the Program Committee’s role is to operationalize the RDPO strategic objectives and that’s why in June she would like to spend some time as a group and maybe even bring more of the work group members to do a little more discussion on some of the objectives.
 - ix) Alice said that she is not familiar with the process, so would like clarification that the vision and outcome elements have come from the Steering Committee and that in turn the Program Committee will tell them what they think the SC means by them?
 - (1) Denise replied that the Program Committee will go to the Steering Committee and tell them their understanding of the outcomes, and ask if they are headed in the right direction. Example: If you don’t mean this, what do you mean? What are we supposed to be doing that you will vote yes on? Again, it goes back to some of the outcomes being very broad.
 - x) Denise then brought up the interplay with the work group itself, because sometimes the SC doesn’t necessarily say “no”, but they say “We need to do this first.” On some it’s about where they are in the process of establishing a regional platform.
 - xi) Alice recalled a meeting where Mass Sheltering, which was a priority, was not funded, and Hazard Mitigation which was not a priority, was funded.
 - (1) Denise clarified: REMTEC liked the shelter projects but saw a need to start with a regional planning platform. And the Hazard Mitigation project was really about regional

preparedness messaging, which was a higher priority among the RDPO 2013-2016 strategic priorities, which guided UASI FY16 decisions.

- xii) Cheryl said from the Comms perspective they are going to disagree with interoperable communications being at the bottom of Tier 2.
- xiii) Denise said those outcomes will go higher, into Tier 1. In other words, by the July 18 meeting the comments will be integrated and the outcomes will be moved to different levels, as recommended.
- k) Denise switched gears and said that it is important for the Program Committee to determine if there are any outcomes that they are struggling to understand how to operationalize. They need to be able to go into the meeting asking for clarity. Denise directed the PrC to the “projects-to-outcomes document” as a tool for asking the SC, “Are these the types of projects that you want to see?”
- l) Alice raised the issue that people may have different interpretations of things.
- m) Denise shared that she would like the Program Committee to select the outcomes that they want the most clarity around, but also to bring their own interpretation to be able to build and connect bridges.
- n) Adrienne said she thinks the RDPO is at a point of maturity where they can start to turn tables. She believes they can start doing more as a regional program all working together to strategize and prioritize, allowing the workgroups to see where there are gaps and they can fill the gaps with the right kind of projects bringing the RDPO forward more effectively than five years ago. They are at the point where the strategy and requests will start to match up intentionally.
- o) Returning to the topic of the Shelter projects, Denise ensured Alice Busch that nobody wanted to reject those projects but there was an expectation that Multnomah County would come back to the region to inform and help make decisions based on their work in the subject area.
 - i) Denise asked John Wheeler for his opinion. John explains the history of the project. In previous years REMTEC was asked if they wanted to work on a project related to Mass Care and Shelter and unofficially they responded that Multnomah County was working on a substantial project to address that issue and get the ball rolling and they wanted to see how it came out before they did anything. The challenge was when the time came to work on the REMTEC work plan and they ended up with two training and equipment proposals. A lot of jurisdictions in the region do not even have plan in place upon which to make training and equipment decisions. With the Just-in-Time training in Washington County, there were a lot of questions about how it would work and who would be involved, which he believes is why there was some resistance.
 - ii) Alice shared her agreement and said she has made the same argument about having a training without knowing what the framework is around it, so it seems like it might be easy to say that enhanced mass care and shelter capabilities need plans and frameworks, and that might be a way to clarify what they are looking for.
 - iii) Denise replied that it is a big topic that must be discussed at the July 18 meeting to come up with a clear direction.
 - iv) Adrienne said that some of the things that matriculated up to the RDPO in 2013 were on the Homeland Security plan for years but no one knew how to tackle them. So they have had to push the agenda, but with the timing and wanting to see the Multnomah County go through its process of learning and planning there was a kind of understanding that everyone would

- come together back to the place where they could have clarity around how to proceed in the region.
- v) Alice said that as soon as she saw that project she said they really need a regional shelter plan.
 - p) Denise then asked the group to reflect and come up with at least a preliminary list of where they would like to see some discussion at the July 18 joint meeting.
 - i) Adrienne: 1.1 -- *Increased coordination between the public, private and non-profit sectors in preparedness, response and recovery* -- is super big and hard to figure out and they are going to have two representative in the room from either private or non-profit, so it doesn't seem like one they can tackle that because it's just them talking to themselves.
 - ii) Robin Holmes: you could put each outcome statement on a poster and ask people to go to the one that they want to work on and do it in two shifts so each person can work on two. And be able to choose which one they want to give input to and have experience on.
 - iii) Kori Nobel asked about the notes in the draft outcomes document, the ones that say "consider consolidating 1.1, 2, 3, 4 and 5." She said she sees *Established coordination of all-hazards resilience planning, policy-making and project implementation across the region* as being focused on our entities and organizations, where *Increased community preparedness/resilience in the region* is focused on community members. She continued: separating those two would help in developing projects, to where the former is about building the resiliency of our companies, entities, and government agencies, and the latter is really focused on building the resilience of our people in our neighborhoods.
 - iv) Adrienne said that while she sees robust conversations being had on *Increased Community Preparedness/Resilience and Enhanced Mass Care and Sheltering capabilities in the Region*, the ones before those two (i.e., *Increased information-sharing and RDPO demonstrates value*) she feels are good ideas, but she cannot see the conversation at the table being more than minimum.
 - v) Alice asked if Tier 1.2 is about how to operationalize whole community involvement of stakeholders?
 - (1) Denise responded that she thinks it is looking at what is in the Oregon Resilience Plan and pulling out what the group should be working on, though some of it doesn't make a lot of sense with the RDPO. However, looking at how the Policy Committee is doing effective advocacy on certain legislation, this is where they will start to see the link in terms of helping to promote parts of those plans. She says maybe they can impact that plan a little more and see what is in there and remind the group of it.
 - (2) Alice responded: If what Denise has said is the same as the recommendation for 1.1, Alice agrees. She also mentions that maybe that's what the resilience plan is talking about, having to work with private industry you need to talk with them.
 - vi) Robin shared that she thinks that the SC will need to provide more background on these when everyone is brought together for the two hours.
 - vii) Denise said that she feels it would be good to really focus on a few of the outcomes, mainly the ones that they feel are needing the most clarification and direction. Additionally, they can try to work out any duplicates or the possibility of some of the outcomes becoming subs and going under other outcomes.

- viii) John shared challenges at reading some of the outcomes because he said they are so general, and he wondered how helpful they will be in the end. He said he thinks the Steering and Policy Committees need to really think about what they want out of the strategic plan, so that when it comes time for putting ideas into the project pipeline, the Program Committee/Work Groups are able to find things that are useful and will address the priorities. He said that his key feedback for Denise is that if the outcomes are so general that they aren't helpful, is there something that can be done to the vision and outcome statement to make them more useful?
- (1) Alice replied that if everything is a priority, nothing is a priority. There is no mechanism to say that something doesn't fit. She suggested that the group needs some kind of scope to be able to say "No" to some of the projects that come in. She referred back to a previous statement that Adrienne made, saying that when a project comes in, they have to try to find somewhere to fit it.
- ix) John asked a question about "increased coordination between the public, private and non-profit sectors": Do this help move the Region forward? The answer: not in a significant sense.
- (1) Adrienne mentioned that they have quite a bit more of the public/private partnership happening now than before, so that is a change. There is always the argument if they are trying to pull in private sectors, what is it they are pulling them in for? It is hard to say that they want them at the table, without reasons to back it up.
 - (2) Denise reminded the body that there are times when the private sector wants things of the RDPO that the RDPO cannot easily effect. She shared that she received a call from Rick Carter, who works for the Public Utility Commission in Salem. He requested that the RDPO Steering Committee discuss how they are going to credential his staff and contractors to be able to enter into restricted zones after the earthquake. The Steering Committee flat out pushed it back and said that while this is important, it is not their work.
 - (3) Sherrie Forsloff said that in regards to increased coordination, she thought it would be great to have a one page of bullet points indicating what groups can expect from one another (i.e., on how each sector works together). It may seem simplified, but there is a lot of talk about exercises, the Fusion Center, and THIRA, but many of the private groups won't understand or know what these mean unless they are a huge organization.
 - (4) Todd explained the many different levels of private sector involvement and what those look like, and that utilities are a natural part of that. Some of the big companies, like Walmart for example, bring certain capabilities during a disaster; however, there are other large companies that don't have those types of programs. Take Nike as another example: they have stuff but there is no plan as to how they are going to work with others, followed by the smaller businesses who are in the same predicament. There is no one size fits all approach to these, and one of the things he said is trying to put together for OEMA in October is to have a conversation addressing this. They have been talking with Debbie Moore from the State, the new public-private sector partnership staff, and are trying to conceptualize a dual sector representation panel discussion, going through a scenario and being able to ask questions. Public on one side, private on the other, and figure out how everyone can work together. He said he sees certain

things that are very obvious but many that are still unclear what the approach should be.

- (5) Sherrie said they need to have those engagement pieces before they can start to flush anything out.
- (6) Alice recommended a gap analysis. She compared it to a recent conversation at REMTEC about the public-private partnerships. In the end, there were such a variety of organizations to interact with. You have to start somewhere.
- x) Adrienne asked that the Committee wrap up this discussion. Denise suggested that the group continue it at the next meeting.
- xi) Before the transition to the next agenda item, John raised a couple of thoughts he has. The first being that it would still be good to massage out the vision and outcome statements. The next he would like the group to think about between this meeting and the June meeting, is to look at a series of two to three questions per vision/outcome statement, where the Program Committee wants some specific feedback from the Steering Committee. There is so much variation between the outcomes that it is too hard to come up with consistent questions to be able to ask about each one.
- xii) Denise stated her agreement with John's proposal and affirmed that they will do that at the next meeting as part of their preparations.
- xiii) Alex said he would like to ask the Steering Committee to really try and make the outcomes smart objectives.

5) **UASI Grants** – Amy Cole, PBEM Grants Program Coordinator

- a) Amy started her report by updating the group on the status of closing out **UASI FY'14**. The amendment has been signed by the state so they are able to work to finish final projects. The amendment reallocates some funding and it also extends the contract period that was supposed to end May 31st. It now ends July 31st, giving them a little extra time to spend money.
- b) The funding for the TITAN Fusion Center was going to underspend this year, so OEM gave the money to RDPO to spend. This was \$54,721 added to the money from other project underspends, totaling \$115,000 for reallocations.
 - i) \$12,300 will be spent on iPad minis for the Metropolitan Air Support Team.
 - ii) \$102,684 will go for the regional radio cache. There was already \$16,000 allocated for the regional radio cache, resulting in a total of \$118,684 to spend. Will go towards replacement radios at a few of the PSAPs. The original project approved by the Steering Committee was \$200,000 back under UASI FY'14, but there was only \$16,000 available at the time. The project will remain open to be a "sponge" should there be any more underspends.
- c) **UASI FY'15**: Amy revisited some of what they talked about this last time. Of the IGAs that went out last month, she has received signatures from Clackamas, Columbia, and Port of Portland. Clark, Multnomah and Washington County are still in process of getting signed. There were a few inconsistencies with the IGAs, so she sent out some amendments which were simply wording changes, and those have now been sent to the partners for signature. Once the IGAs and sub grants are signed it will be fine to spend the money. This goes county by county not required to wait for all of the IGAs to be signed.

- d) **UASI FY'16:** Amy submitted the investment justifications which were uploaded by the deadline, so now they are just waiting for final federal approval and for OEM to send a contract, which she hopes will be sometime in the fall.
 - i) She reminded the body that the quarterly reports for UASI FY'15 are due in July. Amy will be trying something new and using Smart Sheet, a project management tool. It is now going to be a survey with the same questions that when completed will be submitted back to her and made into a spreadsheet.
 - e) Amy took the time to thank the people who participated in the **training and technical assistance survey**. She received 25 responses. The top five areas that came back as needing training or technical assistance were:
 - i) Project design and management
 - ii) Equipment purchasing/contracts
 - iii) PTE purchasing/contracts
 - iv) Requisition and reimbursement process and
 - v) 2.cfr.200 and State guidelines and financial requirement
 - f) Denise and Amy have made the decision to do a combination of webinars, in-person training, and one-on-ones, as needed. For project design management they plan to do a webinar or a call, to avoid making everyone travel to one specific location. For purchasing and contracts as well as requisitions and reimbursement, they will hold an in-person training because it is more complex and expect there to be a lot of specific questions. Two topics that Amy feels are important to expand on are the EHP form and the Project Amendments form, so she will be making a webinar for the two and posting them on the website. Amy will be sending out the EHP form webinar with the EHP form to watch before filling out the form.
 - i) Adrienne suggests that anytime anyone can record a live webinars and put them on the website they should do so because it makes it easy to refer someone to the website for information. It would save a great deal of time and resources.
 - ii) On another note, Adrienne felt that it would be worth the while for Amy and Denise to also do an RDPO overview webinar.
 - iii) It is all in process and Amy will have updates at the next meeting.
- 6) **Update of the RDPO UASI SOP – Amy Cole**
- a) There us a draft that she is still working with.
 - i) Amy and Denise explained to the group that the Program SOP is the charter for the way they spend money in the RDPO Program. It was originally for UASI spending but is being updated to reflect RDPO contributed funds from local partners. It will also be updated to be more consistent and in alignment with the IGA and current processes and structure.
 - ii) Denise said that there is one document that really consolidates all of the structures: their decision making authority, processes from application of grant to amendments, and what happens to the money. We used to use the term “reprograming” but we don’t use that term anymore. So we are cleaning it up and updating it.
 - b) Adrienne asked: “Does that document include stuff like what we have talked about as far as encouraging the Steering Committee members to reach back to their disciplines, or the people they are there representing? We’ve had quite a few conversations about how to improve that system.

- i) Denise: it's really more focused on the money, the rules and responsibilities, and the authority limits processes of spending the grants.
- c) Amy updated the group on getting ready to gear up for the pipeline process.
- d) Denise referred to the [RDPO 2016-2017 Program Development and Management Cycle](#) hand out, an updated version of the one we have been using for a couple of years. Denise then took the group through the cycle, explaining the different phases and features and their purpose, timing and who's responsible.
 - i) She mentioned that the strategic planning will finalize this fall, as the work groups and Program Committee are beginning to fill the RDPO projects pipeline.
 - ii) She said that she would like work groups and the Program Committee to make sure projects still in the Projects Pipeline are still relevant and accurate – i.e., see if there is anything that needs to be taken out, amended a bit, re-prioritized, etc., before the Program Committee adds to it.
 - iii) We will start calling for new projects in August to begin building up the pipeline for UASI FY'16, basically the same cycle as always.
 - iv) Denise shares that the submission deadline will be in November this year to ensure that the Program and Steering Committees have enough time to complete their reviews and approvals.
 - v) Adrienne reinforces the importance of the documents going out soon, and not be as lenient as last year.
 - (1) Denise agreed, and said will send the email out mid-June, after Cascadia Rising is over. There will be a hard deadline set, and nothing will be accepted for that year after the date has passed.
 - (2) The group then discussed and agreed that November 1, 2016 will be the due date for new project concepts.
 - (3) John asked when the strategic planning is going to be done. Denise answers that she thinks by October or November.
 - (4) John shared that he was hoping it could help inform the project platform, but Denise said she thinks they will have a solid enough sense of how the outcomes are going to be translated, so that any new projects coming in should align with them. They may still be very broad but there may be a winnowing process over the next year that they will help focus projects on the right outcomes/parts of outcomes.
 - (5) Denise mentioned that there will be some UASI FY'15 and RDPO partner-contributed funds available this fall.
 - (6) Adrienne said she liked the concept of funding some projects this fall with those funds. There may be new projects that come in that the group doesn't want to delay starting.
 - (a) Cheryl asked what percentage of the three-year UASI FY'15 timeline will have been expended by Fall.
 - (b) Answer, not very much.
 - (7) Amy added that we could release a portion of UASI FY'15 contingency, along with RDPO contributed funds this fall, or wait until spring 2017 and combine all when the UASI FY'17 grant application begins.
 - (8) John asked if the Program Committee could have a standing agenda item for each meeting, addressing what the prognosis of funds being returned for reallocation are,

just to be informed. This way if they got a project that's \$100,000, they can say how much they can or cannot spend and start thinking about right away. He would even like to consider re-allocating right away. If they are dealing with larger amounts he doesn't believe they should be waiting for some milestone to reallocate, they should just do it as they go. He feels that typically when they near the end they have to spend it all on equipment.

- (a) Denise explained that the reason things were a little different under UASI FY'14 was because they were having to hang on for dear life while waiting for the DOJ/TITAN Fusion Center to report back to OEM on their projected underspend. She assured that they were pushing to get the money used and they knew that the radio cache project was already approved and the Steering Committee had just given them a token amount of money, which couldn't buy more than a couple of radios. So that was projected through to finish. For UASI FY'15, we expect the Program Committee to reach back into the pipeline to consider best use of contingency and other funds available. Denise said does not want them waiting until the end of the grant cycle.
- (b) Amy expanded on John's idea that it might also be good to have a standing agenda item for her to give an update on just spending for the projects that have started spending. This time they are given a little more time to spend because UASI FY'14 was only 24 months, and UASI FY'15 is back to 36 months.
- (c) Cheryl mentioned that if they are staying with the pipeline projects and funding them in order, then it's not a huge workload for them. Whereas if they were also collecting additional ideas on projects to be funded that creates a whole other grant process.
- (d) Denise said she thinks it may be a little premature to make any reallocation decisions. Looking at the pipeline right now, they need to see if there are any changes to be made based on Steering committee and Program Committee input as well as going back to the work groups and ask for their feedback.
- (e) Cheryl said she thinks that from her work group perspective, it will be a little bit of a challenge to estimate final project spending or additional needs because they are so busy with their Text-to-911 project. She doesn't know that it will be fully spent by September.
 - (i) Amy replied that they have two years from now to spend the money and are not wanting to penalize projects that take a little longer to get going; reallocation considerations are just for projects with no traction.
- (f) With regards the feedback about the FY'16-17 pipeline: if it had a planning dimension would it be different? Because there are different ways to do it. She said she thinks that some lateral thinking should be done.
- (g) Adrienne said she thinks they should more actively discuss the need to build the RDPO staffing. Can they get more staff within the RDPO to help get stuff done? Though she doesn't think that "more staff" is something Denise can simply ask for, she said she does think that the group should come forward and point out things like "this is where the RDPO needs better engagement." As for now, the work keeps falling on a couple of shoulders.

(9) In order to reaffirm that projects should stay in the pipeline, be changed, or be removed, Adrienne asked for a commitment from chairs of work groups with projects in the pipeline to address the questions:

- (a) Is the project still relevant?
- (b) Is the project still accurate (timing, budget, objectives, etc.).
- (c) Are there any changes we need to make?

7) **Work Groups and Other Updates – All**

- a) **Cheryl (PDCC)** – focus has been all about text 911 right now. It is in the testing phase, doing 12 to 15 hours of testing per week. They are looking at what day to go live. That date can be anywhere from August 1st to the day after Labor Day. She expects September to be the official go live month. This will be the pilot project for the State of Oregon that will be studied for 6 months, then the rest of the state will come aboard in 2017.
 - i) Official hours where it is on, but they don't want anyone to try and test it themselves because it will be treated as a real emergency.
 - ii) A lot of outreach with the deaf and hard of hearing community going on. They are developing PSA's and media bits, hoping to get the media campaign to launch the same time 911 launches.
 - iii) As for funding, they are collecting and asking their 20 targets to send \$5,000, so it should allow them to buy radio, television and develop PSAs that are sign interpreted. [Part of the project is funded under UASI FY'15.]
 - iv) Lastly, she recommended the group watch John Oliver's, "Issues with 911" video. It fully captures every issue they have in the 911 community.
- b) **Alex (Transit)** -- this is his 3rd day on the job, not a lot to update. He provided some background on himself to the group:
 - i) He is from Hawaii and has a background in Emergency Management and military/public sector, and he owned his own consulting business (private sector). He also has experience in grants and in managing law enforcement.
- c) **Kori (MCA)** - explained some of the difficulties that the Marine and Civil Aviation (MCA) Work Group has been experiencing.
 - i) The group has gone from being very port-specific (e.g., Port of Vancouver, Port of Portland, Port of St. Helens, etc.) to expanding to include the first responder maritime response agencies. It has become strictly Police and Fire maritime units wanting equipment. This was not the main objective for the MCA, but that is what it has become. They would like to recommend that the group be dissolved, with Police and Fire members returning to their respective discipline work groups.
 - ii) From a port only perspective, they have a lot of connections with the other ports so there are regular communications regarding initiatives and subjects that are really port-specific and not to a regional benefit; same with law enforcement and fire. That is their recommendation; Denise will be coordinating a call between the leadership of the MCA, Fire/EMS and Law Enforcement Work Groups soon to discuss the proposal and determine who will take over the one large project they have, which is the Shipboard Threat capabilities estimation and exercise project.

- iii) Kori also confirmed that they will not be losing the knowledge base; they will still be in connection with law enforcement.
- iv) Kori also updated the group about the transition of Mark Crosby, head of safety and security at the Port of Portland. He also serves as the Port of Portland representative to the RDPO Steering Committee. Kori explained that he has been promoted to Brigadier General, which provides a ton of opportunities for him outside of the Port. He will be leaving the Port on July 1st.
- v) Denise didn't get to update Kori yet, but as everyone knows there is the Shipboard Threat project that is funded for a total of \$200,000 (\$100,000 under 15 and \$100,000 under FY' 15 and '16. Steve Elbridge of Vancouver Fire told her he would be happy to step up and be the project manager to shepherd it. She will be working with them to get an RFP completed and through the City of Portland system.
- vi) Denise also mentioned that with regards to the aviation TTX/Workshop, the Feds were not able to accept the October dates she and Kori proposed, so the event will be moved to November. More on that to come as the planning commences later this summer.
- vii) Denise said she is still working on Emma's replacement. They have completed four interviews and they will be conducting second interviews of the top two soon. Should be able to make an offer in the next couple of weeks. In addition, Denise mentioned that this Thursday there is a panel who will be reviewing the proposals for the next phase of the Regional MAC Development project.
- d) **Todd (Utilities EM Group)** - the Utilities met with Debbie Moore from OEM last week, and talked about the history of their interaction with OEM, the Cascadia exercise and also public-private partnership and how to move that forward. After Cascadia Rising they will start getting together, to try to put some substance to the idea of having some kind of panel discussion at the next OEMA conference with Utilities, State, and local governments to talk about certain issues where they know they will interact and how to get around any road blocks.
- e) **John (REMTEC)** - the Disabilities Access and Functional Needs project is barreling down the tracks; have had some good surveys and interviews. The first week of the month was the big week for interviews of the key stakeholders. It has been on track, on time and on budget. Global Vision Consortium is the prime contractor, there are 2 subs, one is EAD and associates and the other is Rock Creek. Other updates from John:
 - i) DOGAMI Mapping Project: they will be talking to REMTEC in July.
 - ii) Adrienne asked John about the status of the Facility Allocation Project.
 - (1) John said there is an RFP that has been put out, but no specific update at the time.
 - iii) John continued with an update on the resource ordering and tracking project and the utility coordination plan update (two other UASI FY'15-funded projects). He said these will most likely have to wait until after Cascadia Rising before making any substantial progress.
 - iv) Another project not funded by anyone other than their force account is the stranded worker agreement, which they are working towards the end of their goal. The project, led by Robin Holm, just has one or two sentences that need to be adjusted.
 - v) Last update, John and Todd are starting the process of trying to replace themselves as chair and vice chair. They are taking nominations until June 3rd then will do an election at the July meeting.

- f) **Mike - the PIO Work Group** did an ad campaign for the Public Alerts website, which prompted about 1,500 new people sign up. They have had TV ads with KGW and ads with the Portland Tribune newspaper. Bus ads are also in the works. Also:
- i) Erick Frank is working with the RDPO Messaging Task force to suggest some ways to update the Public Alerts website to make it easier for people to sign up.
 - ii) The transition to Everbridge, the new vendor who sends out the alerts, has gone well.
 - iii) For Cascadia Rising, some of the PIOs are going to be located at the CIM CEL at Camp Wythecombe and others at the local CIM CELs from the different organizations participating in the exercise. He said he believes it will be a good experience for a lot of PIOs.
- g) **Sherrie - NW Hospital Group** has been going through a transition. They met with the HPO Steering Committee last week and decided to meld the Hospital EM group and NWHPO SC into one body. Now, rather than having their two-hour, monthly meeting for the NW hospital group, they will consolidate into one NW HPO Steering Committee group, meeting for three hours every other month.
- i) The Pediatric Surge planning will begin, but first they have to decide who is going to serve as the project manager. It has been suggested that they have someone with health care background manage it. Sherrie thinks they need to sit down and talk about what their expectations are for the peds piece.
 - ii) Sherrie said that she and Kathryn Richer will be taking the regional trauma surge plan around the state -- talking about the components of the plan and encouraging each region to come up with their own. The state is hiring a contractor who will go in and work with each region, one on one, and help them develop a plan. The plan is going statewide.
 - iii) Adrienne added that the Oregon State resilience officer position has been filled by Mike Harryman of OHA, who will serve for a one-year term. It is a rotating appointed position, so he will take the first run at it. Akiko Saito will assume Mike's role in managing the HPO groups and leading that charge.
- h) **Robin - the Public Health Work Group** has begun to update its SOP, and in doing so opened a discussion on membership. She said that Denise attended one of their meetings and helped lead the discussion about how they define who members are, which is still under discussion. They were also formally introduced to a new medical countermeasures coordinator, Jennifer Graham.
- i) **Adrienne (Cities Readiness Initiative)** - Oregon has an MOU between local public health authorities and pharmacies that is signed by the county local public health authorities. All the counties in the RDPO region (minus Clark because they are in a different state) have signed and then pharmacies. Oregon State Public Health is taking the charge on the large pharmacies, like Walgreens and Fred Meyers, while local counties are taking on the mom and pop shops. Oregon State was very good about acknowledging events like the earthquake, so our MOU addresses all hazards as well as medical measures.
- i) There is also a piece concerning medication, for example if a person comes in needing heart medication and they have the bottle, can they get their medication in a crisis?
 - ii) Here is the link to the website with the MOU and who has signed it already: <https://public.health.oregon.gov/Preparedness/Partners/Pages/PharmacyMOU.aspx>. There are already 315 pharmacies that are on board. It's a huge amount of work.

iii) The regionalization project within public health and health care may hear some name changes, referring to it as “cross-county collaboration.” They’ve made a big effort cross walking the work done within the public health emergency preparedness programs, and have identified a regional governance body who will be moving that piece together with representatives from health care, large county/small county, and the health officers. They are a strong group, who then reports to a regional public health leadership group. It is still moving they are just trying to get past hurdles of public health and the shift the HPO just went through.

8) **Good of the Order** – Adrienne Donner

- a) Next meeting will be June 20th, location to be determined.
- b) No other good of the order items are raised.

9) **Adjournment:** Adrienne thanked all colleagues for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 2:57 pm.